

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

TUESDAY, 5 NOVEMBER 1985

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

TUESDAY, 5 NOVEMBER 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—

- Australia Acts (Request) Bill;
- Rural Lands Protection Bill;
- Small Claims Tribunals and Dividing Fences Acts Amendment Bill;
- Private Employment Agencies Act Amendment Bill;
- Gas Act Amendment Bill;
- Electricity Supply Industry Employees' Superannuation Restoration Bill;
- Penalty Units Bill;
- Police Act Amendment Bill (No. 2);
- Police (Photographs) Act Amendment Bill.

PAPER PRINTED DURING RECESS

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

Report of the Auditor-General on the books and accounts of the Brisbane City Council 1984-85.

**REPORT OF THE PARLIAMENTARY COMMISSIONER FOR
ADMINISTRATIVE INVESTIGATIONS**

Mr SPEAKER announced the receipt from the Parliamentary Commissioner for Administrative Investigations of his 1984-85 report.

Ordered to be printed.

REPLY TO MOTION OF CONDOLENCE

Death of Mr E. J. Beardmore, MBE

Mr SPEAKER: I have to inform the House that I have received the following letter—

“

‘Rosehill’ Station
St. George, Q. 4487
20 October, 1985.

The Speaker of the Parliament,
Hon. J. H. Warner, M.L.A.,
Parliament House,
George Street,
BRISBANE, 4000

Dear Mr. Speaker,

Would you please convey to the Members of the Parliament our deep appreciation for the Motion of Condolence passed by the Legislative Assembly,

on the death of our father, Edwin James Beardmore M.B.E. We do especially thank the various Members who spoke on the Motion.

My sisters, myself and my family, thank you most sincerely for forwarding the specially prepared Extract of Speeches from 'Hansard' and for your expression of sympathy.

Yours sincerely,
John E. Beardmore".

PETITIONS

The Clerk announced the receipt of the following petitions—

Ambulance Service

From Mr Veivers (2 966 signatories) praying that the Parliament of Queensland will upgrade the Queensland Ambulance Service with special life-saving equipment and training for officers.

[A similar petition was received from Mr Bailey (1 919 signatories).]

Electricity Subsidy for Pensioners

From Mr Burns (48 signatories) praying that the Parliament of Queensland will provide for a substantial subsidy on electricity costs for pensioners.

Petitions received.

OVERTIME PAID IN GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS

Return to Order

The following paper was laid on the table—

Return to an Order made by the House on 27 August last, on the motion of Mr Kaus, showing the amount of overtime paid in each Government department (all funds) in 1984-85.

USE OF OFFICIAL AIRCRAFT

Return to Order

The following paper was laid on the table—

Return to an Order made by the House on 27 August, on the motion of Mr Simpson, in relation to the operation of aircraft owned by the Government of Queensland, regarding travel by Ministers of the Crown during the year 1 July 1984 to 30 June 1985, showing—

- (1) Total flying time;
- (2) Total number of passengers carried;
- (3) Names of Ministers who travelled on any of the aircraft.

PAPERS

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

Reports—

State Fire Services for the year ended 30 June 1985

Rural Fires Board of Queensland for the year ended 30 June 1985

Parole Board for the year ended 30 June 1985

Royal Queensland Theatre Company for the year ended 30 June 1985
 Department of Transport for the year ended 30 June 1985
 Metropolitan Transit Authority for the year ended 30 June 1985
 Beach Protection Authority of Queensland for the year ended 30 June 1985
 Financial Statements of the Public Trustee of Queensland for the year ended 30 June 1985.

The following papers were laid on the table—

Proclamations under—

Queensland Museum (Assimilation of Coomera Technology Centre) Act 1985
 Queensland Museum Act 1970-1985
 Forestry Act 1959-1984
 Deer Farming Act 1985
 Sugar Acquisition Act 1915-1984

Orders in Council under—

The Supreme Court Act of 1921
 National Parks and Wildlife Act 1975-1984
 Forestry Act 1959-1984
 Health Act 1937-1984
 Fisheries Act 1976-1984
 Meat Industry Act 1965-1984
 Factories and Shops Act 1960-1983
 Irrigation Act 1922-1983 and the Statutory Bodies Financial Arrangements Act 1922-1984
 River Improvement Trust Act 1940-1983 and the Statutory Bodies Financial Arrangements Act 1922-1984
 Water Act 1926-1983 and the Statutory Bodies Financial Arrangements Act 1982-1984
 Water Act 1926-1983
 Harbours Act 1955-1982
 Harbours Act 1955-1982 and the Statutory Bodies Financial Arrangements Act 1982-1984
 Beach Protection Act 1968-1984
 Explosives Act 1952-1981
 Mines Regulation Act 1964-1983
 Electricity Act 1976-1984 and the Statutory Bodies Financial Arrangements Act 1982-1984

Regulations under—

Fire Brigades Act 1964-1985
 Deer Farming Act 1985
 Fisheries Act 1976-1984
 Stock Act 1915-1984
 Factories and Shops Act 1960-1983
 Industry and Commerce Training Act 1979-1983
 Mines Regulations Act 1964-1983
 Mining Act 1968-1983

By-laws under—

Fire Brigades Act 1964-1985

Harbours Act 1955-1982

Rules under Coal Mining Act 1925-1981

Reports—

Bureau of Sugar Experiment Stations for the year ended 30 June 1985

Butter Marketing Board for the year ended 30 June 1985

Cheese Marketing Board for the year ended 30 June 1985

Navy Bean Marketing Board for the year ended 30 June 1985

Peanut Marketing Board and the Queensland Peanut Growers' Co-operative Association Limited for 1985

Sunny Queen Eggs for the year ended 28 June 1985

Statement of Account of the Coal Mine Workers' Pension Fund for the year ended 30 June 1985.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT**Deregulation of Sugar Industry**

Hon. N. J. TURNER (Warrego—Minister for Primary Industries) (11.13 a.m.), by leave: I draw the attention of the House to a number of statements made recently by the Federal Minister for Primary Industry, Mr John Kerin, claiming that he and I reached agreement on a deregulation package for the sugar industry at a meeting in Sydney on 25 September. Mr Kerin has implied that I subsequently reneged on that agreement.

To set the record straight, I point out that the basis of negotiations with Mr Kerin at the meeting on 25 September was a draft position paper prepared from the industry's response to the 100-day sugar inquiry report.

Mr Kerin was well aware that the results of that meeting were to be conveyed to State Cabinet for approval. Cabinet, in fact, rejected it, and I called further meetings with industry leaders to determine their stance in the negotiations with the Federal Government.

As a result of those meetings, I was unanimously requested by all industry representatives to seek from Mr Kerin details of the extent of deregulation that the Federal Government required as a prerequisite to assistance, and the benefits which would accrue to the industry from such deregulation. That information has been received and is now being studied by the industry organisations in preparation for a meeting with Mr Kerin on 13 November.

So that the position in relation to the 25 September meeting between me and Mr Kerin can be understood and appreciated by all honourable members. I will read a letter that I wrote to Mr Kerin on 21 October. It reads—

“Dear Mr Kerin,

I refer to your letter received by my office by facsimile on 30 September concerning support for the sugar industry. I regret the delay in replying to your letter but I have been hoping that the situation would develop to a stage where I could report progress to you.

I think I should clarify to you the genesis of the Draft Position Paper which I presented to you as a basis for discussion on 25 September. I had received from each of the industry organisations their responses to the Report of the Sugar Industry Working Party. Because the Queensland Cane Growers' Council had been much more conservative in its response than the other Organisations, I asked Mr Soper

to obtain from you a reaction to the Queensland Cane Growers' Council's stand. Mr Soper reported back that you were not satisfied with the Cane Growers' response and suggested to me a compromise approach which he thought may satisfy you and yet protect the principal Cane Growers' concerns. Armed with this compromise suggested by Mr Soper but which had not been submitted to his Council, I had my officers prepare a draft Position Paper which would cover the industry's response and Mr Soper's tentative modification of the Cane Growers' position.

It was this draft Position Paper, which had not any official Queensland Government status, which I presented at our meeting as a basis for discussion and based upon this as a working premise, a tentative programme of implementation was developed at our meeting. This was subject to approval by the Queensland Cabinet of the draft Position Paper and then subsequently of the programme of implementation which was built upon it.

As you are well aware, the draft Position Paper was rejected by the Queensland Government and I was asked to seek the industry view on a suitable Position Paper on de-regulation which could be acceptable to the four industry organisations. This Position Paper was prepared by the four Secretaries subsequent to a meeting I held with the industry leaders on 1 October. I was sent a copy of the Position Paper and it substantially meets the objectives which you enunciated earlier and which would have been achieved by the programme of implementation developed at our meeting of 25 September.

This industry de-regulation paper was considered by all industry organisations over the following two weeks and their responses were reported to me on 14 October. The Cane Growers at their Special Meeting on 9 October were quite opposed to even the tentative compromise position which Mr. Soper had suggested and re-affirmed their resistance to substantial change. They argued that price support and de-regulation should be treated as separate issues and would not accept your linkage of the two items.

In order to facilitate discussions at the meeting of all parties tentatively scheduled for 13 November, I am seeking the industry organisations' agreement to the tabling of the initial industry Position Paper and the separate organisation's responses as background material for this meeting.

Yours faithfully,

(N. J. Turner)

Minister for Primary Industries"

I repeat that no agreement has been reached with Mr Kerin on deregulation of the sugar industry. The State Government has maintained that it will not impose on the industry any deregulation which is not acceptable to the industry. Mr Kerin's deregulation proposals are now being analysed by industry leaders and will be discussed at the meeting on 13 November.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr FITZGERALD (Lockyer) (11.18 a.m.), by leave: On 20 October this year, the *Sunday Sun* contained an article headed "Police Tribunal Rejects Bash Case". In that article, two paragraphs read—

"Just before one of Mrs Ashley's sons, Mark, died in August 1984, a family friend wrote to local National MLA Tony Fitzgerald asking for help 'before someone is killed'.

Mrs Ashley said the family 'decided to do the right thing' and go to the Police Complaints Tribunal."

I have been misrepresented. The insinuation made in that statement is that I had received a serious complaint and had not acted promptly. Some people could draw the

conclusion that this in some way did not prevent the death of Mark Ashley. I totally reject those insinuations.

The facts are: I had an interview with Mrs June Ashley on 5 December 1983, in which I advised her that any person who alleges police harassment and brutality should get legal advice and medical evidence, and has the right to lodge a complaint with the Police Complaints Tribunal.

Mrs Ashley came to my office on 16 August 1984 and made a statement to my secretary. My records show that on that date I was attending a primary school sports meeting at Goombungee. Mrs Ashley made certain allegations and handed my secretary a photocopy of a two-page handwritten letter dated 31 July 1984 and signed by R. Franklin. The second last paragraph of that letter, in part, states—

“I feel that something serious will happen to members of the Ashley Family.”

That sentence is marked.

Also handed to my secretary was a photocopy of one page of a typewritten letter that is a copy of part of the first page of the handwritten letter. It is also dated 31 July 1984. That page is an incomplete letter.

A third document accompanied those letters. It is a photocopy of a letter signed “R. Franklin”, and is dated 14 August 1984. It says—

“To whom it may concern, This letter was recently written and discussed with a Major Pickering. It was only partly typed as I attempted to type myself preferring to keep the contents to myself. Since then Mark Ashley had a win on Tuesday 7th Aug. in the Gatton magistrates’ court so I did not bother to finish this letter. I draw your attention to the second last paragraph. Yours faithfully.”

For the record, I state that Mark Ashley died as a result of a single vehicle accident near Plainlands, which is outside Laidley, at approximately 6 a.m. on 10 August 1984.

R. Franklin’s letter dated 14 August 1984 indicates clearly that he was aware that his letter dated 31 July 1984, containing that marked sentence, was not delivered before the accident that claimed Mark Ashley’s life. As Mrs June Ashley handed those letters to my secretary on 16 August 1984, she also was aware that I had not received them before the accident on 10 August 1984.

I point out that all those documents were photocopies, one of which had an incomplete signature. Copies of these letters and a record of interview with my secretary were passed on to the police inspector in charge of the Gatton district on Monday, 20 August 1984. A police inspector came to my office the next morning and made inquiries.

As for the statement attributed to Mrs Ashley that they decided “to do the right thing and go to the police complaints tribunal”—I received a photocopy of a letter from R. Franklin dated 20 August 1984. The last paragraph reads—

“This letter is to draw your attention to these happenings and to suggest you do whatever is possible to expedite the police tribunal. I would be pleased if you could advise me within 7 days of what action is being taken.”

This letter was posted to my office, and I received it on 31 August 1984. The handwritten envelope, which is in my possession, bears the postage stamp mark “Gatton 5.00 p.m. 30 Aug 1984”. Clearly, as it was posted 10 days after the date of writing, the letter gave me no chance to comply with his wish within seven days of his writing the letter.

On Monday, 3 September 1984, I passed on this letter to the police inspector in charge of the Gatton district and sent a copy to the Police Complaints Tribunal. I was advised by the Police Complaints Tribunal by letter dated 18 September 1984 that—

“To date, no complaint has been received by the tribunal from Mrs. Ashley or Mr. Franklin alleging misconduct, improper conduct or neglect of duty by a member of the Queensland Police Force.”

I advised Mr Franklin of the tribunal’s letter.

Clearly, there are some strange factors surrounding the photocopied letters that I have received, the dates that they were received in my office, and the dates that appear on the letters. I cannot hazard a guess as to what is behind these strange events. The evidence that I have put before the House indicates that I have acted properly and promptly at all times.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Lockyer may continue his personal explanation only on the lines of his being misrepresented. If his personal explanation is of considerable length, I ask the honourable member to table it.

Mr FITZGERALD: Mr Speaker, I have been misrepresented. From where the *Sunday Sun* reporter obtained his information regarding my involvement in this matter, which misrepresented me, I do not know. In the article, he made insinuations about my lack of action. Mr R. Franklin is known to me. He writes the gardening section in the *Sunday Sun*.

I thank you, Mr Speaker, for allowing me to set the record straight.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

Police Staffing Levels

Mr WARBURTON: In directing a question to the Minister for Lands, Forestry and Police, I refer to the public brawling engaged in by the Premier and Treasurer (Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen), the Minister for Transport (Mr Lane), the Commissioner of Police (Mr Lewis) and him regarding police staffing levels in Queensland. As this controversy stems directly from the call by the Commissioner of Police for an additional 463 police—in contrast to the additional 104 police officers allocated in the recent State Budget—I ask: Is the Minister prepared to review police staffing levels, in line with the numbers sought by the commissioner, to help combat crime, contain the road toll and fight the drug trade? Alternatively, is it to be assumed that it is not intended to provide, in this financial year, that is, 1985-86, any police officers additional to those approved in the State Budget? Can I get something concrete on that?

Mr GLASSON: The Budget papers, which were delivered by the Premier and Treasurer, made provision for increasing the strength of the police force by 104 personnel, which was mentioned by the Leader of the Opposition. Let me make it perfectly clear that the figure quoted by the Commissioner of Police is the optimum staffing level for the police force in this State. The commissioner has accepted that, when they are trained, those 104 additional police will be allocated throughout the State to areas of most need. In other words, those police will be allocated to the areas where Cabinet feels there is most need. When the figures in the Budget papers for 1985-86 are reviewed later in the year, the Treasurer will consider any further staffing needs of the police force.

Third-party Insurance

Mr NEAL: In asking a question of the Deputy Premier and Minister Assisting the Treasurer, I refer to misleading claims made by the ALP Opposition during the Redlands by-election campaign on the issue of compulsory third-party insurance. I now ask: Will he outline to the House how the financial standing of the Queensland third-party insurance system compares with that of other major States and how premiums in this State compare with those in other States?

Mr GUNN: I have two cuttings, one from *The Australian Financial Review* and one from yesterday's *Melbourne Age*. I think the fact of the matter—

Mr Burns: Stop reading. It is supposed to be a question without notice.

Mr GUNN: This is very, very important.

Mr Burns interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I will have to warn the member for Lytton.

Mr GUNN: The new Queensland third-party insurance premium for private vehicles of \$168 is significantly less than that in the Australian Capital Territory of \$235, the New South Wales metropolitan rate of \$174 and the Victorian rate of \$177. However, the biggest difference between Queensland and the other major States is the financial soundness of this State's third-party insurance system. Queensland's third-party system is actuarially sound, whereas those in southern States are in dire financial straits.

I wish to read an article from *The Australian Financial Review* of Tuesday, 1 October, which states—

“Report explains plight of NSW Govt scheme

The NSW Government's politically expedient decision to allow its compulsory third party motor vehicle insurance scheme to become an unfunded 'pay-as-you-go' scheme has proved financially disastrous.

. . . .

The Government will be forced to make a politically unpalatable decision either to reduce benefits to third party claimants or to substantially raise third party premiums to cover the costs.

. . . .

But rather than raise premiums to allow the GIO to break even on its underwriting of third party insurance, the Government chose to completely abandon the principles of insurance underwriting and opt instead for a 'social insurance' scheme whereby each year's income matched that year's payouts.

At the time of the changeover, the present value of outstanding claims was \$2 billion—some \$650 million more than the money in the fund.”

The New South Wales scheme is well and truly broke. The article continues—

“But at some stage—and soon according to the auditor general—those outstanding claims will have to be met.”

In other words, the piper will have to be paid. The article continues—

“If the Department of Motor Transport's Third Party Insurance Scheme is unable to meet the costs, the NSW road users and taxpayers will have to foot the bill.

The alternative is to reduce the benefits to injured parties.”

That is what is happening in New South Wales.

In Victoria, the Auditor-General has queried the amount of loss suffered by the State insurance office. According to recent media reports, the Auditor-General indicated that the Victorian loss on third-party insurance was \$671m. Once again, that has to be paid.

A report in yesterday's *Melbourne Age* states—

“An official dispute over accounting methods cannot conceal the daunting truth that Victoria's third party motor insurance scheme is in a desperate financial mess which successive state governments have failed to resolve. The State Insurance Office reported a loss of \$238 million on its third party business last year, bringing the accumulated losses to \$909 million. According to the auditor-general, the S.I.O. lost \$671 million on third party last year and has accumulated third party losses of \$1761 million.”

That was in the State of Victoria. Once again, last year, in New South Wales the pay-as-you-go scheme paid out \$111m more than it received in premiums.

The article states also that the Governments of those States, to at least cushion the economic loss, are considering limits on lump sum payments and possibly replacing them with a system of weekly or monthly payments. Those payments will perhaps be indexed to inflation.

The article states further—

“Even this sensible proposal is opposed by lawyers who applaud the present mixed system of a limited no-fault scheme and the unrestrained common law right to sue as unparalleled anywhere in the world for fairness and efficiency.

What lawyers do not so readily concede is that the Victorian system must be also one of the world’s most expensive—and that they themselves are among its main beneficiaries.”

Undoubtedly, lawyers are the main beneficiaries. •

The States of Victoria and New South Wales face a massive increase in third-party insurance premiums when their Governments are forced to acknowledge the financial realities.

The Queensland scheme is sound because, under it, money is being put aside for future claims for damages arising from accidents that are occurring now.

Mr BURNS: May I congratulate the honourable member—

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member may not. He will ask his question.

Mr BURNS: I will ask the question. Would it be possible to issue a dress, a pair of high-heeled shoes and a brassiere to the Dorothy Dix who asks the same questions each week—

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

Mr BURNS: I place two questions on notice.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Lytton will resume his seat. I warn him under Standing Order No. 123A. Any further interjections of that kind will be dealt with.

Mr BURNS interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Will the honourable member for Lytton please ask his question?

Mr BURNS: I place two questions on notice for tomorrow, and the Minister will be able to answer them as he did the others.

School Uniforms

Mr LITTLEPROUD: In directing a question to the Minister for Education, I refer to comments by a Queensland Labor senator, published in yesterday’s edition of *The Courier-Mail*, in which he criticised principals, teachers and parents and citizens associations in relation to the wearing of school uniforms. Could the Minister inform the House of the existing policy on the wearing of school uniforms in Queensland schools?

Mr POWELL: I thank the honourable member for Condamine for his question. During the last few days, I have been disturbed by the so-called controversy that has been stirred up by some people about the wearing of school uniforms. Of course, Senator Colston will continue his one-man crusade in attacking the wearing of school uniforms.

For the benefit of honourable members, I will state the position of the Education Department in Queensland on the wearing of school uniforms. Perhaps my comments will be published in an unabridged form—I hope that they are—so that people will understand the position of the Education Department.

The minimum requirement of the Education Department for children attending school is that their dress should be acceptable, clean, tidy, respectable and safe for the activities that the children will undertake. I point out that students who undertake subjects such as manual arts, home economics and physical education need to wear a particular type and style of dress.

The decision on the school uniform to be worn at each school is made by co-operation between the p. and c. association and the principal of each school. It is agreed to adopt a particular code on uniforms. It is interesting to note that many schools adopt such a code. Obviously, the vast majority of people in the community support the wearing of school uniforms.

In my opinion, many benefits are to be derived from the wearing of school uniforms. They include the development of a sense of belonging, pride in group membership, strengthening of the group purpose and co-operation in striving to achieve it. The wearing of school uniforms also facilitates the identification of students on their way to and from school, and that is of great assistance.

I am quite concerned that Senator Colston's statements will undermine the authority of teachers and parents. Honourable members ought to recognise that that is what Senator Colston is trying to do. His public claim that principals and teachers have no power to enforce the wearing of school uniforms can only lead to the rejection of authority by some students. We as a community ought to be concerned about that. It is a disgraceful display by a public figure, symptomatic of the left-wing trends to undermine at every turn traditional values, authority and responsibility. Senator Colston and his party deserve the strongest censure by Queensland teachers and parents for their mischievous attempts to ferment trouble and rebellion in our schools.

Mr Gunn: He wasn't much of an asset to the schools when he was there.

Mr POWELL: He certainly was not.

Mr Gunn: He had the nickname "Matches".

Mr POWELL: That may well be true.

The Queensland Government strongly supports the stand of parents and teachers to maintain the existing high standards of discipline and authority in Queensland schools.

I am disgusted with the publicity surrounding the issue in Saturday's *Courier-Mail*. On the previous Friday week, the Kedron State High School won *Fanfare '85*, which I have referred to before in the Parliament. That competition was for all school orchestras and bands in the State. The Concert Hall at the Queensland Cultural Centre was packed. Kedron State High won from very strong competition; but *The Courier-Mail* had not one word of praise for it.

I do not care if *The Courier-Mail* does not wish to acknowledge the Government or me personally, but at least it could acknowledge the achievements of the children from that school. Instead, last Saturday morning, *The Courier-Mail* gave headlines to a woman who complained about her child and a uniform. I draw to the attention of honourable members two letters to the editor that appeared in today's *Courier-Mail*. Those letters from a parent and a student of the Kedron State High School, which support the school on the uniform issue, ought to be read by staff of that newspaper. I emphasise that the Government and I support principals and parents and citizens associations who insist on children wearing uniforms to school. In my opinion, it is a form of discipline—and a very positive form, at that.

Coke from Steaming Coal; Impact on Queensland

Mr LITTLEPROUD: I ask the Minister for Mines and Energy: Would he care to forecast the impact on the Queensland coal export industry of the news that the Nippon Steel Corporation has developed a scheme to use steaming coal in the production of coke for its steel mills? What reserves of steaming coal does Queensland hold?

Mr I. J. GIBBS: My attention has been drawn to a newspaper article headed "Japan develops coke from steaming coal", which is an item of great interest. The use of non-coking coal, or coal with very low coking qualities, to supplement coke as a substitute for fuel oil in blast furnaces in Japan is increasing. It provides an additional usage for what is broadly referred to as steaming coal. Several companies throughout the world,

including the Nippon Steel Corporation, have experimented with pulverised coal injection as well as formed coke, which in reality is small briquettes made from steaming coal to replace conventional coke in blast furnaces. No system has yet been developed on a commercial scale.

It is interesting that Idemitsu, which controls several big refineries in Japan, heats refineries with pulverised coal instead of oil. That is another use for steaming coal and will, in the medium to long term, result in several million additional tonnes per year being consumed.

Queensland's recoverable reserves of steaming coal exceed 8 000 million tonnes. Because of its diversity of coals of high quality, the State is well placed to gain any new market opportunities for either steaming coal or coking coal, as our record in recent years shows. Because of the economy of scale of operations and as steaming coal is cheaper than coking coal, those new developments should lead to a growth in demand for steaming coal. Briquetting should aid us as well as the economies of our customers throughout the world. That is very good news, and I look forward to the time when the use of steaming coal and coking coal can be perfected in the manufacture of steel.

Dr Laurie Clift

Mr McELLIGOTT: I ask the Minister for Health: Is he aware that one Dr Laurie Clift owns eight clinics on the southern side of Brisbane, which involve approximately 26 doctors and offer the services of X-ray, pathology, operations, electrocardiograms and electroencephalograms, as well as a courtesy car, comfortable reception area, video games, television and a children's play area? Is the Minister aware also that Dr Clift is circulating handbills which advertise his clinics? In view of the obvious financial gains to be made by this entrepreneurial medico by self-referrals, what steps have been taken by the Department of Health to prevent overservicing? Has action been taken relative to advertising by handbills?

Mr AUSTIN: I am not aware of the operations conducted by Dr Clift. I shall endeavour to find out by referring the matter to the chairman of the Queensland Medical Board. When I receive a report from the board, I will send it on to the honourable member.

Newspaper Article on Health Services

Mr McELLIGOTT: In directing a question to the Minister for Health, I refer to a feature article titled "Health care: a time to face the hard facts" which appeared in *The Courier-Mail* on 4 November 1985, and in particular to the writer's comments that "When the rest of the world is trying to close hospital beds, we are calling for more" and, further, that "Most Governments are now involved in changing their health care delivery systems to switch emphasis from institutional care to primary health care." I ask: What specific initiatives has the Minister taken to change the emphasis of the Queensland health care system from preventive to curative care? How does the Minister justify the expenditure of large sums of money on additional beds when home care providers, such as the Blue Nurses and Meals on Wheels, are inadequately funded, and when the Brisbane Women's Health Centre receives no funding at all? In short, what are the goals of the Queensland health system?

Mr AUSTIN: The honourable member for Lytton (Mr Burns) mentioned something about a Dorothy Dixier. I am delighted that the honourable member for Townsville has asked me this question. When an article not based on fact is written by a so-called professional and appears in *The Courier-Mail*, I am concerned. The writer of the article suggested that the Government was making new hospital beds available all over the State. He has obviously been reading some of my press releases, but has not been reading them correctly. Perhaps he has also been believing some of the propaganda put out by the honourable member opposite.

I point out that most of the country hospitals right throughout the State that are being restructured have not expanded their bed numbers. On the contrary, in many

cases, the restructuring has involved a reduction in bed numbers in areas in which the population has decreased.

The Division of Research and Planning of the Health Department has approximately 80 people working in it, which gives the lie to the statement in the article that the Government is not involved in any research and planning. Either the people employed in that division are not doing anything, or the writer of the article is not telling the truth. I suggest that the officers of my department are working, and that the writer is not telling the truth.

Mr McElligott: What about the hospitals?

Mr AUSTIN: The honourable member should let me finish. The officers employed in the Division of Research and Planning investigate every area of the State to establish the needs in local areas. To that end, I have also established three separate regions in Queensland—a northern region, a central region and a southern region. In each region, a doctor, a nurse and an administrator are involved. Those three people move into an area and discuss problems with the local people and their expectations about health services provided by the Government. In that matter as well, the writer of the article is wrong.

The article referred to an atlas of diseases. Honourable members would be aware that, approximately five weeks ago, I tabled in this House an atlas of diseases found throughout Queensland, including cancer. Unfortunately, despite the fact that it was presented and tabled in this Parliament, not one media representative saw fit to write a word about it or to report on the ministerial statement that I made.

Most of the matters raised in the article written by that gentleman are simply not correct. I refer all honourable members to the editorial that appeared in *The Courier-Mail* this morning, which effectively puts forward a reasoned and valid comment on the article.

The honourable member has raised the issue of funds for the Brisbane Women's Health Centre. I point out that that centre has been funded previously by the Commonwealth Government and it is simply another of the programs in which the Commonwealth Government makes a big announcement about funding, such as, "We are going to fund the Brisbane Women's Health Centre," whereas that Government provides funds for only one year and then walks away from the program, expecting the State Government to pick up the tab. In contrast, the Queensland Government provides women's health centres, men's health centres and family health centres within its public hospitals system.

Queensland's public hospitals provide a very effective and efficient health care system for the people of this State. The Queensland Government will not be picking up the tab for a Federal Government initiative undertaken before the last election in order to buy a few votes. The Federal Government then tried to off-load the cost onto the people of this State.

The honourable member raised the question of community health programs. Queensland has still not received any money from the Commonwealth Government for the Home and Community Care Program.

Mr McElligott: You won't sign the agreement.

Mr AUSTIN: The honourable member will recall that the Commonwealth Labor Government announced that it would spend \$300m on the Home and Community Care Program. Yet when it had to produce the goods in the Budget last year, it came up with \$10m. Not one cent was given to any State. In the recent Federal Budget the Federal Government provided the same amount, \$10m, and Queensland has not yet signed—

Mr McElligott: That's right.

Mr AUSTIN: Right. Nor have the New South Wales and Victorian Governments. The Governments of those two Labor States and the Queensland Government are

objecting to the philosophies put forward by the Federal Labor Government, because the Home and Community Care Program is nothing but a deliberate attempt by the Federal Government to take control of the Home and Community Care Program—

Mr McElligott: Rubbish!

Mr AUSTIN: The honourable member says, "Rubbish!" Why has the New South Wales Government not signed? Has the honourable member telephoned the relevant New South Wales Minister to find out why? I have had discussions with that Minister. Has the honourable member telephoned the Victorian Minister to find out why? I have had discussions with him, too.

It might surprise the honourable member to know that State Ministers have entered into a co-operative arrangement against the Federal Government, which is doing its best to take responsibilities away from the States—take all the glory away—and tell everyone what to do. Then, when a problem arises, the Federal Government walks away from it.

Prior to the last Federal election, the Commonwealth Labor Government announced that it was inviting submissions from all community groups in relation to nursing homes and the Home and Community Care Program. Do honourable members know what the Federal Government did? When it received the submissions, it sent them back and said, "That is a matter for the States." What a joke!

Prior to the last Federal election, because it knew that it would have difficulty over the number of nursing home beds, and because it knew that it could not answer the questions being thrown up by every State Government—

Mr McElligott interjected.

Mr AUSTIN: Not only Queensland but Victoria and New South Wales also have enormous problems with nursing home beds. The Federal Government pulled a political sham. I see that you are about to intervene, Mr Speaker, so, because I have adequately answered the honourable member, I will conclude. I thank him for the Dorothy Dixier.

Financial Assistance to Sugar Industry

Mr CAMPBELL: In asking a question of the Minister for Primary Industries, I refer to the financial assistance provided to cane-growers which he and the Queensland Government have cited as being \$35m for the three years from 1982 to 1985. I point out that cane-growers have borrowed \$35m through the Rural Reconstruction Board. I ask: How can the Minister assert that such borrowings are Queensland Government assistance when the Auditor-General's reports and the annual reports of the Rural Reconstruction Board show that the Queensland Government withdrew \$16.3m from the Rural Reconstruction Board while, in the same period, providing only \$15m to that board? Does the Minister deny that for the three years I mentioned, the Queensland Government deposited only \$15m with the Rural Reconstruction Board and withdrew \$16.3m from it?

Mr TURNER: I thank the honourable member for the question, because it gives me an opportunity to outline just what the State Government has done recently in relation to assistance to the sugar industry.

The figure cited by the honourable member is well below the overall assistance given to the industry over the past two to three years. In fact, the figure is somewhere in the vicinity of \$80m. The honourable member cited only loans. He did not refer to the \$175,000 that the State Government gave towards half the cost of the internal review. Last season, the State Government increased the first delivery advance from \$160 a tonne to \$180 a tonne, or half the interest component. That cost approximately \$800,000. The honourable member would be aware that, in recent weeks, the State Government gave approval for an increase in the first delivery advance from \$150 a tonne to \$170 a tonne. That was done at the request of all industry organisations. That exercise alone will cost the State Government \$3.07m. I refer to the \$10m loan to the six sugar-mills.

The assistance that the sugar industry has received from the State Government has been detailed so many times that I wonder why the honourable member even asks the question. If he looks back through *Hansard* or through any of the reports, he will find that the State Government has made, and is continuing to make, a significant contribution towards the sugar industry in this State.

At the meeting on 13 November, I hope that the Federal Government also will see fit to shoulder its responsibilities and to honour the promises that it made in 1983, prior to the election when it got into power. At that time, the Federal Government promised an underwriting scheme and unlimited finance for the sugar industry. It has never delivered the goods. The State Government has the runs on the board. The Federal Government has made only ducks.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! There is far too much conversation in the Chamber. If honourable members want to engage in prolonged conversations, I ask them to go out onto the verandah.

Mr TURNER: Once again, I thank the honourable member for asking the question. It has given me the opportunity to indicate what the State Government has been doing for the sugar industry. If the honourable member refers to *Hansard*, he will get details of the exact expenditure in every field. As the honourable member was employed by the Department of Primary Industries some years ago, he should be aware of what the department and the State Government are doing for rural industries in this State.

A Government Member interjected.

Mr TURNER: Yes. When the honourable member left, the department had to suck lemons for a fortnight to take the smile off its face.

Seriously, though, I thank the honourable member for asking the question. I hope that he continues to ask similar questions. If he does, I will be able to indicate that the State Government has done, and is doing, plenty for the sugar industry. It is a pity that the honourable member does not prevail upon his Federal counterparts to come to the party, as they promised.

Fire Levies

Mr CAMPBELL: In directing a question to the Minister for Environment, Valuation and Administrative Services, I refer to his reported statements that no house-holder or small-business person would pay more under the new fire levies that he has introduced. However, one small business proprietor's charge has gone up from \$75 to \$688. The charge for a construction company in Bundaberg has increased from \$700 to more than \$13,000. Also, Government charges on insurance for a \$40,000 house total \$67.80, including a five levy of \$48. That compares with Government charges of only \$16.75 in New South Wales. I now ask: In view of the hardship that is being caused to small business and to pensioner home-owners, will the Minister review the new fire levy system?

Mr TENNI: The honourable member can fool some of the people some of the time, but he cannot fool all the people all of the time. I do not know whether he is deliberately misleading the Chamber, but the figures that he quoted are unrealistic, and he knows that as well as anyone else. He quoted \$60-odd as the amount of Government charges for insuring a house. That is totally wrong. Under stage 1 of the new levy system in Queensland, the maximum fire levy paid for any house is \$48 where a full-time service is provided by a particular fire brigade. The honourable member knows that as well as anyone else. Why does he ask questions that deliberately mislead the people of this State? Such questions are uncalled for and are unnecessary.

Any problems that exist with fire levies under the stage 2 scheme are being dealt with as they arise. There is no worry about that. Apparently the honourable member is saying that his local council has not the ability that all the other councils in Queensland have.

Mr De Lacy: Did you read *The Cairns Post* this morning?

Mr TENNI: Apparently the member for Cairns is as dumb as the member for Bundaberg.

Councils have the ability to recategorise any problem areas. If a council sends out a bill for premises that have been placed in the wrong category, it has the right to change that. If the council is not prepared to change the category and the person concerned writes to my department or to me personally, the council will be advised that that person's premises have been recategorised into the category in which they should have been placed in the first place. If the honourable member has a complaint with his council, he should take the matter up with it. That is the responsible body.

Levy in Support of SEQEB Workers

Mr NEWTON: I ask the Minister for Employment and Industrial Affairs: Will he take steps to ensure that there is no repeat in Queensland of the case in Victoria in which a worker was sacked for refusing to contribute to the levy to support sacked South East Queensland Electricity Board workers?

Mr LESTER: That is just what does happen in the State of Victoria. A person in the work-force is not given freedom of choice, and, in many instances, employers in Victoria have not been backed by the Government. That includes those employers who employ a lot of people.

A good example is to be found in the construction of lights at the Melbourne Cricket Ground. The employer involved did something that was contrary to the wishes of the union. As a result, he was black banned for ever and a day. The Victorian Government did not stand up and support that employer, and he has since gone bankrupt. That is the type of action that unions take.

The Queensland Government will stand behind responsible employers to ensure that they can expand their business and, in turn, employ more people.

Burning of Cairns Hill Slopes

Mr De LACY: In directing a question to the Minister for Environment, Valuation and Administrative Services, I refer to the widespread community concern about the annual burning of the hill slopes that are such an important natural asset to the areas that the Minister and I represent. I now ask: What has the Minister done to implement the recommendations of the 1978 Co-ordinator-General's report into the Cairns hill slopes, and, in particular, to establish fire-breaks, especially in the form of fire-resistant trees, along the lower slopes? What organised plan does the fire service have for cold burns on those hill slopes, apart from the work being carried out by the National Parks and Wildlife Service on its land in the Barron Gorge? Has the Cairns Hill Slopes Protection Committee been given the necessary teeth to implement a meaningful program of protection, and does it report to the Minister annually, as recommended in the Co-ordinator-General's report? Has the Minister given clerical and technical assistance to the Rural Fires Board inspector as recommended, given that he has responsibility for an area stretching from Cardwell in the south to Thursday Island in the north and to the Northern Territory in the west, or is the Minister intending to privatise that function, too?

Mr TENNI: The honourable member has just read out a book, but I will attempt to answer his lengthy question in the way that it should be answered.

Firstly, let me say that, since becoming the Minister responsible for fire services in this State—two years and four months ago—I have played a greater role—

Mr Mackenroth interjected.

Mr TENNI: The honourable member did not ask the question. If he likes to ask me a question later, I will do him over, too. I could eat him.

Since I have been Minister, I have done more for fire services in this State than any Minister that I can recall. In fact, the honourable member for Cairns has deliberately misled the House about the hill slopes fires, because he knows as well as I do that it was reported recently in Cairns that there are fewer fires and less burning back. The reason is that the Government Garage has been restoring second-hand Government vehicles and army four-wheel-drives, building trailers and tanks, and making them available to the rural fire services. That service is doing a wonderful job, and if the honourable member wants to stand up in this place and denigrate that work, he can do so. I will pat the rural fire service on the back because it is doing an excellent job and will continue to do so, and I will continue to supply that service with as much equipment as possible.

As the honourable member would have read in *The Cairns Post*, a development company in Cairns has made \$10,000 available to the bush fire brigade.

At 12 noon,

In accordance with the provisions of Standing Order No. 307, the House went into Committee of Supply.

SUPPLY

Eleventh Allotted Day—Reception of Resolutions

The Resolutions reported from Committee of Supply on 17 October were presented and, on motion of Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen, received.

Adoption of Resolutions

The Resolutions being taken as read—

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

“That the Resolutions be now agreed to.”

Motion agreed to.

WAYS AND MEANS

Opening of Committee

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

“(a) That, towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty, for the service of the year 1985-1986, a further sum not exceeding \$2,691,861,696 be granted from the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Queensland.

(b) That, towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty, for the service of the year 1985-1986, a further sum not exceeding \$5,656,317,278 be granted from the Trust and Special Funds.

(c) That, towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty, for the service of the year 1985-1986, a further sum not exceeding \$194,072,355 be granted from the moneys standing to the credit of the Loan Fund.

(d) That, towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty, for the service of the year 1984-1985, a supplementary sum not exceeding \$150,310,308 be granted from the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Queensland.

(e) That, towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty, for the service of the year 1984-1985, a supplementary sum not exceeding \$786,267,357 be granted from the Trust and Special Funds.

(f) That, towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty, for the service of the year 1984-1985, a supplementary sum not exceeding \$5,324,868 be granted from the moneys standing to the credit of the Loan Fund.

(g) That, towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty, on account, for the service of the year 1986-1987, a sum not exceeding \$900,000,000 be granted from the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Queensland.

(h) That, towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty, on account, for the service of the year 1986-1987, a sum not exceeding \$1,300,000,000 be granted from the Trust and Special Funds.

(i) That, towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty, on account, for the service of the year 1986-1987, a sum not exceeding \$90,000,000 be granted from the moneys standing to the credit of the Loan Fund."

Motion agreed to.

Resolutions reported, received, and agreed to.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2)

First Reading

A Bill, founded on the Resolutions reported from the Committee of Ways and Means, was presented and read a first time.

Second Reading

Hon. Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN (Barambah—Premier and Treasurer) (12.9 p.m.): I move—

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

This Bill is the second (and final) Appropriation Bill for the current financial year. It seeks parliamentary approval to cover expenditure included in the Budget Estimates for this year, unforeseen expenditure incurred during 1984-85 and expenditure for the first two months of the financial year 1986-87 to maintain Government activities until further Supply can be granted.

An amount of \$13,582.3m is provided for 1985-86 to cover anticipated expenditures for Supply services from the Consolidated Revenue Fund, Trust and Special Funds, and the Loan Fund, and represents the total of parts III, IV and V of the schedule to this Bill. It also incorporates the amount of \$1,890m for Supply services appropriated in the Appropriation Act 1984-85 (No. 2), and the further amount of \$3,150m appropriated in the Appropriation Act 1985-86 (No. 1).

Unforeseen expenditure for 1984-85 totalling \$941.9m is also incorporated in the Bill. This amount had executive authority but now requires parliamentary approval. Full details of this amount are set out in parts VI, VII and VIII of the schedule to this Bill.

The Bill provides also for an amount of \$2,290m to provide Supply for the Consolidated Revenue Fund, the Trust and Special Funds and Loan Fund for the first two months of the financial year 1986-87. Adequate provision has been allowed to cover cost escalations in the interim period.

Opportunity has been taken in the past to accompany the introduction of an Appropriation Bill with some comments on the State's economy. I consider it very appropriate to follow past practice and make some factual comments on economic conditions in Queensland. I say "factual comments" because they will be just that—factual. They will not be the mischievous and alarmist statements that have come from some quarters about the Queensland economy over the past year. We should put behind us once and for all the Opposition's futile attempts to malign the economy of this State.

The factual position is that Queensland has recently come out of a period of consolidation. It has been during this period of consolidation that some ill-founded criticisms of the performance of the Queensland economy have been made. They are ill founded because they have failed to take account of the very high base from which the State's economic performance was being measured. That high base of economic performance

was the culmination of Queensland's very high rate of growth over the previous five years, particularly with the development of the export coal mines and related infrastructure facilities.

I might refresh some memories in this regard. Between 1979 and 1984, the Queensland population grew by approximately 14 per cent compared with approximately 7 per cent for Australia as a whole—twice the national average. In the same period, Queensland's labour force grew by over 17 per cent, compared with the Australian figure of 10 per cent.

It was not surprising, therefore, that there would be some slow-down in the rate of economic growth once we had completed the massive development of our natural resource projects. We could not be insulated from the world economic conditions of recent times. The conclusion of some major construction projects in this State was inevitable.

However, any competent analysis of recent trends in major economic indicators shows that the claims made about a failing Queensland economy carry very little weight indeed. Employment is a strong case in point.

During the last 12 months, Queensland has provided far in excess of its population share of 16.1 per cent in the generation of new employment. In fact, 42 000 new jobs have been created in Queensland in the 12 months to September 1985, which represents 19.8 per cent of new employment in Australia during that period. Let me emphasise also that employment in Queensland increased by 4.1 per cent in that period, compared with 3.2 per cent for Australia as a whole. As everyone recognises, that hardly seems to be a symptom of a failing State economy. As is recognised by competent researchers, the percentage unemployment figure fails to reflect the significant impact of migration, as people relocate from other States and seek employment in Queensland. That has not been taken into account by our opponents. The effect of that migration has offset to some extent Queensland's commendable performance in generating new employment.

During 1984, net migration to Queensland from other States was 9 037. In contrast, New South Wales lost a net total of 7 447 people and Victoria lost 3 977. That was the fifth successive year of such trends and it illustrates that people have fled to Queensland from Victoria and New South Wales in their thousands. Despite the effect of interstate migration, Queensland's unemployment rate has recently recorded significant decreases and is now at about the national level; in fact, it is lower than that in some other States that have not been affected by interstate migration.

Although the relative performance of this State in the area of unemployment can be put into a proper context, the Government is still concerned at the size and composition of the unemployment problem. It is for this reason that the State has been taking positive and deliberate action to address the issue of unemployment. 1985-86 will be the second year of the \$600m Special Major Capital Works Program, which, together with the \$700m coal rail electrification program, will act to maintain the high levels of employment achieved through recent major natural resource development schemes. The employment figures reflect these initiatives, and there will be further improvements as these programs progress to successful completion.

As I indicated at Budget time, a task force on employment has reported on its findings and its recommendations have been, or are in the process of being, addressed. Those recommendations include the establishment of a new financing body called the Queensland Industry Development Corporation, which will seek to encourage innovative or technologically oriented investments in situations in which Queensland has particular skills, products or advantages to exploit.

In recognition of the additional capital funding necessary to assist in the expansion of employment opportunities in regional areas, the Government has established the Local Authorities Special Employment Scheme at a cost of \$13m in 1985-86. The scheme is making excellent progress. Other task force recommendations in the process of being implemented are in the areas of deregulation of industry, economic infrastructure, industry

competitiveness and technology, wages policy, labour market programs, education and tourism.

In 1984-85, the State Government initiated a program of traineeships in the hospitality and catering industry. The success of such a program can no doubt be measured by the fact that the Commonwealth Government has seen fit to imitate with its own traineeship scheme. For the benefit of young Queenslanders, the State Government will play its part under the arrangements, provided that the Commonwealth does not impose unreasonable and impracticable terms and conditions.

Let me say again to the doomsday critics—to all the negative people who do not believe in the future of this great State—the measures undertaken by the Government are working. Employment numbers are rising, and rising at a rate above the national average. Unemployment levels are now receding, and are comparable with the Australian experience generally. The Government is finding employment for Queenslanders and for increasing numbers of interstate migrants coming to Queensland.

I have dealt at some length with the issue of employment. It has been the prime area cited by critics of the Government as being typical of the so-called failing State economy. I trust that the situation has now been put into a proper perspective, and that debate on that issue can be raised to a more constructive and a more positive level. Let us have some positive thinking and some acknowledgement of what has taken place.

Other important economic indicators confirm that Queensland has emerged from a period of economic consolidation, which followed the boom years of the late 1970s and early 1980s. The encouraging trend of improved retail sales continues, with a 13.7 per cent increase in Queensland's retail sales in the 12 months to August 1985 compared with 12.2 per cent nationally. So Queensland is well above the national average in retail sales. Compared with a population share of 16.1 per cent, the value of work done on all buildings during 1984-85 in Queensland represented 18.8 per cent of the value of work done in Australia. Similarly, Queensland recorded 19.8 per cent of the national total for new dwelling commencements for the same period—well to the fore again, Mr Deputy Speaker.

The latest available information on the home-building industry is very encouraging. During July this year, 2 837 dwelling units were begun in Queensland. That represents an increase of 28.4 per cent on the same month last year.

Queensland's exports contributed nearly \$1.5 billion, or 25 per cent, of total Australian exports in the period July-August 1985—a vital contribution to this country's export earnings at a time of mounting external debt and a weakened Australian dollar.

The Brisbane Consumer Price Index increased by 7 per cent in the 12 months to September 1985 compared with 7.6 per cent nationally. In that area, Queensland is once again by far the best of all the States. Clearly the economic indicators are not pointing to a frail Queensland economy; rather, they show a strong economy that has been able to handle a post-boom situation, coupled with rapid population growth, without a serious or long-term impact on economic growth.

The Queensland economy is now moving beyond a period of consolidation, and this Government's sound and responsible policies, principles and programs will foster continued growth and economic improvement in Queensland.

This Appropriation Bill effectively authorises Government expenditure for the year. These expenditures reflect the Government's policies and philosophies and will assist to strengthen Queensland's economy further.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Mr WARBURTON (Sandgate—Leader of the Opposition) (12.22 p.m.): At the outset, I must say that I believe I have more legitimate optimism about the future of our great State than has the Premier and Treasurer (Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen)—

Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen: Gee!

Mr WARBURTON: That is true.

Queenslanders are absolutely sick and tired of the Premier's phantom projects and phantom friends. They are sick of the Oskars and other such people coming out of their nests. They are sick of the way in which the Premier embraces those people. They are sick of the broken promises. As I said, the people of Queensland are sick of the Premier's phantom projects, the sort of projects that he has been announcing week after week for a long period. Unfortunately for the Premier, the people of Queensland are finding him out.

What is needed in this State is some very sound economic action, and it is needed quickly. The Opposition's criticism of the Government has been the hyping up of the community week after week with phantom projects that are promised but never seen. Finally, and thankfully, the populace of this State have realised what this National Party Government is not doing.

If the Labor Party in this place can contribute anything towards making this National Party Government get up off its butt and contribute towards national economic recovery I, for one, will consider that we have played a proper part in the Parliament of this great State.

In this summation of the Budget session, I intend to concentrate my remarks on the National Party Government's economic performance, or what can be more accurately described as its lack of economic performance. Despite the Premier's rather desperate attempt today to place elsewhere the blame for his bad economic management—particularly at the feet of the Federal Government—the true facts, not the distortions put forward today by the Premier, are that he and his Government have presided over a State that has been, and still is, in an economic dilemma.

Since the 1985-86 Budget was brought down, Opposition members have had the opportunity to peruse the Budget papers of the other States, particularly New South Wales and Victoria. We have also had an opportunity to look at how the Queensland Budget compares with the Budgets of those two States. Unfortunately, I have to say that, as far as Queenslanders are concerned, the comparisons are very unfavourable indeed. The Budget documents of Queensland, New South Wales and Victoria fully support the Opposition's view that Queenslanders are forced to suffer second-rate services because of decades, and I emphasise that word, of systematic and deliberate underfunding by the Queensland National Party Government.

I intend to run through the latest economic indicators, which confirm the continuing poor performance of the Queensland economy. I also intend to comment on what the Premier and Treasurer, in his speech, called the ultimate test for any Government, that is, its international credit rating, and on Queensland's failure to receive an AAA credit rating from the Japanese Bond Research Institute, a rating that both New South Wales and Victoria received.

For years, because of this deliberate underfunding by the National Party State Government, services in Queensland have suffered. The Grants Commission's comparisons have consistently shown that Queensland spends the least of any State on education, health, welfare, care for the aged, police, and various other community services. The National Party's fine tradition of neglect was continued in the last Budget. Queensland's schools, TAFE colleges, hospitals, welfare services, and police all face continuing crises and, if not a further slide in their ability to provide services, at least a stalemate.

So the sad story of Queensland is: if a person lives in the State of Queensland, he will more than likely leave school early, he will have more difficulty in gaining entry into a tertiary course, he will have less chance of getting an apprenticeship or of obtaining a job, he will have to suffer greater delays in the public hospital system, and, once there, he will have to suffer from nurse shortages. If a person happens to be a resident of Queensland, he will have more chance of ending up in an ambulance that is manned only by a driver. On becoming an aged person, he will have less chance of getting into an old people's home.

Mr FitzGerald interjected.

Mr WARBURTON: If the honourable member for Lockyer makes it through all that, there will be a greater chance of his committing suicide—and probably a few people round here might wish him to proceed on that course.

The list of deprived services in Queensland goes on and on. A quick comparison of the Budget papers of Queensland and those of New South Wales and Victoria confirms what the Opposition has been saying. It confirms the miserable approach of the Queensland Government, an approach which, in certain cases, borders on some form of criminal neglect.

When the Budget papers are compared, the first point that becomes obvious is the sheer absence in Queensland of many of the programs that operate effectively in other States. As an example I shall take women's issues. New South Wales has a whole host of programs devoted to these women's problems: women's health, sexual assault, child sexual assault, homeless women, domestic violence, children's services, women in prison, women's employment and training, women's education, and migrant women. There is a whole range of other specific women's programs, not the least of which is the equal opportunity legislation. Such legislation is totally absent in Queensland.

Queensland has virtually none of those types of programs in any definitive way. That is not to say that some departments in Queensland do not do some of the things to which I have just referred. Evidently, those programs are not seen in this State as being important enough or relevant enough to warrant any specific mention in this State's Budget papers.

I shall deal briefly with some other unfavourable comparisons between Queensland and the other States. I shall deal with the issues about which the Premier and Treasurer was speaking before he left the Chamber. Firstly, I turn to consumer affairs, which is an important matter for ordinary people. In that area, Queensland spends a miserable \$2.2m, compared with \$10.7m spent in New South Wales and \$9.1m spent in Victoria. Queensland spends, on a per capita level, only half of the amount spent by the two southern States. I am not just comparing amounts; I am comparing per capita levels.

On occupational safety, Queensland spends \$4.9m, New South Wales \$16.6m and Victoria \$13.5m. If Queensland were to spend a comparable amount, it would almost have to double the \$4.9m allocation. This is another example of the misplaced priorities of the National Party Government in Queensland.

Let me turn now to community home care. Queensland spends \$21.8m, New South Wales \$64m and Victoria \$76.7m. In per capita terms, the Queensland allocation compares very badly.

I turn now to ambulance services. The Queensland Government provides \$20m and the New South Wales Government provides \$66m. In other words, the Queensland allocation is just one-third of the New South Wales allocation per head of population.

I turn now to sport, which much is made of in this State. Queensland likes to think that it does well in this regard but, again, the figures show that Queensland spends less on sport per head of population than either New South Wales or Victoria. The Queensland allocation includes the very creditable schemes that have been set up by the Department of Sport, and I would be the first to admit that those schemes are worthy of credit. Queensland spent \$4.7m on sport, New South Wales \$15.5m and Victoria \$14.2m.

I move now to discuss police, a subject that has been very much in the news of late. Queensland allocates \$226m, New South Wales \$423m and Victoria \$374m. That is a very poor performance on the part of the Queensland Government.

For hospitals, the Queensland Government spends \$875m, the New South Wales Government provides \$1,967m, and the Victorian Government spends \$1,329m. That is another poor comparison in per capita terms.

The National Party Government likes people to perceive that it helps small business. However, the Queensland Government allocated a miserable \$1.4m to small business,

much of which will be taken up with administrative costs. That allocation compares unfavourably with the \$4.6m given in New South Wales. If Queensland were to make a comparable effort, it would have to subscribe \$2.8m to small business.

I turn now to high technology. Frequently, the Minister for Industry, Small Business and Technology (Mr Ahern) speaks about technology and, in particular, high technology in the State of Queensland. Speaking facetiously, I suggest that, with regard to its allocation to technology, the Government really makes the big time. According to the Minister and other members of the National Party, the so-called massive allocation of \$700,000 will help to make Queensland the leading high-tech State in the nation. In comparison, New South Wales allocated \$12.1m, while Victoria has produced a package worth \$70m, in which high technology receives a very high profile. When one goes to the southern States to ask about what is being done with regard to high technology, and when one talks with people who know what is happening in Queensland, one finds that Queensland is the laughing-stock of the nation concerning the promotion of high technology by State Governments.

I turn now to employment initiatives. The Minister for Employment and Industrial Affairs (Mr Lester) seems to think that he did his department proud when he managed to get \$2m for the range of initiatives proposed by the task force that had its genesis in the Rockhampton by-election held early this year.

I will draw a comparison between New South Wales and Queensland. On specific employment initiatives, New South Wales spent \$52m. If Queensland wanted to match the level of effort that New South Wales put into its employment generation program, it would have to allocate at least \$25m, not the lousy \$2m that was given—obviously grudgingly—to the Minister for Employment and Industrial Affairs. When I note the miserable amount of money that the Government allocates for that purpose, I sincerely believe that the Minister has something to answer for and that he ought to explain to this House and to the people of Queensland how he can say in this place and publicly that the Government is taking certain employment initiatives.

The Government's attitude seems to be to give a dollar here and 50c there, while continuing to plead that it is broke. However, what is very important is that precisely \$58.8m from last year's Budget remained unspent. Almost \$60m that should have been spent on services was spirited away to the Trust and Special Funds so that the Government would not have to face the justifiable demands from teachers, nurses, police, etc, for additional funds, which are so urgently and desperately needed to bring their numbers up to a reasonable standard. When the Premier and Treasurer says that he does not have the money for extra services, that his Government does not have enough money to contribute towards alleviating the problems in the sugar industry, that he cannot play a part in the scheme that the two Governments and the sugar industry are trying to work out and that, because the Government does not have the money, it cannot make a reasonable contribution to the industry, is it not strange that \$60m was left unspent from last year's Budget?

Mr Booth: You told us the State was broke.

Mr WARBURTON: I did not say that the State was broke. I am saying exactly what I have said consistently throughout the year.

Mr Booth interjected.

Mr WARBURTON: If the honourable member for Warwick can show me where I said that the State was broke, I will accept his statement. It is the members of the Government who are saying that the State is broke.

The Opposition is saying that the Government has pared services to the people to the bone. One can only guess at the reason why the Government purposely secreted \$58.8m. Not only is that fraudulent but it is also unfair to the people of Queensland. On the other hand, the Premier and Treasurer found a significant sum of money to offer a swag of promises in the recent Redlands by-election campaign. The point I am making

is that, contrary to what the Premier and Treasurer has said today, the people are in fact waking up to the way in which the National Party operates.

Mr Stephan interjected.

Mr WARBURTON: The Minister for Works and Housing (Mr Wharton) is sitting in the seat usually occupied by the Premier and Treasurer and is making numerous statements. I will resume my seat if he wants to exercise his right to explain the Government's actions. As he is the only Minister in the House, I challenge him to explain to me why, last year, his Government deliberately underspent by \$58.8m. I ask him to tell me honestly that that money was not carried over. Can he tell me why the Government did not properly spend that money on the services needed in this State? If he does not want to answer, well and good, but the challenge is there. He is the one who has had plenty to say; he is sitting in the Premier's chair.

Mr Wharton: I never said a word.

Mr WARBURTON: Because the Minister knows it is true, he is now running away from the facts. He is the one who will not build enough houses for the people of the State. With \$58.8m, he could have done much for the ageing community in the State.

Mr Wharton interjected.

Mr WARBURTON: I have told the House that the Minister had plenty to say, particularly for one who is only minding the front bench.

The state of the Queensland economy received some very selective commentary in the Budget speech and in the contributions of various National Party members. Some very unusual comparisons were made.

The most useful indicator of the well-being of an economy is the trend of the statistics. If the statistics are examined, it can be clearly seen that the economic recovery of Queensland continues to lag behind that of Australia as a whole. Opposition members have consistently stated that. I refer to economic statistics for Queensland prepared by the Federal Department of Employment and Industrial Relations. That department states that the economic statistics for Queensland "reinforce suggestions that the local recovery is narrowly based with benefits spread unevenly across the community."

I will outline the facts on an interstate comparison—not what the Premier has put forward. The facts are that Queensland recorded the lowest percentage rise in the number of new motor vehicle registrations of any State for this year. Queensland had the lowest percentage increase in the number of dwelling commencements and the value of other building approvals of any State. In Queensland, the number of new dwellings approved fell by 5.2 per cent, whereas for each of the other States the number of new dwelling approvals rose.

Queensland recorded the greatest percentage decline in actual fixed capital expenditure by private enterprise, whereas most of the other States' percentages increased. Of all States, Queensland recorded the worst performance in actual new fixed capital expenditure by private enterprise in the mining sector, and, obviously, that is where some of the hopes of Queenslanders lie.

Queensland recorded the highest percentage increase of all States in the number of working days lost due to industrial disputes. What a record to be proud of! Queensland recorded by far the highest increase in bankruptcies of all States.

After 10 consecutive months of recording the highest unemployment in Australia, Queensland's unemployment dropped to the third highest in September, even though its rate of 8.8 per cent is still considerably above the national average. Unfortunately, youth unemployment was higher this September—those are the latest available figures—than it was in September last year.

The poor performance of the Queensland economy is showing up in average weekly earnings, with Queensland being the only State in which average weekly earnings of

workers actually declined in the 12 months to the June quarter 1985. In real terms, male wages in Queensland declined by 6.5 per cent during 1984-85, compared with a national average of 3.2 per cent. The drop in female wages was even higher, declining in Queensland by 10 per cent, compared with 4.2 per cent in Australia as a whole. Household income per capita is still the lowest in Australia, with the exception of the Apple Isle of Tasmania.

Despite having the information available, the Treasury, it seems, has chosen not to provide the details of the overall measurement of the State's economic performance—that is, the gross State product. If that information had been made available in the Budget papers, it would have shown that, after the boom years of the 1970s, Queensland still contributes only about 95 per cent of the national average to Australia's economy.

I turn now to the Premier's much touted Queensland credit rating and his claim, which was made before the news leaked out of Queensland's failure to receive an AAA rating, about the importance of a credit rating as justification for good economic performance and good economic management.

Recently, a conference was held in the Parliamentary Annexe by Credit Suisse and the First Boston Corporation. It was designed to inform the State Government borrowers of latest developments in the foreign exchange market and the credit rating process itself.

The documents issued at that conference confirm what I and other members of the Opposition have been saying about Queensland's credit rating and its failure to receive an AAA rating. The bungled attempts by the Deputy Premier and Minister Assisting the Treasurer to deny that Queensland had even sought a rating from the Japanese Bond Research Institute got him further into the mire.

Mr Gunn: Rubbish!

Mr WARBURTON: The Deputy Premier sank further into the mire because he was at pains to point out that Queensland had not applied for a formal rating and had not even applied for a preliminary rating. He failed to say, however, that Queensland was offered an initial indicative rating, sometimes referred to as a provisional rating, of AA. I read from the document issued at that conference, *The Rating Process*—

“After an on-site review of the issuer and following resolution of any specific questions arising out of either the written or oral presentation, the rating agencies would advise the issuer of its provisional rating, which is kept confidential and would only be made public with the express permission of the issuer. Should the issuer, for any reason, not wish to accept this rating (and not proceed with the offering), it has the option to decline it, in which case neither the rating, nor even the fact that it had been sought, would be made public by the agencies.”

It is clear that, after the initial decision to seek a rating from the Japanese Bond Research Institute and the usual consultations, Queensland was offered only an AA credit rating. Because of the political problems that that would have caused, it decided not to proceed to have the initial indicative rating confirmed as a preliminary rating and later formalised when the Government wished to enter the market. It was the gossip of the week among Japanese banks, so the Opposition has been informed, that Queensland had failed to get that rating. The reasons given for the failure were the overdependence of the Queensland Government on Federal financing, the narrow base on the Queensland economy and the problems facing some of our major industries, particularly sugar.

The criteria which the agency uses in assessing a rating are extremely comprehensive, covering—

- political setting;
- administrative system;
- demography and infrastructure;
- composition of a State's economy;
- revenue structure;
- liquidity;
- current expenditure trends;
- capital expenditures; and
- debt management.

Queensland failed to meet the test and, as a result, has declined to enter the low-interest-rate Japanese public bond market. Ludicrous explanations have come from the Deputy Premier, ranging from claims that the private market was more attractive than the public market to suggestions that currency swaps were not available via the public market. He hoped that nobody understood what he was reading.

The only credit rating that Queensland has is the short-term A1 + P1 rating from the New York agencies of Moody's, and Standard and Poor's. The Government announces that as proof of its good rating. When anybody inquires—when anybody deliberately seeks the truth—what is not said is that that is only a short-term rating for 18 months and that, if Queensland wants to prove that it is a good credit risk, it must apply for a long-term credit rating from either of those two credit agencies. The Government, however, will not do so—and it knows why. Certainly, somebody in Treasury knows why. Whether the Deputy Premier knows why is another matter altogether. The Government has not done so, and I personally believe that it will not do so, because it knows that its economic and financial position would come under intense scrutiny. After the set-back it received in the Japanese market, it certainly does not want another set-back on the New York market.

Because of the poor performance of the National Party Government, the people of Queensland are suffering. For years and years they have suffered from inadequate services. The Opposition is now able to identify what has been going on. For the first time in a very long time, the Opposition has been able to show up the Government for what it is.

The people of this State are suffering because of the poor economic performance of the Government. Queensland is overseen by a National Party Government that apparently is devoid of any initiatives, any ideas, or any strategies that are needed urgently if Queensland is to meet its obligation to play a proper part in national economic recovery.

Hon. Sir WILLIAM KNOX (Nundah) (12.51 p.m.): I am happy to support the Bill, which provides funds needed for the maintenance of the good order and Government of the State. In the Estimates debate, the opportunity has been taken to debate Budget items one by one; but today, all honourable members are provided with an opportunity to speak about the general position that now faces the State.

The Premier and Treasurer (Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen) is quite correct in saying that the most serious problem facing the State at the moment is still unemployment, particularly unemployment of young people. Unemployment causes great distress, not only to individual families but also to the community at large. It is a topic that has been mentioned in this House many times.

Part of the problem lies in the inability of Government instrumentalities, industrial tribunals, unions and even employer organisations to come to grips with the impediments to the provision of employment opportunities, particularly for young people. Although members of Parliament are sometimes criticised for referring only to unemployment among young people, I point out that we recognise also the problem of unemployment among older people. For instance, many people have retired from the work-force simply because they have not been able to find jobs during the last year or so. That is a problem of significance in the service industries.

The industry that has the capacity to employ an enormous number of people, including a high percentage of young people, is being prejudiced very heavily. I refer to the hospitality industry in Queensland. Some of the prejudicial effects emanate from the Federal level, but some are to be found at the State level.

I mention first the wage scale, which includes penalty rates. Penalty rates that apply in the hospitality industry are quite absurd, because the hours not worked by people in ordinary industries are the hours of work in the hospitality industry. Under the strait-jacket constraints of the present system of industrial relations, the unusual hours attract very high penalty rates of pay.

Although nobody is suggesting an alteration in the basic numbers of hours worked in a week—whether it be 38 or 40—or a reduction in the base rate of pay, which, in the hospitality industry, is quite high, the penalty rates that apply in that industry can be regarded as virtually a tariff that prevents the creation of opportunities for employment. Because of penalty rates, businesses do not open, and people are not offered employment although services are required. Unemployment remains a problem because of the inhibiting factor of penalty rates associated with the provision of services.

Mr Gunn: Business people like to make a profit, but they are unable to under the present system.

Sir WILLIAM KNOX: Exactly. Business people also like to provide a service at a price that the consumer would be prepared to pay. However, if penalty rates are such that the cost of the service is prohibitive, the consumer does not turn up or seek the provision of services.

Mr De Lacy: On the subject of penalty rates—do you know that the wage for a house-cleaner is less than \$230 a week? With the payment of overtime for working on Sunday, the wage is \$248 a week. If house-cleaners worked 40 hours a week, including Sunday, and received \$248, would you think that that was an exorbitant rate of pay?

Sir WILLIAM KNOX: I do not consider it exorbitant or anything else. That is the wage that has been set by the award. People generally accept that as the current wage for that particular calling.

There is a whole range of wages in the hospitality industry, from managerial-type people to those who do the most menial tasks. All of them are high levels of wages for those tasks that have been accepted by the unions and by employers. However, penalty rates, which are the rates for the prevention of the sweating of labour by changing normal working conditions into abnormal working conditions, are a sort of prohibition on employment. But they do not really prevent the sweating of labour, because nobody wants to employ people under those sorts of conditions. Because the normal hours of work are traditionally those that everybody recognises, penalty rates for trades people, people working in the public service and people working in factories are justified.

The hospitality industry—a service industry that has grown up in this State in the past 20 or 30 years—is finding that that type of strait-jacket inhibits any employment at all. That is a great pity, because the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation has shown quite clearly that the abolition or reduction of all penalty rates in the hospitality industry to some degree would lead to the immediate employment of 23 000 people. Services which do not exist at the moment could be provided. I am not suggesting for one moment that the award wage be reduced. The award wage is quite high. Whether it is 36¼, 38 or 40 hours that people have to work each week, if those hours were spread over the period when the service was required, people would get jobs at high rates of weekly pay without having to worry about working extra hours or about penalty rates. The present situation is absurd.

The second problem to which I refer is pay-roll tax, which is a very heavy burden indeed on small business. It is not a heavy burden on big business although it involves a substantial sum of money. For small business, even the payment of a few thousand dollars in pay-roll tax is an extremely heavy burden. Quite small businesses have to pay \$50,000 or \$100,000 a year in pay-roll tax. A tremendous number of small businesses in the hospitality industry are paying pay-roll tax, and that burden is another inhibitor in the employment of people in that industry.

I have said before that pay-roll tax is an antisocial tax, and it has in fact put a tariff on employment. It is a pity that the threshold is not lifted considerably to release, from the payment of pay-roll tax, the thousands of small businesses in the hospitality industry in this State, each of which would be more than happy to employ one or two more people. Of course, most of them would be young people.

The third problem that has now loomed on the horizon is the Commonwealth Government's tax package, which is a severe burden on private enterprise. Although some fuss has been made about the big enterprises of this nation losing share-holders because of the extra tax to be levied on dividends in 18 months' time, the extra burden is quite crippling to small businesses. This has been seen already in the protests made by the catering industry. Soon the laundries will discover that they are adversely affected because they service that industry. Vegetable-growers will be adversely affected because they also service that industry. Many people employed in those industries have already lost their jobs because of the Federal Government's tax package, and many more people are about to lose their jobs. That is a very serious matter indeed. There is more to come as the tax package bites and people discover how it will adversely affect them. The new tax package is certainly a great burden on the small businesses in the hospitality and tourist industries. It will, of course, cause more unemployment. It will certainly not encourage employment. These are the inhibitions to which I referred.

Sitting suspended from 1 to 2.15 p.m.

Sir WILLIAM KNOX: Before the luncheon recess, I was talking about the impact of the Federal Government's tax package on the hospitality industry, which, of course, is one of the service industries of this nation. In Queensland, in particular, the service industries are growing and providing jobs for many new arrivals in the State and also for young people. Indeed, service industries account for 60 per cent of the total output of the nation and two-thirds of the total employment in this nation. In fact, the figure is a little higher in Queensland.

The Federal Government's tax package will be a tremendous imposition on service industries. Service industries depend very heavily on being able to claim promotional costs as part of the expenses incurred in earning income. Traditionally in this country, costs incurred in the earning of income have been tax deductible. Now, in many instances, those costs will not be allowed as tax deductions.

Much has been said about the catering industry. Certainly that area has been highly prejudiced by the Federal Government. Legitimate business expenses are associated with the earning of income in the food and entertainment industries. Those expenses have been recognised in this country and in other countries.

I shall look now at what will happen to the motor car industry and to all the people involved in that industry. For many people, a motor car is not a perk; it is an office on wheels. A person's ability to do business and to provide a service is related to his mobility. People do not get into cars and drive round just for the fun of it. The motor car is an extension of their office.

I am sure that honourable members would agree that a real estate operator spends most of his time in his car transporting himself or his clients to places at which he can do business. Many people depend upon motor cars to provide a service. It is quite ridiculous to regard a motor car as a perk or a luxury.

Years ago, the Labor Party used to regard a refrigerator as a luxury. It was all right for people to have an ice-box. If they had a refrigerator, it was considered that they had a luxury. At one time the Labor Party discovered that a refrigerator was a necessity, and it decided to include, in its platform, a promise to put a refrigerator in every home.

Mr Gunn: It would have been cheap one.

Sir WILLIAM KNOX: It was, too. That was part of the Labor Party's policy back in the '30s.

A motor car is no longer a luxury for most people. It is an extension of their office and a working tool that is used in business. Of course, a tax is to be imposed on the employer. It is interesting to note that the Queensland Government will be taxed on the motor cars that it provides to public servants. Some people think that the only officers in the public service who get motor cars are heads of departments. Of course,

thousands of public servants carry out inspections and interviews. It is necessary for them to go to the site or to the client.

Mr Gunn: They are on call all the time.

Sir WILLIAM KNOX: Indeed, they are on call.

They have the privilege of taking a car home, but it is cheaper for the Government to allow the employees to take the cars home and look after them than to garage the cars every night and employ people to supervise them. As I understand the position, the Queensland Government will be taxed 49c in the dollar for providing those services to the community. I think that that is in contravention of section 114 of the Constitution, and I hope that the Government's advisers, together with other State Governments, are working towards challenging the legislation on that basis.

Although the legislation has not yet appeared before the Federal Parliament, it will be worth the Government's while to do its homework. It seems iniquitous that a State Government will be taxed on the moneys that it receives from the tax-payers via the Federal Government by way of reimbursement.

I understand that the Federal Treasurer said that, if the State Governments do not pay the tax, it will be deducted from the reimbursements to the States. What a lot of hog-wash and bureaucratic muddling on the part of the Labor Party in order to pursue its own philosophy! It has nothing to do with reducing the cost of Government; it is all about the Labor Party's philosophy of redistributing wealth and income. It has nothing to do with making this country efficient; it is all about the Labor Party's doctrinaire approach to solving the nation's problems.

As a result of the new taxation package, some companies have postponed and, indeed, may cancel their orders for cars in the next calendar year. I have no doubt that the State Government will have to review its position with regard to the ordering and servicing of motor cars. The huge number of people employed in the motor vehicle industry, not only in the manufacture of cars but in their servicing—that aspect is dominant in Queensland—will have their jobs placed in jeopardy as a result of this stupid decision by the Federal Government.

There has been a giant shift in employment from production to services; yet the Australian Government is making it more difficult for people to be employed in service industries. The future of employment in service industries was very rosy in this nation, particularly in Queensland, and special mention must be made of the hospitality industry. Because of the administration of the new tax package, more people will face unemployment and more businesses will be placed in difficulty. One could not find a better example of a scheme that creates disincentive in the community than the new tax package. But it does not stop there; other measures are looming on the horizon.

The proposed identity card will create further problems. When it was first proposed, it was said that the card would be introduced to deal with tax-dodgers; but that is stupid. The Government could deal with tax-dodgers in a number of other ways that would be less costly and far more efficient than identity cards. I lived in this country when identity cards were used between 1942 and 1945, and I remember them very distinctly. I have a replica of one of them with me. Everybody over the age of 16 years had to carry his cardboard card.

Mr Vaughan: Where are all your mates?

Sir WILLIAM KNOX: They have other things to do. They are doing the same sort of thing as the honourable member's mates are doing, as are other honourable members; they are poring over bits of paper in back rooms.

The identity card system, which was introduced in this country between 1942 and 1945, was an abomination and a curse. One of the worst features of the card was that it had to be produced on the demand of those people with the authority to make such a demand. If a policeman wanted to make a certain person's life difficult, he could pick

that person up at every street corner and demand that his identity card be produced at police station X or Y within the next 48 hours.

Some people seem to think that an identity card is like a credit card. If I mutilate my credit card, nobody gets very upset about it; but it will be an offence to mutilate the new identity card. If a person is found guilty of that offence, he will have to pay a fine. If the fine is not paid, the person will go to gaol. I cannot simplify it more than that. Compulsory identity cards are quite a different story from credit cards.

Last week, the Federal Government announced that a person seeking employment will have to produce his identity card. Originally, the Federal Government said that identity cards would be used for no purpose other than to catch tax-dodgers. Many reasons will be advanced for the production of identity cards. As was the case when identity cards were used between 1942 and 1945, people will think up all sorts of reasons for using them. Identity cards were so unpopular in this country that, after the signing of the peace treaty in Tokyo Bay, the legislation was repealed within three weeks. That is how unpopular they were!

The mutilation of a compulsory identity card is not the only offence attached to its use. If a person does not notify the registrar of any change of address, that is an offence. If, upon marriage, a woman does not notify the registrar of her change of name or address, that will be an offence.

The new legislation, which is now being drafted, provides also that if a person allows another to use his identity card, that will be a very serious offence. If somebody uses another's identity card by mistake, that will also be an offence.

As was the case between 1942 and 1945, a huge black market in forgeries will come into being. People who absconded from prisoner-of-war camps during that period had no trouble in getting identity cards. When the new system is introduced, people in our community who need identity cards and do not possess them will have no trouble in obtaining them. The experience in north America has been that, because the forgery business is enormous, the introduction of identity cards for the social security system has been a complete failure.

I understand that the cost of producing an identity card that would reduce, but not eliminate, the possibility of forgery would be \$50. The present proposal is that everybody over the age of 18 years will be issued with an identity card. Believe it or not, the original proposal was that everybody over the age of 12 years would be issued with one. Honourable members can imagine the initial cost involved. It will run into hundreds of millions of dollars. The administrative costs relative to compulsory identity cards are enormous.

All of us in this House know of the tremendous changes that occur every year in electoral rolls—people changing addresses, changing names or moving into the country. The numbers run to tens of thousands. Now, every time somebody changes his name or address or comes into the country, he will have to apply for an identity card or have his existing card altered. The administrative cost of that will run into millions of dollars a year.

Mr Borbidge: It will mean a massive bureaucracy.

Sir WILLIAM KNOX: It will mean a tremendous bureaucracy at an enormous cost to the tax-payer.

Mr McPhie: Yet there is no photograph, so they will not be effective, anyway.

Sir WILLIAM KNOX: The honourable member is quite right; without photographs, they will not be effective. Simply because the forgery business will become very large, they will not be effective in the form proposed.

Although it will be much tougher to get a passport than it will be to get a compulsory identity card, criminals have no trouble in obtaining a forged passport for use when

coming into or going out of the country. At a price, people will have no trouble in getting a forged compulsory identity card. That will add further confusion.

On top of the initial cost of the scheme will be the costs that have to be borne by private enterprise and by Governments. Identity cards have been produced for a purpose. When transactions take place, the compulsory identity cards will have to be produced and the numbers entered on the documents. Every time documents change hands, the numbers will have to go with them. If an error is made in the transcription of the numbers along the way, a host of letters and explanations will have to go through the system. The cost of that will be quite enormous.

I hope that all State Governments in Australia will press the Federal Government not to proceed with the introduction of compulsory identity cards because, as I said, when such cards were in use in this country they were very unpopular, and the administration of the system was costly. That will be repeated if compulsory identity cards are introduced again. I know quite a few people who were originally in favour of compulsory identity cards but now realise the burden that would be placed on their businesses in keeping track of the necessary information. Those people now realise that the introduction of compulsory identity cards should be opposed.

Perhaps worst of all, compulsory identity cards will cause our gaols to be filled with people who make transgressions—some of them probably quite innocently—in the handling of the compulsory identity cards. People who fail to pay fines because of not attending to some matter for which they are prosecuted will face the alternative of going to gaol. People who misuse the cards—and many people will—will be subject to penalties and, alternatively, a gaol sentence, and on it will go.

I hope that State Governments will resist the introduction of compulsory identity cards and will challenge the validity of the legislation in relation to the payment of funds to the Federal Government under section 114 of the Constitution. I hope that State Governments will refuse to co-operate with the Federal Government by not providing the access to the register of births and other records that it is asking for.

If the State Governments refuse to co-operate, the Federal Government may think again and be a little more careful about reintroducing this iniquitous practice, which was abandoned in 1945 and which people hoped never to see again. In fact, if identity cards had not been withdrawn in 1945, they would have become an election issue in their own right because they were such a nuisance and a hindrance to people in their dealings.

Mr BORBIDGE (Surfers Paradise) (2.32 p.m.): In supporting the Appropriation Bill (No. 2), I will comment on the ongoing and more than repetitive campaign being waged by the political opponents of the Government, who suggest that this State's hard-earned reputation as a low-tax State is not really deserved. For the information of honourable members, I will outline certain statistics that I believe not only confirm this status but also indicate that the National Party Government in Queensland is consolidating this status.

Mr McPhie: Send a copy to the Leader of the Opposition. He is not in the Chamber.

Mr BORBIDGE: The honourable member for Toowoomba North reminds me that the Leader of the Opposition makes brash and unsubstantiated allegations in this Chamber and then runs for cover whenever Government members attempt to put him right. Government members have learnt that that is a method typically used by the Leader of the Opposition.

No doubt if he was in the Chamber, he would want to know where I am getting my figures from. The source of the statistics that I will outline come from the Budget papers of the respective State Governments, that is, the Queensland Estimates of Receipts and Expenditure 1985-86, the New South Wales Estimates of Receipts 1985-86, the Victorian Receipts and Program Expenditures 1985-86, the South Australian Estimates of Receipts for the year ending 30 June 1986 and the Australian Bureau of Statistics

Australian Demographic Statistics for the September and December quarters 1984 and the September 1985 quarter.

Those statistics make very interesting reading because, statistically, Queensland remains the lowest-taxed State in the Commonwealth. When the measures that have been taken by other State Governments are taken into account, Queensland's reputation gets better each day. For example, if New South Wales taxation rates were levied in Queensland, this State would have an additional \$255m in the Treasury. If Victorian rates of taxation were levied, Queensland would benefit to the tune of \$320m. If South Australian taxation rates were levied, Queensland would benefit by \$160m. If Western Australian taxation rates were levied, the figure would be \$72m. If Tasmanian taxation rates were levied, it would be \$128m. If the average of all States was levied, this State's Treasury would be \$187m better off. It is important to note that those achievements have been made possible at a time of blatant financial discrimination against Queensland and its Government that is probably unrivalled in the history of federation.

On the basis of information provided by the Commonwealth Grants Commission as part of its review of State relativities, Queensland would generate additional revenue of \$187m if it imposed the levels of taxes and charges applicable in the other States. The Australian Bureau of Statistics discloses that, for the year 1985-86, on the basis of Government financial estimates, State taxation on a per capita basis will be—

	\$
New South Wales	781
Victoria	754
Western Australia	655
South Australia	589
Queensland	511

The Budget papers for the taxation year 1985-86 reveal that, on a per capita basis, taking the population at 31 December 1984, the figures are even more interesting. Per head of population, the tax will be—

	\$
Queensland	399.44
Victoria	737.94
New South Wales	654.17
South Australia	627.34
Western Australia	517.40

Victorians pay \$358.5 more per person annually in State taxation than Queenslanders. New South Welshmen pay \$254.73 more State tax per person annually than Queenslanders, or 1.5 times as much. South Australians pay \$227.90 more State tax per person annually than Queenslanders. It is well known that Queensland does not impose a liquor tax, a petroleum tax or a tobacco tax. Western Australians pay \$115.96 more State tax per person annually than Queenslanders.

Mr Fouras: Boring.

Mr BORBIDGE: I point out, for the benefit of the honourable member for South Brisbane, who is in his incorrect seat, that I am quoting figures contained in the Budget papers of the respective State Governments. Honourable members on the Government side are becoming fed up with the lies being spread about Queensland's economic performance and the level of State Government charges in Queensland. The Queensland Government has a record that it can be proud of.

Mr FitzGerald: The best Government in Queensland's history.

Mr BORBIDGE: Indeed.

Mr McPhie: It is worth making the point, too, that we have been able to achieve those figures and balance our Budget, too. Those other States can't balance their Budgets.

Mr BORBIDGE: Yes, we have managed to balance our Budget, as well.

Mr Fouras: You don't provide any services.

Mr BORBIDGE: Queensland has been able to achieve that result in spite of the blatant financial discrimination it has been subjected to by the colleagues of the honourable member for South Brisbane, who is becoming very excited. I would like to know, as I am sure his constituents would, when he will take a stand on their behalf.

Mr Gunn: I believe that he will have a change of boundaries. I don't think he will have any constituents.

Mr BORBIDGE: The Deputy Premier suggests that the honourable member for South Brisbane may have a problem.

The Leader of the Opposition has attempted to imply that pay-roll tax in Queensland has, in some way, been higher than in other States. I refer to the per capita figures. In Queensland, pay-roll tax per head is \$189.04. Under Victoria's Labor administration of John Cain, it is \$285.19. In New South Wales, under the Labor Government of Premier Wran, it is \$282.06. In South Australia, under the outgoing Labor Government, I suggest, of Premier Bannon, it is \$192.88. In Western Australia, under the Labor Government of Premier Burke, it is \$215.78. Yet, from time to time, the Leader of the Opposition and some of his spokesmen stand up in this place and claim that something is wrong; that the Queensland Government is not doing the right thing; and that pay-roll tax charges in Queensland, although they are the most reasonable in the country, are too heavy. Honourable members opposite know that they are the most reasonable in the country, but they just cannot accept it.

It is also interesting to examine the position in other States in regard to business franchise fees, because as far as I am aware, they do not exist in Queensland. Approximately three or four weeks ago, I had the opportunity of talking to my colleagues in New South Wales who were discussing problems confronted by small business in that State because of the multiplicity of licence fees and business registration charges that have been imposed by the Wran Government. For example, for commodities such as liquor, petroleum, tobacco and gas, no business franchise fees are applicable in Queensland. In Victoria, the fee in respect of liquor is \$18.61 per capita; in New South Wales, it is \$23.96; and in South Australia, it is \$22.89. In relation to petroleum, the fee per head in Victoria is \$55.61; in New South Wales, \$42.27; and in South Australia, \$33.86. In respect of tobacco, the business franchise fee per head in Victoria is \$26.9; in New South Wales, \$18.19; and in South Australia, \$29.44. The total of those fees per capita for each State is as follows: in Victoria, \$100.31; in New South Wales, \$84.42; in South Australia, \$89.74; and in Queensland, zero! Yet Government members regularly witness the curious exercise of Opposition members claiming that the cost imposed by the Queensland Government on small business is too great. In the light of the comparison with the other, Labor, States, how the Australian Labor Party can even hold up its head in Queensland when talking about small business is totally beyond me.

Honourable members opposite need to be reminded that during February, at the time of the power dispute, when small business operators were being hit severely as a result of the industrial action that was taken by colleagues of honourable members opposite, the State Government set up an emergency relief scheme. Of course, we all know what happened after that. The Australian Telecommunications Employees Association, under the leadership of the State President of the Australian Labor Party, Mr McLean, refused to connect telephones. Members of the Opposition should not have the audacity and cheek to talk in vague terms about the commitment of the Australian Labor Party to small business.

I turn now to examine the amount of stamp duty per head of population as imposed across the States. In Queensland, it is \$143.78; in Victoria, it is \$188.2; in New South Wales, it is \$151.96; in South Australia, it is \$167.48; and in Western Australia, it is \$162.12. For land tax, too, the amount payable per head in each of the States is worth

examining. In Queensland, the amount is \$14.24; in Victoria, it is \$42.68; in New South Wales, it is \$49.43; in South Australia, it is \$27.97; and in Western Australia, it is \$38.73. The rate of gambling tax per head in each State is as follows: in Queensland, it is \$18.67, which can be compared to \$73.39 in Victoria, \$51.87 in New South Wales, \$35.63 in South Australia, and \$23.56 in Western Australia.

The Queensland Government, despite pressure and heavying exerted by the Federal Labor Government, has refused to introduce a financial institutions tax. In Queensland, that tax is non-existent; however, in Victoria, it amounts to \$24.80 per capita; in New South Wales, it is \$24.80; in South Australia, it is \$22.82; and in Western Australia, it is \$17.86.

I could go across the wide spectrum of tax measures and make comparisons, and credit must certainly be given to the Labor Party for ingenuity when it comes to dreaming up new taxation measures that can be imposed on business and the tax-payer.

I suggest to honourable members opposite that if they want to have any credibility in the debate about State Government taxes and charges here in Queensland, they should first look over the border to see what their colleagues in Government in New South Wales are doing. They should also remember that their colleagues in Government in the other States are receiving a far better deal in the share of the national taxation cake than is the National Party Government here in Queensland.

Mr Davis: Why don't you tell the truth?

Mr BORBIDGE: The Opposition Whip suggests that I am not telling the truth. The honourable member entered the Chamber after I had begun my speech, so I will enlighten him. If he alleges that I am not telling the truth, I suggest that the New South Wales Government has misled the New South Wales Parliament in regard to its Estimates of expenditure for 1985-86. I suggest that the honourable member's colleagues in the Victorian Government have misled their Parliament about the Victorian Government's receipts and programmed expenditure for 1985-86. I suggest that a similar thing has happened in South Australia. A similar allegation can be made about the Australian Bureau of Statistics. We on this side of the Chamber face an ongoing sniping campaign by honourable members opposite because they do not seem to believe anything we say; yet when we indicate to them the source of the information that we are using, they are not prepared to accept it. The sources of my information are the Budget figures of the honourable member's colleagues in Government interstate.

Mr Davis interjected.

Mr BORBIDGE: The honourable member can scream all he likes, but he has been caught out. He is not in a position to substantiate allegations of high State Government taxes and charges in Queensland.

Mr McElligott: What was the source of your statement that there are no massage parlours on the Gold Coast?

Mr Gunn: No-one would know more about that than the honourable member.

Mr BORBIDGE: I take the interjection of the Deputy Premier. I note that the honourable member for Townsville (Mr McElligott) wishes to change the subject. Certainly, if he wants to debate massage parlours, he may be more qualified to do so than I am; I do not know.

The records show clearly that Queensland has the lowest pay-roll tax, stamp duty, land taxes and gambling taxes in Australia. Queensland also lacks the range of taxation measures that have been implemented by Labor Governments in other States. That says it all, and I hope that, in the course of the debate this afternoon, we hear a fairer approach to this Government's economic performance than was forthcoming from the Leader of the Opposition earlier or, for that matter, from other Opposition members in other debates.

I wish to refer also to allegations by Senator Gerry Jones that were critical of the performance of the Queensland tourism industry.

Mr Gunn interjected.

Mr BORBIDGE: I take the comment of the Deputy Premier. Senator Jones said that tourism development in Queensland is lagging, and that tourism development on the Gold Coast is lagging. The senator is a hypocrite. If he had one ounce of commitment to the tourism and hospitality industry, and to the people who are involved in it, he would have taken a very strong stand indeed against the Federal Labor Government's taxation package. I note that he has not, and I challenge the Australian Labor Party's new-found expert on Queensland tourism to tell the people of this State where he stands in regard to the taxation measures that have been introduced by the Federal Labor Government. The situation in the industry is critical.

Already, reports have been made by groups such as American Express that about 30 000 people may lose their jobs in the tourism and hospitality sector across Australia.

Mr Davis: Rubbish!

Mr BORBIDGE: The Opposition Whip says, "Rubbish!" I will take that interjection so that it appears in *Hansard*. Does any other Opposition member want to say, "Rubbish!"?

Mr McElligott: Rubbish!

Mr BORBIDGE: The honourable member for Townsville says that it is rubbish.

Mr Vaughan: Rubbish! They rip their customers off on the price of their wines.

Mr BORBIDGE: I will also take that interjection from the honourable member for Nudgee. Time and time again, accusations have been made that the hospitality and tourism industry is a taxation roort.

Mr Vaughan: They rip the customers off with the price of their wines.

Mr BORBIDGE: The interjection confirms the hostile assault that Labor members are making on the jobs of people in the hospitality and tourism industry. After that vicious assault on their jobs, how anybody involved in that industry would ever vote Labor or be a member of a union is totally beyond me.

Already, 1 000 Queenslanders have lost their jobs and Opposition members could not give a damn. They are laughing; they think it is funny that 1 000 Queenslanders are out of a job as a result of what their mates in Canberra have done. I predict that the policies of the Federal Labor Government will cost the Labor Party in this State dearly. The Federal Government is displaying a massive ignorance of the hospitality and tourism industry. I remind Opposition members that it is the greatest job-creating industry that we have.

Mr Davis: What is?

Mr BORBIDGE: The hospitality and tourism industry. Opposition members have sold out the industry and all those people who have the capacity to work in the industry.

Mr DAVIS: I rise to a point of order. The member for Surfers Paradise pointed to me and said that I have sold out the tourist and hospitality workers. That is incorrect. The only people I am against are those whom he supports—the restaurateurs who have robbed the public for many years and who continue to do so.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Booth): Order! There is no point of order.

Mr BORBIDGE: I look forward to sending copies of my contribution to this debate—particularly the part showing the reaction of Opposition members—to the hospitality and tourism workers in my electorate. For a senior member of the Opposition,

the Opposition Whip, to make a comment such as that is an absolute disgrace. How the Labor Party could ever hope to have any credibility on any matter relating to the hospitality and tourism industry is totally beyond me. With a sense of reluctance, I shall certainly make copies of my speech, including the silly comments of Opposition members, available to the young kids who have been thrown out of jobs. It is a great disappointment to me that they have lost their jobs. For a while, the tourist industry thought that John Brown may have understood the industry. What the Prime Minister, the Federal Treasurer and the Federal Government have done indicates clearly that that is not the case.

Before I was side-tracked, I was referring to the vicious attacks that Senator Jones made on the hospitality and tourism industry. He referred to certain figures used by the Australian Tourist Commission. It is worthy of note in this place that the figures used by the ATC in the survey that was quoted by Senator Jones are statistically incorrect. That has been confirmed by representatives of the Australian Tourist Commission, including Mr Jim Kennedy, who is also deputy chairman of the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation. A new company was commissioned to carry out a survey, but a mistake was made in the survey.

In conclusion, I comment on the Australian Bureau of Statistics figures as they relate to the Gold Coast. The ABS statistics on room occupancy rates on the Gold Coast take in less than one-quarter of the overall market because they omit holiday units, flats and caravan parks. It is worthy of note that in the quarter ending 30 June 1985, 1.46 million visitor nights were spent on the Gold Coast, compared with 1.32 million for the same quarter in 1984. That represents a growth of approximately 10.6 per cent.

The tourism industry in Queensland is going very well. The only threat to it is the very vicious assault being made upon it by the Canberra colleagues of Opposition members.

I support the Appropriation Bill.

Mr PALASZCZUK (Archerfield) (2.55 p.m.): In rising to speak to this Appropriation Bill, I will comment firstly on the garbage that is spoken by members of this Government about Australia's overseas debt. To listen to the Premier and his Ministers, one would think that Australia is about to be placed in receivership. What a load of rubbish! Australia has one of the highest credit ratings in the world with the international financial community.

Because Australia is a developing country, it has been necessary to borrow large sums of money to finance the huge development projects that are on the go at present. To service this debt, Australia needs to lift its export performance, and the Hawke Labor Government is doing an excellent job in this regard.

I ask honourable members to consider the successful trade mission to Europe that was concluded recently by the Minister for Trade (Mr Dawkins). He is negotiating a huge wheat deal with the Russians. It always amuses me to hear the Premier, the Deputy Premier and their cohorts belting Russia and the Eastern Bloc countries for all they are worth. However, as soon as those countries want to enter into a trade deal such as that being negotiated by Mr Dawkins, those countries become the good guys. That is a typical example of National Party hypocrisy.

The Queensland Government has done its fair share in contributing to Australia's overseas debt. I have marvelled at the time that the Premier and the former Treasurer (Sir Llew Edwards) have spent in Tokyo rattling the begging bowl. Much of those borrowings were for the construction of power houses. As my colleague the honourable member for Nudgee (Mr Vaughan) has pointed out repeatedly in this house, Queensland has so much excess generating capacity that it will take 10 years before it is utilised fully.

If the Government had exercised a little financial restraint and had shown some of the management skills that one is always told abound within it, the nation's overseas debt would be lower. The Government's advisers have much to answer for, but I suppose that no-one is game to deflate the Premier, explain the real world to him, and dispel

some of his fantasies. I ask honourable members to consider Tarong. The tax-payers of Queensland will pay for this mis-sited folly long after the Premier has gone to the big peanut farm in the sky. It will stand for many years as a monument to National Party financial mismanagement and pork-barrelling.

It is timely in the debate on this Appropriation Bill to discuss the funds allocated to the Queensland Housing Commission. Enough funds are never allocated and, although the Minister for Works and Housing (Mr Wharton) says that the number of applicants and the wait-time are down, the position is still very serious. Like other honourable members, I spend at least half of my time dealing with Housing Commission problems.

Mr FitzGerald: You wanted more of them in your electorate.

Mr PALASZCZUK: I am pleased to have got them, too.

The problems that I deal with concern people seeking help to obtain accommodation, and tenants complaining about a lack of basic maintenance on their homes. The main complaint, with which I entirely agree, is the length of time that it takes to get the most basic repair job attended to. I know that the day-labour force of the commission is limited, but that is really no excuse.

The Minister for Housing and the Queensland Housing Commission cannot have it both ways. The Housing Commission charges high rents, and the tenant has the right to expect that his landlord, in this case the Queensland Housing Commission, will maintain his property at a reasonable standard. Once upon a time, the commission seemed to be interested in preventive maintenance, but now it waits until a complaint is lodged before it responds. I hope that the Minister will ensure that the commission has sufficient funds to enable it to maintain its properties, which, after all, are not the property of the Government or the commission, but of all Queenslanders.

Recently, the Minister for Works and Housing wrote to me after I raised, in this House, the possible use of a large tract of land in Watson Road that was lying idle. The land is presently undergoing boring and engineering tests to determine whether it is suitable for housing development. I hope that, if the tests prove satisfactory, the Minister will make sure that funds are allocated as speedily as possible to enable construction to begin. All the services are there.

I remind the Minister and the Housing Commission of the urgent need for a block of pensioner units at Acacia Ridge. The land that I have mentioned provides a golden opportunity for this facility. As the Minister is aware, and as I have mentioned in this place before, the only other suitable land was occupied by a church. Unfortunately, the major Christian denomination concerned set a price too high for the Queensland Housing Commission and sold the land to a private developer. So much for Christian compassion!

Whilst I am on the subject of allocation of funds to the Queensland Housing Commission, I must take issue strongly with the honourable member for Sherwood (Mr Angus Innes) over his recent statements that appeared in the *Satellite*. He said that the proposal to build a small number of Housing Commission houses in his electorate at Seventeen Mile Rocks Road would be not beneficial to his area. I fully support the commission's policy on integration. The member for Sherwood "went off" and his remarks smacked of snobbery of the worst kind. If one listened to him, one would believe that the Queensland Housing Commission was about to erect a number of humpies. They will be nothing of the sort.

Mr Gunn: Not one of them is in the Chamber.

Mr PALASZCZUK: That is usual. I wonder what the Liberal members are doing at present.

The houses will be well designed and well built. The commission has indicated that it will carry out some landscaping.

Mr McElligott: They might be vetting applications for ministerial jobs.

Mr PALASZCZUK: I would say the Liberals are poring over the maps on the electoral redistribution.

Returning to the subject, I should say that the houses will fit in well with the suburb. As a matter of fact, I took the time and trouble to go to that area to see for myself what was involved. I spoke to some of the local residents, who were not perturbed at all about the construction of the houses. All in all, I think the honourable member for Sherwood shot from the hip.

Mr Gunn: I will take them in my electorate at any time. They are beautiful houses.

Mr PALASZCZUK: I would appreciate the same sort of thing in my electorate. I have a huge tract of land that is ready for Housing Commission houses. I am glad that the Deputy Premier agrees with me. Perhaps he will help me in my approaches to the Minister for Works and Housing to get some houses in my electorate.

I can assure the honourable member for Sherwood that, had he been in the Inala Plaza shopping centre in the couple of days after his remarks were published in the *Satellite*, he would have needed his running shoes.

It is pertinent in this debate to discuss some of the matters mentioned by the honourable member for Surfers Paradise (Mr Borbidge), such as the claim as is often made by the the Premier and Treasurer that Queensland is a low-tax State. As my leader recently pointed out, over the last year more than 5 000 fees and charges have been increased. Many of these increases were far in excess of the inflation rate.

I have previously mentioned the rip-off in the Titles Office. If a document is lodged over the counter, a fee is not charged. However, if it is posted in, as most of the documents are, a mail-opening fee of \$10.50 is charged. That adds insult to injury. The usual Titles Office charges are payable, yet this nice old rip-off seems to have gone unnoticed.

As my colleague the shadow Minister for Mines and Energy (Mr Vaughan) recently pointed out, the South East Queensland Electricity Board is also into the act. SEQEB has recently increased its special reading fee from \$1.50 to \$10, an increase of more than 500 per cent. I cannot see how an increase of that proportion can be justified. Customers who query their electricity account are required to pay \$10 to have the meter reread. If the initial reading is found to be incorrect, the fee is waived. What other business would get away with that sort of daylight robbery? When one considers that the special reading fee also applies to tenants moving out of houses, flats and units, one realises that SEQEB is onto a nice old lurk.

I turn my attention to the tourism industry and the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation. Recently the Minister responsible for tourism referred to the 21.8 million visitor nights as proof of increased tourism. During the recent school holidays, I had four days off and took my family to the coast. As I am a humble back-bencher, I do not own a holiday home, so I stayed in rented accommodation. I will probably show up on the Minister's figures as a tourist and visitor. Recently, I was also invited to the coast to meet some of the owners and managers of units there. I now have a clearer picture of the tourism industry on the coast. The Government waxes long about high occupancy rates. Because of very keen competition, most owners and managers are very reluctant to disclose occupancy rates. Therefore, it is difficult to get an accurate picture. From what the Government says, one would think that half of the population of Tokyo was sitting on the beach at Surfers Paradise. In actual fact, very few of the accommodation houses on the Coast cater for the Japanese. They are just not equipped to cater for their needs—24-hour service, and so on. Quality Inns have set the running, and I congratulate them on five years of hard work that is finally paying off.

Last week I was pleased to note that the Federal Labor Government made a grant of \$500,000 to train people for the hospitality industry on the Gold Coast. 238 people will spend six weeks training at a TAFE college and 48 weeks on-the-job training. With

the new hotels opening, those trained people should have no trouble in obtaining employment.

As I said, competition is very keen. I know for a fact that in years gone by owners and managers would turn all the lights on in the building to give the illusion that the building was fully occupied. That was a very smart marketing trick. However, all that has changed. Under the stewardship of the honourable member for Albert, the Minister for Mines and Energy (Mr I. J. Gibbs), the custodians of the building are flat out affording the cost of using the security lights. Electricity tariffs are certainly not helping the tourism industry.

Two subjects dominate the conversation on the Gold Coast—the Gold Coast casino, Jupiters, and attendant poker machine row, and the standover tactics of the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation, in particular its contract with regard to the Sunlover holidays. As I understand the position, the contract was sent to the accommodation owners and managers, giving them only a few days in which to study it and return it. Many operators just signed and returned the contract without realising its implications.

One of the gripes is the requirement of the owners to transfer to the corporation a minimum of three units for them to market with the Sunlover holidays. Paragraph 3 of the contract prevents the accommodation owner from offering anyone a lower tariff than that quoted to the QTTC. This restricts the owner or manager from offering reduced tariffs to groups.

Another outrageous condition is that if the QTTC overbooks its three units, the accommodation owner—I repeat the accommodation owner—is required, at his expense, to find alternative accommodation for the people overbooked by the QTTC. Is it any wonder that a significant number of the high-quality apartment buildings pulled out of the Sunlover program and refused to put their buildings into the hands of the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation? That is a disadvantage to the general public. It limits their freedom of choice. When people book through the QTTC, they do not get the wider selection of accommodation that is on offer.

Another major bone of contention is the compulsion to join the Visitors Bureau. Everyone knows that they are little empires—people seeking kingdoms. The fee is \$200, plus \$10 per unit with a minimum of 20 units. In theory, the idea is fine to promote the whole region; but it is not working out that way.

The Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation has said that to participate in the Sunlover program the accommodation owner must be a member of the Visitors Bureau from April next. One owner put to me that he, along with numerous other owners, is not overly impressed with the tourist promotion of the Gold Coast by both the QTTC and the Visitors Bureau. He felt that it was time the Coast moved away from the tits-and-bums promotion to something a bit more sophisticated. What was appropriate in the time of the late Sir Bruce Small is not necessarily right for 1985.

Another rip-off of the QTTC is the fee of \$200 charged to the accommodation owners to appear in the Sunlover brochure. In the QTTC brochure, the accommodation appears five to a page, and soon will be three to a page. In the airways brochure, for which there is no charge to the owner, each apartment block occupies a full page, and there are three photographs of the individual apartments and a full scale of charges. I invite honourable members to compare the two brochures. One would like to see something like this advertising one's units, with one page containing three photos, tariffs and so on. What exposure is provided by the Sunlover Holidays brochure? Five accommodation places are contained on each page. Which would be the most attractive to the owner? Certainly not Sunlover.

It is high time that the Minister for Tourism, National Parks, Sport and The Arts (Mr McKechnie) took a long, hard look at the QTTC. I realise that he is not master in his own house. He is in a similar position to Mr Hinze when Sir Edward Lyons was chairman of the Totalisator Administration Board. Just as Sir Edward had a direct line

to the Premier and Treasurer, so does Sir Frank Moore. The Minister is just the office boy.

After listening to tourist people at the coast, I suggest that the Minister leave the rural delights of Stanthorpe and listen to people at the coast who are promoting the tourist industry. They are not particularly impressed by the QTTC ivory tower, with its three board rooms, fine china and crystal. Those who are doing the real work of promoting the tourist industry are too hard headed to be duchessed by the QTTC.

I echo the opinion expressed in the Federal Treasury paper on the two-airline agreement. In my opinion, the sooner the agreement is scrapped, the better. As it was so forcefully put to me at the coast, if it were not for East-West Airlines Ltd, the big two would be even bigger bush-rangers than they are now. In many apartment blocks, New Zealand tourists make up 60 per cent of the occupants. A strong case could be made for direct flights from Auckland and Christchurch to Coolangatta. I realise that Qantas and Air New Zealand are not keen on another international point of entry. If they are not interested, perhaps other airlines should be approached to provide the service.

The Premier's attitude to poker machines is well known, but it is pertinent to make a few observations. It was very interesting to hear Sir Robert Sparkes on the ABC on Wednesday, 16 October, on the subject of poker machines. His voice seemed very tired—and who would wonder, after all the strife the Government has been in of late? Sir Roderick Proctor has also spoken on the subject. As is well known, Sir Roderick is a leading Queensland businessman, National Party guru and head of Jupiters casino. He is entitled to be listened to. He has expressed the fear that, if Mr Wran were to license a couple of casinos at Tweed Heads, Jupiters would be in financial trouble without poker machines. Jupiters is not designed to cater for the average constituent, although doubtless it will have novelty value for a while.

I am sure that Sir Roderick was thinking of the Twin Towns Services Club and Seagulls as casino sites. Both of those clubs are suitably designed. The inclusion of casino facilities would not require a great deal of time. Imagine the uproar if Mr Wran allowed them to have casino licences. There would be howls of outrage, such as, "How dare those dreadful socialists down south upstage the good puritan State of Queensland!"

At some time in the near future, Jupiters will have to install poker machines. Often, clubs on the Gold Coast have complained about the amount of Queensland money that pours into New South Wales clubs. My own experience is a case in point. Each year, the executive of my branch organises approximately three bus trips to the poker machines, either at Terranora or the Tweed Heads Golf Club. I emphasise that the people who go on these trips are all ordinary people going out for a good night. They do not have to put on a monkey suit to gain admission. On one trip, in a brief survey, I estimated that the 50 people on board contributed \$2,437 to the New South Wales economy. I emphasise that amount.

People save for those outings. The surroundings are excellent, the food is cheap and the entertainment is first class. On our last trip, the entertainers were Bill and Boyd. Usually a ticket to such a show would cost quite a few dollars. At the golf club, admission was free. Naturally, everybody had an enjoyable time. They are all ready to go again.

It would be interesting to count the number of buses each Saturday afternoon heading along the Pacific Highway for the Tweed. I am sure that they would out-Armada the Spanish Armada. It would be safe to say that the Pacific Highway on Saturday afternoon should be known as the "Pokie Armada". How long is the haemorrhage of Queensland money to continue? If one bus-load can contribute over \$2,000 to the New South Wales economy, the mind boggles at how much money goes to New South Wales in a week, bearing in mind that buses travel there each day.

I would have thought that the honourable members for Southport and Surfers Paradise would be concerned about it, but there is deadly silence from them. Perhaps each of them is quietly hoping to enjoy the smell of ministerial leather when Mr Hinze

retires. I would have thought that both would be pushing for poker machines. I suggest that they talk to the members of the bowls clubs and the RSL clubs at Southport and Surfers Paradise.

In conclusion, I offer Trans Australia Airlines a revenue-raising idea. Because a small portion—the south-western corner—of its terminal building at Coolangatta Airport is situated in New South Wales, it should consider providing a small bar and poker machines in it. I am sure that that would prove to be very popular with passengers who are waiting to board flights.

Mr SIMPSON (Coorooora) (3.15 p.m.): It is for a number of reasons that I support with pleasure the Appropriation Bill. Firstly, I point out that a Government has the right to expend funds only with the approval of Parliament. In the light of that, it is interesting to note that certain media organisations have recently been reviewing events that occurred at about this time in a past year, and that the stories about Whitlam and Kerr have reappeared. They tell about the way in which the Governor-General pulled Whitlam into gear and in effect told him that he could not spend without approval by Parliament of the appropriation. It was Whitlam's intention to expend funds without the authority of Parliament, and his flouting of the Westminster system of responsible government could not be tolerated.

People sometimes forget that the Governor-General is the keeper of the rules and protector of the people against unlawful acts such as those that were embarked on by Mr Whitlam. It should also be remembered that the Governor-General did not have the final say, however; the people of Australia did. The Governor-General dissolved both Houses of Parliament and in effect sent the matter back to the people for determination at the polls. The people of Australia made it abundantly clear that the behaviour of Whitlam in misusing his authority and his intention to spend funds without the authority of Parliament were not acceptable. The purpose of an Appropriation Bill, such as the one which is presently before the House, is to give authority to spending.

The management of this State is second to none. Queensland has been shown to be the State with the lowest level of taxation on a per capita basis. However, more and more, articles that are published by independent sources show that this country's reputation for financial management at the Federal level has been condemned. It should be remembered that the financial policies of the Federal Government have an influence on the capacity of this State to provide services, and so forth. In terms of the value on the international market of the Australian dollar, Australia has been condemned by impartial organisations. It would not matter how much rhetoric Federal politicians indulge in or how much the Labor Opposition in this State tried to refute that claim; there would be no way in the world that the Australian Labor Party could fool the hard-headed business people who believe that the management expertise displayed by the Australian Government under Mr Hawke has been a disaster that has resulted in a loss of confidence in the Australian dollar in international rates of exchange. In terms of equating it with the American dollar, the Australian dollar is also losing value when compared with the other countries that also are members of the International Monetary Fund.

That is a factor of importance for the State of Queensland, because it affects the economy and Queensland's capacity to trade at an international level. For the benefit of honourable members present and those who would report this debate, I point out that the productivity, too, of this State is second to none in the Commonwealth. There is an important reason for that—the positive attitude of the Queensland State Government towards people who play a part in production.

It concerns me a great deal that members of the Australian Labor Party and the Liberal Party claim that there should be equality in votes, because the same criterion is not used in taxation. When it comes to taxation, members of those parties are prepared to tax one person twice as much as another. Another person might be taxed three times as much, and so on. That is hardly fair treatment of individuals. In the end result, productivity will be discouraged, and thus the ability of the nation to create wealth will

be diminished. If wealth is not created, there can be no distribution of money to those in need.

An article in the financial section of *The Weekend Australian* of 2-3 November related to the unions building a disaster in this country and, of course, in this State by demanding such high wages. Only yesterday, a Federal decision was handed down that reflected a sweetheart agreement between the Federal Government and the Australian Council of Trade Unions. The ACTU told the Federal Government that it had to agree to a full flow-on of the increase in the Consumer Price Index. That will add further to Australia's inflation rate, which is already two to three times the inflation rate of its competitors. It will lead to a fall in our devaluation relative to other nations, and in terms of interest——

Mr Vaughan: A fall in our devaluation?

Mr SIMPSON: A fall in the value of the Australian dollar.

Mr Vaughan: That's better.

Mr SIMPSON: I thank the honourable member. I am glad that he agrees that that is the case and that the problem has been caused by his colleagues in Canberra.

The fall in the value of the Australian dollar has caused an increase in interest rates. Increased interest rates add to the cost of the capital required to put small businesses and companies on the road. Small business require capital to expand existing businesses, increase productivity and create employment, which are desperately needed in this country. Interest rates in Australia are now running at three or four times the average interest rates in other countries in the Western World. That is a disgrace, and is something that should make Federal and State Labor Party members hang their heads in shame. Increases in interest charges flow through the economy and affect other costs, including those in the transport and building industries.

The unions have affected the economy of this country not only through the ACTU and its dominance over the Federal Government but also in the work-place through insistence on additional conditions on site, which have added to costs. Recently, a conference of consulting engineers from throughout Australia was held at Noosa in my electorate. That conference was told that it was now necessary for consulting engineers to have a union ticket to be able to supervise engineering works on building sites. That shows the stupidity——

Mr Vaughan: Which union?

Mr SIMPSON: It does not matter which union.

Mr Vaughan: I am asking you which union.

Mr SIMPSON: I do not know, but I will find out.

Mr I. J. Gibbs: Gallagher's.

Mr SIMPSON: Thank you. It was the building workers union.

Mr Vaughan: That is a fabrication.

Mr SIMPSON: The honourable member says that that is a fabrication, but that is the sort of deceit one hears from the Labor Party, from the Builders Labourers Federation and from those outlaws, such as Gallagher, who stand over people. Opposition members think that it is all right for unions to act like that and impose additional costs on the building industry. They also think, and this is worse, that they have the right to mislead the public into thinking that that does not happen.

Mr I. J. Gibbs: They are also doing it to the landscapers and nurserymen when they come in the gate. They are not allowed in unless they join the building workers union.

Mr SIMPSON: That is a shocking situation.

The same thing happens to florists who want to load cut flowers on aircraft. Even though they are owner-operators driving their own trucks, they are told that, if they do not have a ticket, they cannot unload their flowers.

Mr Campbell: What is wrong with that?

Mr SIMPSON: Everthing is wrong with it. Here we have an Opposition member who dares to claim that there is absolutely nothing wrong in adding to the costs of industry. The national wage increase that was granted yesterday will push up inflation and interest rates; it will cost jobs. That is what is wrong. Unfortunately, an ignorant Opposition member is deliberately trying to mislead people into thinking that there is nothing wrong in people losing jobs.

There is not only the social impact on young people who lose jobs but also the loss of productivity. More and more, other countries are leaving Australia behind. Yet people such as Kerin have the audacity to claim that the great sugar industry should be deregulated. Kerin wants to reduce the production of sugar in this State to the point at which a majority of the sugar produced is consumed in Australia. It will mean that more than half of the cane-farmers in this State must cease production. It will also mean that single mills, such as the Moreton mill in Nambour and the mill at Beenleigh, must close. Kerin's deceit is to call that deregulation. That deceit is infiltrating into the Labor Party in Queensland.

The sort of deregulation for which Kerin is asking will result in more than half the cane-farmers in this State leaving the industry. The Queensland Government cannot tolerate that, because that is not what the cane-farmers and the great sugar industry want. The Queensland Government has supported the sugar industry with carry-on funds. It has poured many millions of dollars into the industry. Recently, it provided another \$20m for the industry to carry on, perhaps until Kerin's promises are honoured.

Kerin said, "There is no money in the Federal Budget for the sugar industry." That needs to be underlined. That is what he means by deregulation. He has said, "Unless you do it my way, you won't get any money." That is not acceptable to this great Australian industry.

The Federal Government has received more than \$1,000m in excise and in taxes collected from workers in the sugar industry, cane-farmers and sugar-mills. It should assist the sugar industry in the same way as it has assisted the car industry and the steel industry. That is what is required, but the Federal Government will not do that. Kerin has the idea that deregulation will result in more than half the cane-farmers in this State leaving the industry. That is not on.

Keating is doing the same thing in reducing the costs that people can legitimately claim in producing their income. I refer to certain fringe benefits. Suddenly, people, including power-station workers, school teachers and other people in Government departments, will sit down and work out how it will affect them. They are the people who must consider what the tax on fringe benefits will do to their incomes.

The tourist industry and the restaurant industry, which have a high labour content, will be affected by the new tax package. The new tax will have a devastating effect on the Noosa shire, which is in my electorate, because it has more than 50 restaurants.

Mr McElligott: Is that too many?

Mr SIMPSON: In a free enterprise system, competition is permitted and businesses find their own level and produce effective performance, as has been the case in Noosa. Unless an athlete is allowed to run, how can it be determined whether he will be a champion? The Labor Party would control everything to such an extent that no-one would be allowed to compete.

I turn now to discuss the party political discrimination against Queensland, which has come about because Queenslanders do not vote in the way in which the Federal Labor Government thinks that they should. Although the Medicare tax is applied uniformly across Australia at 1 per cent, it is not distributed uniformly among the States. Under the Medicare agreement, South Australia receives three times as much as Queensland, and Victoria and New South Wales receive twice as much as Queensland. The Federal Government, having admitted that the distribution of the moneys is wrong, told the Queensland Government to argue its case before the Grants Commission to see whether Queensland could get some of its money back. The Queensland Government, locked out of that forum, approached the Grants Commission, which said that, because the people of Queensland are the lowest taxed in Australia, Queensland's allocation would be reduced, not increased.

Mr Vaughan: That is the Grants Commission?

Mr SIMPSON: Yes. Queenslanders are the lowest taxed per capita in Australia. For example, no fuel tax applies in this State. I point out to honourable members that in parts of Victoria, which is only a small State, petrol is as much as 65c a litre. Queenslanders also do not pay an institutions tax. Because the Government does not collect enough by way of taxes, the Grants Commission said that it would not listen to its claims that Queensland is short-changed under the Medicare arrangements, but decided to take more money from the State.

It all comes back to a common denominator: the envy of people who would be thrifty and productive. That is the socialist ethic—put down those who perform. Queensland and Queenslanders are performing, and it is opportune that today this Assembly appropriates and gives authority to the Government to borrow and to carry on its good work and good management. It is leading the way in Australia. Most importantly, the correct procedures, not the procedures followed by the Whitlam Government, have been followed. Thank God for Sir John Kerr, who made Whitlam face the people. The people decided that the Governor-General was correct and that Whitlam was not to break the rules of Parliament.

It is with pleasure that I support the Appropriation Bill before the House.

Mr McELLIGOTT (Townsville) (3.34 p.m.): It is always interesting to follow the honourable member for Cooroora and try to sort out his garbled logic, and I will attempt to go through some of the points that I understood him to make.

The difference between the honourable member's approach to Government assistance to the sugar industry and Government assistance in other directions seems very strange to me. I am sure that honourable members on both sides of the House would understand that the sugar industry is the most regulated industry in this nation. It is regulated for very good reasons. The present proposals to deregulate the industry—I suggest that the National Party's basic political philosophy would be to argue for that—would be disastrous.

Mr Simpson: No, it is Kerin who wants to deregulate the industry.

Mr McELLIGOTT: No, Mr Kerin does not propose the deregulation of the industry.

Mr Simpson: Yes, he does.

Mr McELLIGOTT: If he has done that, why would the member for Cooroora and his National Party colleagues, who are supposed to belong to a free enterprise party, reject that proposition? They are the ones who continually support the concepts of free enterprise, free marketing and competition. Why will they not permit it to take place in the sugar industry? They know that the regulations that apply to the industry, which were introduced by a State Labor Government, are necessary for the industry's continuation. National Party members know that. What they are showing to the people of Queensland, particularly the cane-growers, is that the National Party does not have a

long-term policy for the industry. Where have they come out and said what they would do to assist the sugar industry in the long term?

What the member for Cooroora (Mr Simpson) is saying to Mr Kerin and the Commonwealth Government is, "You make all the decisions. You put up 100 per cent of the financial assistance to the industry. We will sit back and criticise you." That is what National Party members are doing. I ask them to sit down at the table and say what they will do for the industry. They should enter into the negotiations.

I wish to mention the furphy put forward by the member for Surfers Paradise (Mr Borbidge) in regard to the Commonwealth Government's taxation proposals concerning the so-called businessman's lunch. The point that needs to be clearly stated and understood is that the Commonwealth Government is not saying that from now on nobody can take a business associate to lunch; what it is saying is that, if businessmen choose to do that, they cannot expect the ordinary tax-payers of this country to subsidise the cost of the meal, which is what has been happening.

Members on both sides of the House know that businessmen have been making a welter of this tax haven. That is one of the reasons why the Cooroora electorate has approximately 50 restaurants. People knew that, while this taxation advantage was available on business lunches, they could have a very nice lunch each day and claim the cost of the lunch as a tax deduction.

What needs to be understood is that for every dollar that is allowed as a business expense, and therefore as a taxation deduction, the ordinary tax-payers have to foot the bill. The fellow who is working on a building site and who takes his lunch to work in a brown-paper bag has to find that extra dollar. He is the one who is subsidising the cost of those free lunches.

I agree with the comments of my colleague the member for Nudgee (Mr Vaughan) that the restaurant industry has made a welter of this lurk. I have no doubt that the cost of food and wine at restaurants has been substantially increased because the restaurateurs knew that business houses were paying the bills and claiming them as a tax deduction.

I know people in the industry who realise that if they bring their prices back to a reasonable figure, to the level at which they should have always been, they will continue to receive luncheon patronage not only from the business community but also from the general community. The member for Cooroora is totally incorrect if he is seeking to blame the Federal taxation proposals for any reduction in the number of restaurants in any area. The good restaurants—the ones that are charging reasonable prices—will continue to attract customers, who will include business people seeking to have luncheon discussions with business associates.

A number of comments have been made about the 3.8 per cent national wage increase that was announced recently. I never cease to be amazed at the way business-leaders and industry groups try to suggest that such increases are a threat to their profitability. The argument about which comes first—price increases or wage increases—has been going on for many, many years. In recent times, by virtue of the fact that wage levels have been pegged, the nation has had the opportunity to assess the spiralling increases. Nobody can tell me that commodity prices and State charges have not continued to increase at levels comparable to those in the worst years of the 1970s. As Dr Jim Cairns, I think it was, once said, what has clearly been established is that inflation starts in the supermarkets. Any housewife knows the way in which commodity prices in supermarkets have continued to increase, some of them by extraordinary amounts. However, for a long period, wages have been virtually pegged. It has been clearly established that the wage increase that has been granted is justified. The courts have determined that that is so. It only represents wage justice for the ordinary working people of this country.

I turn to health-related issues. In particular, I refer to an article in *The Courier-Mail* about hospitals. This morning, I made reference to that article in a question to

the Minister for Health (Mr Austin). As is typical of him, he sought to denigrate the author of the article rather than address himself to the points that the author was making. In my opinion, the article is worthy of consideration. However, I accept the Minister's assertion that it does not necessarily relate to the total Queensland situation.

The article seemed to be saying that the Government has become obsessed with the establishment of hospitals. Certainly, in recent times, the Government has given priority to the provision of additional hospital beds. I am inclined to agree with the Minister, and I must be honest and say that, offhand, I cannot think of any new works in Queensland hospitals that I would not support or that I would suggest should be closed down. However, I do share with the author of that article a feeling that some decisions are being made without adequate planning or, if they are based on sound planning considerations, that the basis on which the decisions are made is certainly not being made known to the public.

Redlands is the most recent and obvious example. It is a fact, as stated, that no Budget allocation was made for either the construction or operation of a hospital. Yet, when a by-election became necessary at very short notice, suddenly the funds were available to establish a 40-bed hospital in that area.

The most glaring example of a lack of planning in my electorate is the decision, prior to the last State election, to construct a 60-bed hospital at Kirwan, which has not yet been staffed and opened. Grave doubts about the success of that hospital are being raised by people such as general hospital consultants, who ought to know. The specialists who provide services to Townsville General Hospital are now saying that that hospital is ill conceived and simply will not work. Those specialists are not prepared to be a part of it. I agree with what the specialists are saying—and this argument will apply also in regard to Redlands—that is, that the hospital simply will not attract the right sort of staff. For example, medical superintendents are only likely to go to a hospital of that type in anticipation of establishing themselves in private practice or perhaps using it as a stepping-stone to some future appointment. It is hard to imagine a small hospital being an attractive proposition to the people needed.

Mr De Lacy: Would you say that there is some pretty poor planning in the whole hospital system?

Mr McELLIGOTT: I would suggest that there is. As I said before the honourable member for Cairns entered the Chamber, if planning is involved, it certainly has not been explained to the people of Queensland, and the decisions that are being made appear to be ad hoc decisions.

Mr Littleproud: A minute ago, you said you agreed with all the planning.

Mr McELLIGOTT: No. What I did say was that I cannot think of a particular construction that I would suggest should not proceed. However, the explanations for these decisions are not always made known to the people of Queensland.

Having accepted that what has been done to date can possibly be justified, I sound a note of warning about another point that the author of that article makes, that is, that Governments all over the world are becoming more concerned and are placing more priority on what is known as primary care rather than on institutional care. Governments are concerned about community health and preventive health, with the aim of improving the health standards of communities, rather than providing hospital beds for people who become sick. If that occurred in Australia—and, in my opinion, we are moving in that direction—it may well be that Queensland already has too many beds. The additional hospital beds, which the Minister says are the Government's provision for the future, may well turn out to be unnecessary. It is essential that such a debate be made public and that the health professionals who are working in the field be consulted.

The Minister referred to my question this morning as a Dorothy Dixier. I personally felt that it was a point of view that had to be drawn from the Minister, but he did not

address himself to my question. I asked how it could be asserted that there was an ever-increasing need to provide beds for future demands when organisations such as the Blue Nurses, Meals on Wheels and community health services, which are under-funded, provide the preventive health service that I mentioned earlier. For example, the Blue Nurses presently work a 9-to-5 day, Monday to Friday. They do a remarkable job. The emphasis is given to the treatment of aged people in their homes. However, they are without any support services at all over the week-end and, during the week, between 5 o'clock in the evening and 9 o'clock the next morning. The Blue Nurses argue that they could provide the additional services if Governments would make available the funds necessary. There appears to me to be a conflict of planning and objectives on the part of the Government. The matter should not be dismissed lightly. It needs to be addressed seriously and quickly.

Another organisation that I mentioned today is the Brisbane Women's Health Centre, which the Minister suggested had been let down by the Federal Government. What he did not say was that the centre was established with funds provided by the Commonwealth under its Community Employment Program, which, as is well known, is a 12-month program designed for job creation. Under the Medicare agreement, the continuation of the service provided by the centre is clearly the responsibility of the State Government. The Minister is entitled to decide not to provide follow-up funding, but I raise the matter in commenting on the change in attitude by Governments around the world towards preventive medicine rather than curative medicine. It seems to me that Queensland is not addressing that matter thoroughly.

The next matter that I raise has been brought to my notice by a constituent who has complained about the necessity for warnings on fish care products. She wrote to me about a product known as Multi Cure, which is manufactured and distributed by Aquarium Pharmaceuticals of Fortitude Valley, Brisbane. The bottle in which the chemical is sold contains no warning. She kept it adjacent to the fish tank. Her 11-month-old son swallowed some of the contents. Because there were no warnings on the bottle, she had not hidden it away in the cupboard that contained other toxic substances.

Not only are there no warnings on the bottle; the quantities of the various ingredients are not listed. When her son was admitted to hospital, the doctors had great difficulty in determining a cure. Thanks to the help and the quick attention of the doctors, her child has suffered no ill effects. She believes—and I support her contention—that products such as Multi Cure, which contains dangerous substances, ought to be clearly labelled. They should also contain reference to all of the chemicals that are found in the medicine.

Another matter I wish to raise has been mentioned previously in this House. I refer to a fund at Eventide, Charters Towers, that, I understand, is called the patients comfort fund. I raise this matter because it has become an issue of grave concern not only to the residents of the home, but also to the specialist doctors who provide services to the home. They all feel that there is a need to construct a swimming-pool at the home for therapeutic purposes.

I understand that the Government has refused an application to have the pool constructed, and the residents are saying that the pool ought to be constructed by using the money that has accumulated in the patients comfort fund. The information I have is that the fund contains in excess of \$1m, and that expenditure from the fund is not even equal to the interest that is being earned. The residents believe that some of the moneys should be used for purposes of the kind I have mentioned.

I raise the matter today because I was very disappointed by the apparent reluctance of the Minister for Health to answer questions about his portfolio. When I asked a question about this matter, the Minister's response was simply to indicate that he could not tell me the balance in the fund. I find that extraordinary. The Minister also went on to say that to calculate the income and expenditure from the fund over each of the past few years was too big an exercise to undertake, as I requested. I find that an extraordinary admission.

The Minister also indicated that the fund was subject to Government audit; yet I can find no reference to that fund in either the Auditor-General's report or the annual report of Eventide, Charters Towers. The Minister ought to come clean on the matter. I challenge him to inspect Eventide at Charters Towers, where he will see the very poor facilities that the residents have to put up with.

I understand that the Minister for Northern Development and Aboriginal and Island Affairs (Mr Katter) visited the home during the past week. That is the first occasion upon which he has visited the home for some time, but I am hopeful that some action will be taken as a result of his visit.

The final matter I wish to raise is one that has been raised previously by me in the House. I refer to the competence and conduct of the senior ambulance bearer at Maryborough. As I indicated to the House on previous occasions, very serious allegations have been made to me. Because I undertook to do so, again I passed on the details of those allegations to the Minister for Health. The Minister has now advised me that the department has requested the Maryborough Hospitals Board to continue to keep the matter under review "with a view to further improving the situation". The Minister also mentioned in a letter to me that "it again became apparent that the background to the complaints related to staff dissension".

I suggest to honourable members today that the staff dissension referred to is the result of the alleged conduct that has been mentioned, rather than the other way around. A full inquiry should be conducted so that the rights or wrongs of the allegations can be sorted out once and for all. I find it incredible that a Minister should be prepared to allow such a situation to continue.

Of course, counter-allegations have been made. The honourable member for Maryborough has suggested that the problems are all due to the fault of another bearer. That may or may not be the case, but the matter ought to be sorted out once and for all. When I referred to this matter previously, I mentioned that a number of specific allegations had been made against the senior ambulance bearer. I have provided the Minister with names of persons who claim to have witnessed particular indiscretions committed by the senior ambulance bearer; yet I understand that none of those persons has been questioned in an attempt to find out the facts.

Despite the airing given to the matter, and despite the attention paid to it by the media, the Minister has made no meaningful decisions that would resolve the problems.

Mr MENZEL (Mulgrave) (3.55 p.m.): On the last occasion on which I addressed this Chamber, I spoke of secret meetings held between cane-growers and sugar-milling representatives at which plans to deregulate the sugar industry were discussed. I spoke about 10 faceless men who attended those meetings organised by CSR Limited. I now intend to reveal a little of the history of the two high-ranking CSR men who organised those meetings, and show that it was no accident that they were involved.

Honourable members have heard a good deal about funding for the sugar industry, and I believe it is important that this matter be brought to the notice of the House.

Mr De Lacy: I think Turner was one of those faceless men, you know.

Mr MENZEL: I did not say that the honourable member for Cairns was one of them, but it would not surprise me.

I say here and now that there is a very strong inference to be drawn that the Labor Government in Canberra knew in advance that the clandestine meetings were to take place.

Those meetings fitted in very well with the present Kerin plan to deregulate the industry and demolish the destiny of cane-growers. I say that because Kerin and the big proprietary millers are working hand in glove to bring about the deregulation of the sugar industry. What a mockery of the so-called Labor Party principle of battling for the battler. Kerin is working hand in glove with the capitalists—the big milling companies.

Kerin has embarked on a campaign to get rid of the battlers—the little people, the family farmers.

Members might ask how the campaign was set in train. Some members might recall that the then head of CSR (Mr Vernon) advised Prime Minister Menzies that unsuitable farmers should “be forced to leave their farms”. The then Country Party pressured Menzies to reject that Nazi-like advice. What happened when the Labor Party under Hawke gained power in Canberra? Apart from increasing the price of fuel, what was Hawke’s first administrative act as Prime Minister? He appointed Gordon Jackson, the head of CSR, as one of his advisors. What did Gordon Jackson tell Hawke about the sugar industry? One can only guess, but one could come up with a pretty shrewd idea if one follows the actions of the top CSR men thereafter. One can guess that Jackson told Hawke to deregulate the sugar industry.

That would have been the same advice that the chairman of the Industries Assistance Commission inquiry gave to the Commonwealth Government. Members should not be surprised to learn that the chairman of that IAC inquiry held 2 026 shares in CSR. They should not be surprised that Kerin, like Hawke, is a champion of deregulation of the sugar industry. I have with me a document from Kerin that proves that.

Members should not be surprised to learn that CSR sent its three top men to Queensland to disseminate propaganda to brainwash growers. They were John Noble, Mark Hertzberg and Peter Frawley, who are all well known in the sugar industry. As I said previously, Hertzberg and Frawley set up the secret meetings. Hertzberg, who was almost due to retire, undertook his final duty for CSR. He attended the annual conference of the Queensland Cane Growers Council and attempted to brainwash growers into accepting deregulation. Is it not a remarkable coincidence that Hertzberg, one of the CSR men who set up the secret meetings, was invited by the hierarchy of the Queensland Cane Growers Council—I presume it was Belcher and others—to attend the annual conference to brainwash the grower delegates? He was invited, by the same council hierarchy who now deny that the secret meeting took place, to brainwash the conference.

Let me now look at the career of Peter Frawley, the other CSR officer who set up the secret meetings. Following the meetings, at least four of the 10 faceless men were taken on an overseas jaunt to study the deregulation of the sugar industry. It will come as no surprise that one of the four men was the chairman of the Queensland Cane Growers Council (Mr Fred Soper).

Mr De Lacy: Who can the Government listen to if it can’t listen to the Queensland Cane Growers Council?

Mr MENZEL: I guess that listening to Fred Soper would not be much different from listening to the honourable member for Cairns. Fred Soper is already a frequent traveller overseas—at cane-growers’ expense—on some pretext or other. Recently, he was overseas. Like Gough Whitlam, a former Prime Minister, Soper is now back visiting Australia.

Let us look at the itinerary of the study tour of the faceless men. They went to Japan, where they were met and indoctrinated by Kelman, Campbell and Munday—all high officials of the CSR company. They went to Washington, where they were met and further indoctrinated by Barnard, Duncan, Purcell and Andrews—all attorneys from two Washington law firms that have long been retained by CSR. They went to London, where they were taken to be instructed by Czarnikow, long-time sugar-brokers who sell sugar on behalf of CSR.

When those on the so-called study tour, or junket, returned to Australia, a 283-page report was prepared, outlining the trip. The report was totally slanted to deregulating the sugar industry. Its title was, *Report by Steering Committee on Overseas Visit*. It is known to growers as the “Steered Committee”.

Heading the list of signatures to that report is the signature of Fred Soper. Nowhere does the signature of the real author of the report appear. That report was written by

Peter Frawley of the CSR. Where is Peter Frawley today? Once the purpose of the secret meetings had succeeded, once the purpose of the overseas study report had come to fruition, and once the industry was embarked on a review, where do we find CSR's Peter Frawley? He was taken from the CSR by the Commonwealth Labor Government and given a top-flight job. He was made chairman of the Meat and Livestock Corporation. He was given his reward by Hawke and Kerin, the allies of the big millers, for a job well done.

Let us look at John Noble, another top CSR man, who set up the industry review. On 28 October 1983, four months before the industry review began, Noble, in a written document, stated that growers would be relocated off their farms elsewhere and settled in the Burdekin, where CSR dominates the milling scene. In fact, I understand that CSR is thinking of dismantling the Pleystowe mill in Mackay and reassembling it in the Burdekin. Noble stated that "contractual arrangements between growers and millers would become more flexible". That is what is stated in the Savage report and what Kerin, Hawke and the big milling companies want.

Noble said that "the assignment system would change or disappear entirely", and that "I would not be surprised if peaks fail to rise much higher than the present levels. They may not even continue to exist." Four months before the review began, Noble spelt out what the ultimate findings would be. Those findings coincide with the report of the Industries Assistance Commission and the stated philosophy of Kerin and the Bureau of Agricultural Economics. He is either a remarkable man or he was privy to Commonwealth Government intentions.

The CSR company has actively lobbied politicians to agree to deregulation and abolish the security of the assignment system and the Central Sugar Cane Prices Board. Kerin and Dawkins stated, in the *National Farmer* of 2 October, that the EEC Common Market agricultural policy of subsidy was the No. 1 problem faced by Australian primary producers. I do not think that anyone disputes that. Following that, in a radio talk, Kerin claimed that the sugar industry was one of the most efficient in the world. Yet, on the other hand, he is saying, "Deregulate and become more efficient." Why does he want the sugar industry to deregulate if it is so efficient? He does so because it is what the big millers want him to do. They are running in harness together.

After I spoke in this Chamber about the conspiracy in the sugar industry, Ron Belcher, a participant in the conspiracy, was busily telexing cane-growers' executives, demanding that I be denounced. However, the fact is that Belcher should be sacked for selling out the growers' interest in favour of the big milling companies. The proof was presented to Parliament, and it still stands. I have received hundreds of telephone calls, letters and telegrams from growers all over Queensland, including growers in Mackay and Maryborough, supporting my actions.

I will table a telex from the Mackay cane-growers executive, which tries to blackmail members of Parliament to dissociate themselves from me. The telex reads in part—

"The Mackay District Cane Growers' Executive today called on local members of Parliament to disassociate themselves from the allegations of the member for Mulgrave, Max Menzel.

Yesterday Mr Menzel reportedly attacked the Queensland Cane Growers' Council and its staff, accusing it of selling out growers interests in respect to possible deregulation of the sugar industry."

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Randell): Order! I remind the honourable member that Appropriation Bill (No. 2) is under debate, and I ask him to relate his speech in some way to that Bill.

Mr MENZEL: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. I will finish quoting from the telex, and get back to the Bill. The telex reads further—

"The Acting Chairman of the Mackay District Cane Growers' Executive, Mr Jim Pedersen said Mr Menzel's remarks were not only untrue but were a disgraceful attempt by him to smear the council and its staff, to no good purpose."

Much has been said about deregulation, but Governments must put money into the sugar industry. The Queensland Government has done the right thing and increased the delivery price by \$20 a tonne—which will cost over \$3m of tax-payers' money—to build up the No. 1 Pool from \$150 to \$170 for the delivery price. That will mean, on average, about \$1.50 a tonne, which will go to the growers immediately. That is a positive measure. There is no need to deregulate the sugar industry. It is a matter of giving the growers a bit of extra cash and carry-on finance that will help to tide them over this difficult time.

I call upon the Government to set up a royal commission to unmask the deceits and deceptions practised by high-ranking members of the Queensland Cane Growers Council.

I turn now to discuss the long-awaited document from Kerin, which purports to show that deregulation of the sugar industry can save \$146m annually. Kerin talks about putting money into the sugar industry. In actual fact, he is simply blackmailing the industry by threatening that if it does not agree to deregulation, the Federal Government will not provide any money. The plan is to dismantle the primary producers of Australia.

This document is supposed to be a serious study undertaken for Kerin by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics in Canberra. The truth is that it has no substance, and it does not provide any proof that savings can be made. More importantly, it is not even a new document.

I know that the Queensland Government has had many discussions with the Federal Government and has been pressured to agree to deregulation before funds will be provided. The State Government has been asked to contribute one third to lift the overall price, but that is simply blackmail. It is unacceptable to the industry and to the Queensland Cane Growers Council.

This document is a shonky rehash of a study undertaken by John Cairns, a BAE white ant imported onto the staff of the Queensland Cane Growers Council. His salary is paid by the BAE. The same John Cairns launched the document on 20 August 1985 in Townsville at a meeting attended by members of the cane-growers council and members of the cane-growers executives throughout Queensland. Like his mentor Kerin, all Mr Cairns had, when questioned, was an impractical theory coupled with unbounded arrogance. He did not have the facts, he did not have proof, and he did not have answers to practical questions asked by practical people.

Mr De Lacy: I would like to get you on a public platform to see who knows the story properly.

Mr MENZEL: He would have no trouble answering the member for Cairns. He might find it would be a little different if I was there.

All he had was a vicious theory—Kerin's industry restructuring. Before any Government will contribute any money, it demands that the industry be restructured. The proposals that Kerin is putting to Queensland, which are supposedly based on savings available to the industry, are completely unfounded and are based on the theories of Canberra academics and the Federal Government. If their theories were used in the running of their own businesses, they would go broke.

Mr De Lacy: where did the Savage report get its story from? That was basically a Queensland group.

Mr MENZEL: I would say that those people made their report on the basis of information supplied by the friends of the Federal Labor Government, CSR and the Bundaberg Sugar Co. Ltd.

Mr Kerin maintains that areas in which savings would be available are on-farm costs and increased farm sizes. The Labor Government is saying, "Get big or get out." That is what is in this blue document. Kerin also recommends the abolition of the Central Sugar Cane Prices Board. Is that board the reason for the low prices? It certainly

is not, as Mr Kerin has previously admitted. The low prices have been caused by overproduction by the European Economic Community, which is dumping its product on the rest of the world.

Mr Cairns claims that the transferability of assignments would save money and that, therefore, Governments need not continue to provide tax-payers' money to the industry. He believes that, within three years, if the industry is deregulated, if the board is abolished, if in the first year no more than 5 per cent of assignments are allowed to move out of a mill area, and if the industry is then gradually opened up, the Government will not have to spend money in the future to prop up the industry. As everyone knows, that is a lot of nonsense. There is no doubt that Greg Ferguson from the Queensland Cane Growers Council and Ron Belcher have been pushing that idea to help the millers. The secret meetings that Belcher and Soper attended worked this out months ago.

The Federal Government has set a price level that will get rid of 25 per cent of the industry. Those people are being forced out by the Labor Government in Canberra. As expected, Kerin's proposals present no means of cost savings to the industry. The industry is the most efficient in the world. Kerin is using blackmail tactics. He demands deregulation before he will give tax-payers' money. That will force hundreds of cane-growers off their farms and onto the scrap-heap. Bob Hawke is trying to curry favour with big business in Sydney and Melbourne. By deregulating the industry, he is trying to make out that he leads a free enterprise Government.

For a couple of reasons, I am against the deregulation of the airline industry. For the safety of passengers, the two-airline policy has worked fairly well. Overall, the nation is provided with a fairly good service. The abolition of the two-airline agreement will mean fewer services in remote areas. Perhaps that is what some people are after. Because the abolition of the agreement will mean keener competition, less money will be available for aircraft maintenance. That will have an adverse effect on aircraft safety, which is not good.

Unfortunately, the Labor Party wants to show that it can deregulate an industry in Queensland—the sugar industry—which has existed during successive Federal and Queensland Governments for 60 years. The Labor Government believes that it can use deregulation as its platform for free enterprise at the next election. The cane-farmers of Queensland are having their economic futures jeopardised to satisfy the future of the Canberra Labor Government in the city electorates.

My understanding is that a submission put to Cabinet by the Minister for Primary Industries (Mr Turner) contained comments about deregulation that were contrary to the policy of the Queensland Cane Growers Council and that were agreed to by Ron Belcher and Fred Soper at a number of meetings last week. If that is true, Soper and Belcher have once again misled the Queensland Government. I hope that sooner or later the Queensland Government will wake up to the fact that it is being misled by the hierarchy of the Queensland Cane Growers Council. A few members of that council have a particular interest.

As I said, a few weeks ago in Townsville the Queensland Cane Growers Council, which consists of 30 members, voted 29 to 1 not to deregulate the assignment system and accept peak entitlements. The only person who voted against it was Roy Deicke's brother-in-law, Kelso Greenwood, of Proserpine. I suppose that he has to think about his family sugar company. However, I feel that Mr Greenwood would be better off representing the growers who elected him in Proserpine and looking after their interests.

I have also a press release telex from Ron Belcher in which he admits that meetings did take place. I will table it. He says that those meetings were informal. I do not know whether the meetings were formal or informal; however, the fact is that he is admitting that the meetings took place. I am reliably informed that those meetings have never been reported to the Queensland Cane Growers Council. Therefore, the meetings were secret until I found out about them.

I have a copy of the Kerin plan on deregulation. The Queensland Government is being asked to contribute money to the No. 1 Pool. Mr Kerin believes that it is a condition that Queensland tax-payers must contribute. He says nothing about the delivery price. I thought I heard an Opposition member say that Mr Kerin does not really want to deregulate too much.

Year 1 cane-farmers are to be licensed. Cane farm peaks will be allocated as entitlements, to be negotiated within a mill area. The cane price formula is to be retained, with freedom to move either side via negotiation at local board level. That is contradictory. The same sentence in the plan talks about the formula being retained and moving either way. In other words, the first-year protection that growers have had, an in-built formula of the value of a tonne of cane based on the price for the No. 1 Pool and the c.c.s. of that cane, will be thrown out the door as it was 60 years ago.

The plan mentions a chairman, one grower and one miller on local cane prices boards. Of course, local cane prices boards comprising two growers, two millers and the clerk of the court are already in existence. I do not know why the Federal Government wants to change that.

It is also suggested that the Central Sugar Cane Prices Board, with its powers, be abolished. It is clear that that is what Kerin is saying.

Kerin talks about mill rationalisation in the second year. That probably is not a bad idea up to a point. If it is necessary, fair enough. It is suggested also that no more than 5 per cent per annum be moved freely into other areas unless the mill closes. Kerin talks about transferring peak entitlements into different mill areas. Larger amounts would have to be approved by the local board. I believe that that would be unworkable. Would it be that the first 5 per cent can move without any approval and that after that a grower, if he was not quick off the mark, would have to go to the other growers, who, if they wanted to transfer their peak entitlement or sell it outside the area, would have to get the approval of the local board? That seems ludicrous.

I do not know who drew up the plan, but those are the conditions that the Commonwealth is insisting on before it will provide money to the Queensland Government.

Year 3 is open slather. There will be no central board, no regulation and people can do as they please. It is contradictory. Mr Kerin, who is a very smooth operator, tries to say nicely, "Well, look, we might not want total deregulation." I do not know what regulation will be left if he has his way with this document. There would be nothing worthy of regulation. It is my understanding that regulation is part of the platform of the Labor Party, and I hope that its members support it.

Mr De Lacy: It is, too.

Mr MENZEL: That is good. Opposition members should see that their Canberra friends get back on the track. The Federal Government is obviously espousing some big-business and capitalist philosophy and is supporting the milling companies. Doubtless, it would be of advantage to milling companies if they could gobble up everyone else, but it would be a bad thing for Queensland. The small towns up and down the coast would die.

The Federal Government attempted to deregulate the dairying industry. However, the dairy-farmers stood up to the Federal Government, using every avenue available to them, including the assistance of the Australian Democrats in the Senate, to block the Kerin dairying plan. As a result of his plan, within three years Australia would have been importing dairy products. That appears to be the pattern of the Labor Party in Canberra. It seems to be content to go along with the academics and abolish our primary industries, which have been the backbone of Australia. The Australian economy progressed on primary industry, which is still making a very important contribution to the economy. If the sugar industry, the dairying industry and every other primary industry were demolished, there would not be much of an Australia.

Certainly, primary industries have their ups and downs. From time to time, Governments are called upon for hand-outs, usually in the form of loans. The Queensland Government has supported the sugar industry more than has the Commonwealth Government. It is a matter of tiding the industries over their difficult times. All primary industries are subject to cyclical patterns. The beef and wool industries were in a terrible state. People involved in them believed that there would never be an improvement; that they were finished. Certainly, a great number of producers went to the wall. Fortunately, conditions improved and those who are still producing are faring reasonably. It is now the sugar industry's turn. Dairying is starting a slide, too. I ask the Queensland Government to keep a close watch on the position. Obviously, the Canberra Government is quite prepared to dismantle the dairying industry. Primary producers, in general, strongly support the National Party; so the Government in Canberra probably thinks that dealing with primary producers harshly is a good way of abolishing the National Party.

Mr De Lacy: What about Nixon and Sinclair? They haven't done much for the farmers.

Mr MENZEL: They did much more than Hawke and Kerin have done. Hawke and Kerin promised an underwriting scheme for the sugar industry. Just prior to the March 1983 Federal election, when Labor was swept into power, Kerin promised in Cairns an underwriting scheme for the sugar industry. That was reported in *The Cairns Post*. I have tabled it and referred to it on a number of occasions.

Mr Campbell: He said that he would sympathetically look at it.

Mr MENZEL: He has not been very sympathetic, has he?

People are going down the drain. Millers and growers are in an extremely tight financial position, but he has not shown them much sympathy. He continually says that he will place a submission asking for money before Cabinet. He must be rather un influential.

Mr De Lacy: He has said that there is \$150m. He is not putting that to Cabinet. That is agreed.

Mr MENZEL: Hawke and Kerin will look at it, they say. First they said that they would guarantee \$220 a tonne for No. 1 Pool sugar.

Mr De Lacy: \$230.

Mr MENZEL: Kerin at first agreed with the Savage report. He is on record as saying that the Commonwealth would support \$220. Every fool and his dog knows that world prices will reach \$220 without Government assistance. Under extreme pressure, Kerin agreed to \$230. The industry says that \$240 is the bare minimum. I agree. Many people will not survive even at that level. Before the last Federal election, the figure of \$240 was spoken of; so today the price ought to be much higher.

Mr Kerin has been neither sympathetic nor influential in Cabinet. He is continually defeated in Cabinet. I suspect that Kerin deliberately allows himself to be defeated. He tries to make a nice guy of himself by saying that he will put it to Cabinet. He is always proposing something, but his proposals are continually defeated. I do not think that Mr Kerin is doing much good for the cane-growers, who are becoming sick and tired of the Commonwealth Government's trying to blackmail them. The Federal Government knows that the cane-growers will not accept the proposal because, if they did, it would be the end of the sugar industry. Despite that, the Federal Government is deliberately advocating deregulation, because it does not intend providing any financial assistance. Deregulation is only a trick that is being used to try to stop financial assistance being given to the industry.

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

Time expired.

Mr CAMPBELL (Bundaberg) (4.25 p.m.): My contribution to the debate on the Appropriation Bill will concentrate on three aspects—the Forestry Development Fund, which has an allocation of \$28,802,883, the Rural Adjustment Fund and the Rural Reconstruction Fund, which have a combined allocation of close to \$32m, and the Water Resources Construction Fund, which has an allocation of \$81,841,002.

During the course of my speech, I will outline what could be classic episodes of *Yes, Minister*. They indicate ministerial incompetence, pork-barrelling by the Premier and Treasurer, economic mismanagement and Government incompetence. By examining the Appropriation Bill, I believe that I can demonstrate that there is a lack of confidence in the ability of this Government to manage the State's economy. I suggest that a loss of confidence in the Government's ability to handle the economy is the most serious charge that can be laid against a Government. The three episodes that would be appropriate for *Yes, Minister* could be titled, "The Premier's Dam", "The \$20m Hoax" (or "The Way the Premier Treats Cane-Growers as Fools") and, "The Expensive Pine Tree". Those episodes would show the incompetence, the dim-wittedness, and the uneducated mismanagement by the Government of this State's resources.

Before I turn to those three aspects, I wish to examine the comments made by several Government members. The honourable member for Surfers Paradise (Mr Borbidge) produced a comparison of State taxes. I believe that he conveniently forgot that the other States impose State taxes whereas the Queensland Government disguises its taxes as excessively high State charges. In instances such as electricity charges and compulsory third-part insurance premiums, the State Government is able to disguise its taxes.

Government members do not take into consideration who has to pay the taxes or charges imposed. The Government has demonstrated a common element among Governments by imposing taxes and charges on those who have the least ability to pay. Time and time again, it is the pensioner and the ordinary house-holder who pays the high charges for the benefit of the influential National Party supporters who are then able to waste their money or hoard it in capital investment. I believe that one of the important facts that is evident can be found in the stamp duty concessions made to certain property-owners. I instance the case of a person, such as the Premier and Treasurer, who owns a farm worth approximately \$3m to \$4m. Such a person can transfer to his children or to his grandchildren the whole of that property for \$50. In contrast, if the ordinary house-holder or pensioner wished to transfer a house to his children or grandchildren, it would cost him at least \$600 and up to \$1,200. That indicates the excessive charges that ordinary people have to put up with in this State.

I now turn to some of the comments made by the honourable member for Mulgrave (Mr Menzel), and I ask those questions: Why is it that, over 28 years, the Queensland Government has allowed CSR to build up an overt and excessive influence on the operations of the sugar industry? Why has the Queensland Cabinet become an ally of the big milling organisations at the expense and inconvenience of cane-growers? In other words, why has the Queensland Government sold out cane-growers over the past two and a-half decades?

I wish to turn my attention now to the "The Premier's Dam". I believe that it is very important to point out this total waste of Queensland's finances and public revenue. I have a copy of a report on the Barker-Barambah Irrigation Project. The report was completed in December 1979. It is interesting that the report shows that, for over a decade, moves have been made to have a dam built in the electorate of the Premier and Treasurer. So the public servants went in and said, "Well, if the Premier wants a dam, let's give him one. We will give him either one on Barker Creek, one on Barambah Creek or two little ones, or even three."

The dam was constructed to keep the Premier happy. The problem is that it is the tax-payers of this State who have to pay for that type of pork-barrelling. I am a very strong supporter of irrigation and water storage investment, but I am appalled that such

a decision was made by a National Party Cabinet with the help of the Liberals, who are supposed to be top people.

This 1979 report stated—

“The analyses suggest that in economic terms the project can only be considered as marginal.”

In other words, in economic terms, the project was a very risky proposition. The suggestion was that it should not be proceeded with.

On page 1-8 the report states again that the project can “only be considered to be marginal”. Similar statements are made right through the whole report.

To digress, Mr Deputy Speaker, I notice that, according to the clock, I am to be given only 20 minutes in which to speak, whereas the member for Mulgrave (Mr Menzel) was given 30 minutes. I would like to know why.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Randell): Order! I inform the honourable member that I made a mistake. I will allow the honourable member his full allotted time.

Mr CAMPBELL: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker.

A site known as 1.3 km on Barker Creek was selected. The report states—

“The rock is extensively faulted, leakage-prone limestone lenses are present. . .”

The report also states that the project is uneconomic and that the selection of the site was causing a problem.

When it was decided in 1980 that the Premier's dam would be built, the cost was estimated to be \$17.6m. All of a sudden that estimate has fallen apart because of the problem with the siting of the dam. It is a leaky dam, and that will increase construction costs by many millions of dollars. Although in 1979 it was estimated that the dam would cost \$17m, in this year's State Capital Works Program the estimate has increased to \$42m. A dam that was a marginal economic project at a cost of \$17m in 1979 is now estimated to cost \$40m, and that cost will be borne by the pensioners of Bundaberg and all the other pensioners throughout Queensland. That is Cabinet mismanagement that the Treasury has to put up with. Cabinet Ministers must accept responsibility for deciding to build a leaky dam for the Premier.

I have here a report presented to the Water Resources Commission in March 1983 by Peter James, an engineering geologist. It relates to karsticity on the Barker Creek 1.3 km dam site. It was presented three years after the hasty decision was made to build the dam and waste tax-payers' money. The conclusions state—

“Karsticity at the site appears to be related to the present drainage system and should therefore attenuate with depth.

Methods of treating leakage beneath the dam will be influenced by the findings of further boreholes and shafts on the left abutment.

Reservoir leakage appears feasible and a detailed geological mapping of the 'Carboniferous belt' is required as a first step in assessing the problem.”

The report also refers to—

“. . . the potential leakage problems . . .

Leakage under the dam

Leakage from the reservoir.”

That is the Premier's leaking dam.

Under the heading “Dam leakage”, the report states—

“. . . general solution could take the form of a slightly deeper than normal cut-off in the limestone; cleaning out and plugging with concrete exposed sink holes, at least to depths greater than their planned dimensions; reliance on a major grouting programme; and some blanketing of upstream areas, where limestone is exposed.”

Under the heading "Reservoir leakage", the report states—

"It could be anticipated, however, that a solution to reservoir leakage is not likely to be found in clay blanketing of the reservoir. . . grouting of the whole of this zone would not be beyond consideration."

In other words, the major problem is exposed. The report also states—

"The problem of reservoir leakage is perhaps the one which could most seriously affect the viability of the project. Therefore, it would be useful to have much of the regional mapping completed prior to the other investigations planned for the right bank area."

I raise this issue because it shows the incompetence of the people who occupy the Treasury benches. We can ill afford that \$42m.

In his 1983-84 report, the Queensland Commissioner of Water Resources, when referring to the Barker-Barambah Irrigation Project, that is, the Bjelke-Petersen dam, stated—

"These investigations have confirmed that a dam can be built at the site and that the need for extra foundation materials will increase the cost."

That is how the report can disguise and cover up a serious problem.

I lay the charge that, in order to pork-barrel one electorate, the Government has been prepared to waste tax-payers' money. Although that dam has a very famous name, it will have to be paid for over many years. It is money that Queensland tax-payers can ill afford to pay.

The second of the *Yes, Minister* episodes refers to the \$20m that the Premier and Treasurer said will be made available to cane-growers. That money has not been provided by the State Government. To date, the State Government has not requested any money from the Commonwealth Government. In the Budget speech, it was stated that the Commonwealth Government would be requested to pay \$10m. The Commonwealth Government has not received any application for that money. In other words, that \$20m was nothing more than a public relations hoax. When the Government makes statements such as that, only one thing can happen: the Government will lose the confidence of the cane-growing industry. I believe that it has lost that confidence.

The Queensland Government says that it does not have the money for the 6 000 cane-farmers. It refuses to negotiate. It was marvellous that the Government was able to pull \$17m out of thin air for the Redlands by-election. As I said, it has nothing for the sugar industry. To date, the Government has provided \$57m for the Greenvale Nickel company, and it is committed to providing more funds until 1995.

Mr De Lacy: If Mr Sciacca wins the by-election, I think that the Government will make that \$17m available to the sugar industry.

Mr CAMPBELL: The Government could do that. The Nationals cannot be trusted.

The Government has provided \$18m to the Queensland Cement and Lime company. In addition, the Government said that it can provide the funds for the \$300m gas pipeline. How can it find money for those projects when there is no money for the sugar industry?

I said that the Queensland Government was going to provide at least \$10m for the sugar industry under this \$20m hoax. Let us see whether \$20m is being made available to cane-growers. I look at the Budget and at the Rural Adjustment Fund, for which \$27.8m is being made available. Nowhere within that fund can \$20m be found for assistance to cane-growers. That expenditure cannot be manipulated to provide \$20m.

Out of a total of \$27.8m, \$500,000 goes to salaries, \$500,000 to rent of offices, travelling expenses and incidentals, another \$5.8m covers repayments to the State and Commonwealth, another \$2.2m is provided for bovine tuberculosis and brucellosis eradication campaigns, and \$150,000 goes to interest and redemption under the subsidy

scheme. The sum of \$20m cannot be found within that fund. The Premier lied when, in introducing the Budget, he said that \$20m was available, because it cannot be found within these funds. The industry can make the charge that the allocation is a hoax.

Under the Rural Adjustment Fund, \$8m has been allocated for other forms of adjustment, \$3.3m for carry-on finance for the sugar industry and \$7.2m for the interest subsidy scheme. That does not add up to \$20m; it is a lot less. In addition, if all that money is given to cane-farmers, what are other needy farmers to receive? This reveals that the Government, through its Budget, has lied. More importantly, it has treated cane-growers as fools. No-one in this place can deny that charge.

The public relations hoax perpetrated by the Government has gone further. In the document entitled *Facts About Sugar*, it was said that \$15m was provided in 1983-84. That was revealed in a document released under the signature of the Minister for Primary Industries (Mr Turner) and the Premier; yet, in his Budget speech, the Premier declared that only \$10m was provided. The Government hopes to get away with its shameful lies.

It is regrettable that the National Party lackeys in the cane-growing industry are prepared to accept what the Government says. I ask honourable members to consider where the sugar industry has ended up after 26 years of mismanagement. In 1980, when the Queensland Government sold out the cane-growers in its changes to the Sugar Acquisition Act by making growers pay for sugar quality research that was carried out at mills, Sir Joseph McAvoy made a prediction about the future of the industry. Under the changes to the Act, the Government took money from the cane-growers that had already been spent.

I turn now to what I call "The Expensive Pine Tree". One of the Queensland Government's largest loan expenditures has been in the Forestry Development Fund. In the Budget and in this Appropriation Bill, \$28m has been provided for that fund. In actual fact, so far, the Government has poured \$281m into developing the State's forest resources. That expenditure has been exceeded only by the railways, with \$680m, subsidies to local bodies at \$560m, and water supply and irrigation at \$343m. The State is making a major capital input into forestry, and I do not believe that the money is being spent effectively. In fact, it is another sign of this Government's mismanagement. Queensland has the greatest resources in all of Australia, but those resources are being wasted.

Let us have a look at what is happening to the \$281m already expended and the \$28m to be spent this year. Most of it has been spent on pine forests in south-east Queensland. That money is being used to grow pine trees.

An interesting fact is that while the Government is prepared to put \$28m a year into pine forests, APM Forests Pty Ltd has sold 7 000 ha of land on which there are 4 000 ha of mature forests. If it is such a great investment and if the State has such great, competent managers on the Treasury benches, why is free enterprise selling its mature forests and letting the Queensland Government grow pine trees?

Mr De Lacy: It is selling them as real estate.

Mr CAMPBELL: Yes, it is selling land as real estate. APM knows that no-one in the timber industry will complain about the planting of more pine trees. All that means to the industry is that, in the future, it will get cheaper and cheaper timber.

Mr De Lacy: In the meantime, north Queensland is 120 million cubic feet short. The Government is planting timber in south Queensland when it should be planting it in the north.

Mr CAMPBELL: That is a major aspect of the mismanagement of the Treasury's resources. The Government has not appreciated that although north Queensland has a shortage, it is planting in south Queensland, and planting species that are not wanted.

Three major proposals have been made for paper/pulp mills. The Government is still growing timber for those proposals, but there is nowhere to sell that timber. That

is the problem. The State cannot afford to continue putting dollar after dollar into the establishment of forests without getting some return.

Honourable members may ask: What return is the State getting? This year the State will put in \$28m. Last year it was more than \$20m. The overall debt is \$281m. When will the State get a return for its money? I wish to quote from the document entitled *Departmental Services and Programs: A Budget Perspective 1985-86*. Under the heading "Plantation Forests", it states—

"Yield from established plantations including both thinnings and final crop material amounted to 242,086 cubic metres of milling timber plus an additional 82,194 cubic metres of pulpwood material valued at \$6 million."

That is the return the State is getting. What kind of investment is it that yields a \$6m return for an investment this year of \$28m, particularly when \$280m has already been spent?

A great need exists for the expenditure of money on the State's timber resources, but it is for fine cabinet timbers—silky oak, black bean and yellow wood. Those beautiful timbers that are native to Queensland should be developed, but they are being forgotten. In fact, New Zealand is undertaking to grow some of those species of this State's cabinet timbers. Last year, the State was able to harvest less of that timber from its own natural forests than at any other time in history. That is an example of the mismanagement of the State's forestry resources.

In my contribution today, I have outlined three basic aspects of incompetence in the Budget and in the Treasury. The first one was the expenditure on a dam known as the Bjelke-Petersen Dam—a dam that leaks. The construction of that dam was of marginal economic value. The member for Lockyer (Mr FitzGerald) and all other members would like more money to be spent on the water resources in their electorates; yet the State spends money on uneconomic, wasteful projects at the fancy of the Premier. That is the mistake that the Government is making. The State cannot afford to waste \$42m.

Mr FitzGerald: That is bunkum, and you know it.

Mr CAMPBELL: The construction of that dam was an economically marginal project that initially cost \$17.2m. Now it will cost more than \$40m.

Mr Gunn: You are a knocker.

Mr CAMPBELL: I am only knocking bad decision-making. As a member of the Opposition, it is my job to expose the Government's poor decisions, its mismanagement and its lack of competence. This is where the Queensland Government has failed. Because the Government has not been able to make the decisions, it will lose the confidence of the business people, as it has lost the confidence of the cane-growing industry. That leaky dam will cost Queensland tax-payers millions of dollars.

In the next part of my contribution, I pointed out the \$20m hoax contained in the Budget. Cane-growers were supposed to be provided with that money; but, in reply to a question in the House, the Minister for Primary Industries (Mr Turner) provided information that established that only half a million dollars is to be provided to the Rural Adjustment Fund and \$300,000 to the Rural Reconstruction Fund. That is a total of only \$800,000.

Where is the \$20m that was to be provided? It is an outright hoax, and the sugar industry should be told about it by the press. I do not know how the Government members can hold their heads up when they try to perpetrate such lies. The lies even went further. It was said that part of that \$20m would be provided by the Commonwealth Government, yet the Treasurer of this Government has not communicated the fact that the Queensland Government wants that \$10m.

Mr Gunn: We have not got anything for Expo yet. We do not get letters answered.

Mr CAMPBELL: It is interesting that the Deputy Premier and Minister Assisting the Treasurer should mention Expo. It is interesting also that this Government has not provided one dollar for Expo other than by way of loans. It has not provided one grant to Expo. It is about time that this Government started putting money in.

I turn to "The Expensive Pine Tree". I ask the Deputy Premier and Minister Assisting the Treasurer to reappraise the pine plantation program to see whether or not the Government is being over-optimistic in what it is planning to plant and what it is planning to provide in the future. Why should the Government not reappraise the provision of additional funds for Queensland's fine cabinet timbers? That would also assist the development of forestry in north Queensland. It is very important that the Government consider that. The annual reports of the Forestry Department reveal that Queensland is producing smaller quantities of fine cabinet timbers. It is important that the Government act now, because those timbers take 20 to 30 years to grow. If the Government is not prepared to consider it now, it could be too late.

Mr Innes: That debt that you referred to for the pine softwoods——

Mr CAMPBELL: \$281m, yes.

Mr Innes: Wasn't that provided under the Federal/State softwood agreement to turn marginal land into productive land?

Mr CAMPBELL: The Commonwealth has made money available to show that it has an interest in making long-term decisions for the benefit of the State.

It is interesting to note that whenever Commonwealth money is given to the State, it is misspent and mismanaged. That is the problem. It is interesting to note that the net contribution by the Commonwealth Government to the Rural Reconstruction Board has been \$49m and the net contribution by the State Government has been \$1.5m. I ask the Deputy Premier and Minister Assisting the Treasurer to deny that that was the case as at 30 June 1984. Any annual report will show that this State Government, through the Rural Reconstruction Board, has provided net contributions to the farmers of Queensland of only \$1.5m. The net contribution made by the Commonwealth Government is \$49m.

Mr Gunn: You haven't got a clue.

Mr CAMPBELL: I believe that the Deputy Premier and Minister Assisting the Treasurer has never read the Treasury reports. He does not even understand what is going on.

I have two minutes in which to raise a matter that I had not intended to raise. I refer to the Queensland Industry Development Corporation. It is time that people who represent farmers recognised the formation of the Queensland Industry Development Corporation as a great threat to the provision of finances to cane-farmers and all farmers. The corporation is proposed to absorb the functions of a number of existing bodies such as the Industries Assistance Board, the Agricultural Bank, the Rural Reconstruction Board and other financial schemes.

What I am concerned about is that, once all that money is hidden under the umbrella of the Queensland Industry Development Corporation, money that would usually be set aside for cane-farmers and other farmers will be spent by the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation on its multimillion-dollar projects.

In the last three years, the Government has taken more money out of the Rural Reconstruction Board than it has put into it. My concern is that the Government will hide that money; that funds that ought to be provided to farmers will be diverted to other industries. Why is it that the Government can provide only \$35m, most of which is Commonwealth Government money, to cane-growers, whereas it has provided \$57m to the Greenvale nickel project and \$18m to Queensland Cement and Lime? I want the Queensland Government to give money to the farmers, to whom it ought to be provided.

The Government has lost the confidence of financial advisers, cane-farmers and other primary producers and, because of that, it will not remain on the Treasury benches.

Mr STEPHAN (Gympie) (4.56 p.m.): Following that very confusing speech by the member for Bundaberg, I intend to direct my remarks to the development of Queensland. If ever there was an attempt at confusion and an inability to comprehend, we have just heard it. Never before have I heard of anyone who wanted to pay more taxes, but the member for Bundaberg and his Opposition colleagues have asked that money far in excess of that which is available be provided as grants. However, I have not heard them suggest where it should come from.

Mr De Lacy: He was only pointing out that you have claimed to be giving money when you haven't.

Mr STEPHAN: No. He was asking for money to be made available as grants. For example, he spoke about Expo and complained bitterly that private enterprise is involved in its construction. He claimed that the Government should have been making money available as grants rather than as loans. He is asking that money be spent, but he is not willing to contribute.

Our State has been developed through water conservation. The Bundaberg Irrigation Scheme has received large sums of money from the Government.

Mr Gunn: We have provided over \$70m.

Mr STEPHAN: I have not heard the honourable member for Bundaberg saying that that should not have been provided. He has not complained that it should have been spent in Gympie, Lockyer or some other electorate in the State. He referred to the Barker Creek dam. If he had known anything about dam construction at all, he would have realised the problems of development and the testing that has been conducted in that area over a long period. Experts from outside Australia have been required to overcome the problem of sealing off the limestone and the fissures to ensure that the water can be stored. The dam will be of benefit to future generations. Why shouldn't future generations pay for its use? I do not suggest that contributions should be made now for something that will be of benefit in 50 or 100 years' time.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr STEPHAN: Members of the Opposition are now asking whether it will be self-funding. Usually such projects are. At times, however, assistance must be given. One example of that is the Pie Creek diversion scheme, which is part of the Mary River scheme. It has been a virtual disaster. Not long after the diversion scheme was completed, the dairy-farmers left the area.

The Leader of the Opposition made a similar contribution to his contribution in the debate of the Appropriation Bill (No. 1). In that debate, he contradicted himself to an even greater extent than he did today, for, within 10 minutes of his pointing out that the State was broke, he said, "Make no mistake about it; the State has plenty of money." Today he made much the same claim. He said that the Government has not spent \$59m, I think it was.

Mr Gunn: \$100m.

Mr STEPHAN: \$100m, was it? In that case, the amount has grown somewhat. I realise that the honourable member's ability to understand economics is not great and that he becomes confused. Government members feel sorry for members of the Opposition because of their inability to comprehend and realise what is going on in this State.

I wish to review the development of the State and the growth that has taken place over the last 12 months or longer. I am pleased to say that the rate of unemployment in Queensland continues to fall. In September 1985, figures released by the Australian Bureau of Statistics confirmed a declining trend in the unemployment rate in Queensland, which demonstrates the continuing generation of job opportunities in this State. The

statistics showed that the rate of unemployment had dropped for the seventh consecutive month to 8.8 per cent, after having peaked at 11.3 per cent. Although an unemployment rate of 11.3 per cent indicates a large unemployment problem, that figure relates to February of this year and things have improved since then.

Over the past 12 months, 41 900 new jobs have been created in Queensland, which represents a growth rate of 4.1 per cent. That is a considerably better rate of growth in employment opportunities than the nominal rate of 3.2 per cent for the same period in the other States of the Commonwealth. The statistics show that 1 068 000 Queenslanders were engaged in employment during September, and that was an all-time record level of employment in this State.

The labour force statistics for Queensland show that, without doubt, the employment-generating policies of the State Government are working. That makes a mockery out of the claims made by the Leader of the Opposition that the Government's Special Major Capital Works Program is a sham. The Special Major Capital Works Program was announced in the September 1984 Budget. The lead time required to establish the projects would take the benefits to be derived in terms of employment well into the 1985-86 financial year. It is clear that State Government initiatives and the confidence placed in the Government by private enterprise organisations in the Queensland economy have pegged back unemployment.

The State Government has also undertaken new initiatives to generate employment opportunities by the establishment of 30 new positions in the Department of Employment and Industrial Affairs so that the recommendations of the task force on employment can be carried out. The sum of \$2m has been provided in the State Budget for employment initiatives, and that sum includes an amount to cover the recommendations of the task force. The recommendations are designed to expand the present Youth Employment Program to other age groups and to provincial cities, and are also designed to assist in implementing the traineeship program in provincial cities. Those programs are regarded by the Government as initiatives to increase employment of apprentices and trainees, and to promote a greater awareness in the community of the various schemes that are available.

I might add that the Youth Employment Program has been very well received in many areas throughout the State, and particularly in provincial areas. People under 25 years of age have come forward with initiatives and ideas of their own for development. Those who have the ability to work for their own benefit and the benefit of the community have been able to undertake various projects, provided that they have received some support. The idea behind the Youth Employment Program is to give financial support in cases in which it is not available through private lending authorities.

I am pleased that the program is likely to be expanded. If it is, that measure will be welcome. At present, it is proposed that a total of 10 staff will be appointed to a new employment initiatives unit to implement employment programs that are recommended by the task force. A further eight staff will administer the traineeship program that will begin next year, and 12 people will be appointed to a temporary field promotion team to further promote the employment of apprentices and trainees throughout the State.

As I mentioned previously, the unemployment rate in Queensland dropped. Queensland is the only State to bear the distinction of having created jobs. All other States have lost jobs. That aspect of the unemployment problem should not be lost sight of, and honourable members should also not lose sight of the fact that, for example, New South Wales has lost 700 jobs; Victoria has lost 9 300 jobs; South Australia has lost 11 300 jobs; Western Australia has lost 900 jobs; and Tasmania has recorded the loss of 3 000 jobs.

Mr FitzGerald: How many of the unemployed migrated to Queensland?

Mr STEPHAN: How many of the positions lost in the other States were transferred to Queensland? As I pointed out earlier, 41 900 new jobs were created in Queensland over the past 12 months, and that fact should be combined with the fact that so many

people have migrated from the so-called havens in New South Wales and Victoria. Those facts make one realise the development that is occurring in this State, and the initiative and confidence that have been engendered in Queensland.

Mr De Lacy: They are being taxed up here by your socialist Government.

Mr STEPHAN: No, they are not. A little later I will have a look at taxation in Queensland compared with the other States. I will not back away from that comment.

The Consumer Price Index also makes very interesting reading. For the 12 months ending September 1985, the CPI increased by 7 per cent in Brisbane, which was the lowest of all the Australian capitals and below the weighted average of the Australian capitals of 7.6 per cent. The following table illustrates the difference between the capitals—

Capital City	Percentage
Sydney	7.5
Melbourne	7.7
Brisbane	7
Adelaide	8.4
Perth	7.3
Hobart	8.7

Those statistics make a mockery of statements made by Opposition members about this Government's charges.

The honourable member for Cairns (Mr De Lacy) asked me a question about taxation. I stand by my claim that Queensland is a low-tax State. If taxes in Queensland were levied at the rate charged by New South Wales, Queensland would be able to gather an additional \$255m. If they were levied at the Victorian rate, an additional \$320m would be gathered, and at the South Australian rate, an additional \$160m. However, on the basis of information provided by the Commonwealth Grants Commission as part of its review of State relativities, Queensland would generate additional revenue of \$187m if it levied the levels of taxation and charges applicable in the other States. On a per capita basis, Victorians are paying \$338 a year more State tax than Queenslanders, and in New South Wales the figure is \$254 more per capita.

A number of taxes levied by the other States are not levied by the Queensland Government. For example, there is no liquor tax in Queensland. In Victoria, liquor tax is levied at a rate of \$18 per capita; in New South Wales, \$23 per capita; and in South Australia, \$22 per capita. In the area of pay-roll tax, in Queensland the average tax is \$189 a person; in Victoria, \$285; and in New South Wales, \$282. In the area of stamp duty, the average tax a person in Queensland is \$143; in Victoria, \$188; and in New South Wales, \$151. In the area of land tax, there is a big difference, with an average of \$14 a person in Queensland; in Victoria, \$42; and in New South Wales, \$49. And so the story goes on.

Queensland is a low-tax State because so many people are coming here from the southern States and bringing with them their money and initiative to assist in developing the State at an even faster rate than it is developing at present.

It should be remembered that Queensland has the lowest pay-roll tax, stamp duty and land tax of any State in Australia. Bearing in mind that the Melbourne Cup has just been run, in the area of gambling taxes—

Mr Innes: You go on and on about this, but we don't have the lowest stamp duty.

Mr STEPHAN: I suppose it depends on which figures one looks at. I am citing figures supplied by the Australian Bureau of Statistics, and they show that the comment made by the honourable member is not correct.

I will now look at another major economic indicator and relate it to the other States. I refer to dwelling unit approvals and the number of dwelling unit commencements. I point out that Queensland has only 16.1 per cent of the nation's population. That

should be kept in mind when one compares dwelling unit approvals in 1984-85. The Queensland figure was plus 3.7 per cent, New South Wales minus 8.4 per cent, and Victoria minus 0.6 per cent. In the area of total dwelling unit commencements, Queensland had roughly the same figure with plus 3.8 per cent, New South Wales minus 9.5 per cent, and Victoria plus 0.1 per cent.

Mr De Lacy interjected.

Mr STEPHAN: The honourable member does not like to hear the positive aspects of development in this State. I realise that he is becoming uneasy about the figures that I have been citing. The value of total building approvals in this State was plus 2.4 per cent, in New South Wales minus 5.1 per cent, and in Victoria minus 1 per cent.

As I have pointed out, in the jobs-created area, the figures are plus 5 per cent in Queensland, minus 13 per cent in New South Wales and plus 5 per cent in Victoria.

I now compare the Housing Commission wait-list in Queensland with those in the other States. That comparison also makes very interesting reading. The wait-list for rental houses in Queensland has been significantly reduced and has continued to drop since it reached its peak in February 1984. Between then and the end of June of this year, the wait-list for people seeking rental housing through the Queensland Housing Commission dropped by almost 18 per cent.

New South Wales, which has double the population of Queensland, has a wait-list close to seven times that of our State. South Australia, which has just over half of Queensland's population, has a wait-list four times that of Queensland. Those two States, New South Wales and South Australia, account for 66 per cent, or two-thirds, of the total wait-list in Australia. The Minister for Works and Housing (Mr Wharton) has certainly done a good job in keeping the wait-list down as low as it is. The wait-list is 58 000 in New South Wales, 23 000 in Victoria, just over 8 000 in Queensland, and a massive 35 000 in South Australia.

Motor vehicle registrations give an idea of what is happening. With the exception of South Australia, all States recorded a fall in motor vehicle registrations for September. Queensland's fall of 4.3 per cent was below the national drop of 4.6 per cent. For the 12 months ended September 1985, Queensland showed an increase of 13.7 per cent, which was the highest of all the mainland States and well above the national increase of 8.8 per cent. Motor vehicle registrations are an indication of the way in which the economy is functioning and of the confidence that the Queensland people have in their State.

One developing area that comes to mind is the construction of TAFE colleges. I commend the previous Minister for Education (Mr Gunn) and the present Minister for Education (Mr Powell) for pressing on with that important aspect of the education program. Many students who have the ability to continue on to tertiary education will find that there are not sufficient places available in tertiary colleges. Therefore, it is absolutely essential that TAFE colleges be constructed in various parts of the State as quickly as possible. A number of colleges are presently being constructed and will be opened within the next year or so. I am aware that planning is proceeding for a TAFE college in Gympie, with the idea of opening it in 1989 or 1990. That certainly will not be too soon. If ever an area needs a TAFE college, it certainly is the Gympie area.

At present, TAFE colleges are suffering through a lack of facilities and equipment. The younger people and the older folk are utilising the facilities at the TAFE colleges to further their knowledge and to make a contribution that they have not been able to make previously. That is certainly appreciated by the older folk.

This afternoon, much has been said about the sugar industry and the problems facing it. I realise that the sugar industry is passing through a tight economic period. I shall refer to the problems that the sugar industry will face if it diversifies into another industry.

The horticultural industry would face many problems if large areas of land were planted with horticultural crops. That industry relies very much on the law of supply and demand. It produces enough to meet demand and occasionally over-supplies the market. It does not take too much in the way of additional production to tip the scales so that horticultural crops are grossly over-supplied. Existing farmers have the capacity and the equipment to produce additional crops when required. It would be wrong of any industry to think that it could grow horticultural crops to make a fast dollar without causing damage to the horticultural industry.

Attempts have been made to develop more markets overseas, particularly in the Asian countries. Unfortunately, the ridiculous situation has been reached in which new markets have been created in South East Asia for fresh and chilled products but orders must be refused daily because of a lack of refrigerated air freight. In addition, industrial troubles affect the nation's ability to export its products. Recently, Sydney waterside workers refused to load some containers because of a demarcation dispute. That attitude is doing nothing for the confidence of the buyers in Australia's ability to supply products when ordered.

I disagree with the honourable member for Bundaberg (Mr Campbell) that the amount of money spent on forestry is being wasted. In the last 10 years, calls have been made for an expression of interest in the development of a pulp and paper-mill in the south-east corner of the State. Much to my disappointment, and that of others, for one reason or another the mill has failed to eventuate. However, I feel confident that the expressions of interest that have been called for in the last month by the Forestry Department will bring positive results.

The world market is entering a period of shortage of timber products, and Australians must be aware that our timber is a precious commodity that is eyed enviously by other countries. I am sure that they would like to get their hands on those very fine plantations about which the member for Bundaberg seemed to be so critical. Whether it will be in the short term or in three or four years, a pulping operation will——

Mr De Lacy: What about the fact that they are selling it off to real estate?

Mr STEPHAN: The honourable member suggests that pine plantations are being sold off for real estate. The timber on that land would be utilised; it would not be pushed down and burnt. APM Forests Pty Ltd would not be stupid enough to spend millions of dollars on developing and growing timber to burn it off. That land has been sold does not mean that APM is not buying land in other areas and is not planting on that land. APM may well establish an operation similar to its operation close to Brisbane. It must be borne in mind that land in the metropolitan area attracts very high real estate values and I am sure that, in 50 years' time, envious eyes will be looking towards other pieces of land that may be developed as timber plantations.

It gives me great pleasure to support the Government on this Appropriation Bill.

Mr De LACY (Cairns) (5.20 p.m.): It gives me great pleasure to contribute to the debate on the Appropriation Bill (No. 2). To begin with, I must comment on the speech of the member for Gympie (Mr Stephan). I never cease to be amazed at how Government back-benchers, when they are defending the Queensland economy, keep quoting statistics. It seems that there is no end to the way in which they can rework statistics until they come up with something that sounds good. The old story about lies, damned lies and statistics seems to apply. What Government members do is start off with the conclusion they want to reach and then look for statistics that will substantiate that conclusion.

A Government Member: You are recycling your last speech.

Mr De LACY: I am not recycling any speech.

No amount of reworking of statistics will hide the fact that the Queensland economy has been dragging the chain in the national recovery that has taken place in this country in the last couple of years.

When the member for Mulgrave (Mr Menzel) spoke about the sugar industry, he carried on with his particular line of attacking the leadership of the Queensland Cane Growers Council. He has now taken to task the general secretary (Mr Belcher) towards whom he seems to have a great deal of animosity, the chairman (Mr Soper) and, today, he has added another to his hit-list, that is, the deputy chairman (Mr Kelso Greenwood). It is coincidental that the member for Mulgrave is now in the chair as Deputy Speaker, and I put it to you, Mr Deputy Speaker, that, in the same breath, you attacked the Federal Government for not taking notice of what the Queensland Cane Growers Council said and then you attacked all of the important office-bearers in the Queensland Cane Growers Council. You cannot have it both ways. You cannot blame the Federal Government for not listening to the council and attack the office-bearers of that council.

Today, I wish to speak about the sugar industry and the mess in which it finds itself. The Queensland National Party Government has forfeited any right it may have had to negotiate with the Federal Government, or with anyone else for that matter, on behalf of the sugar industry. The provision of aid to the ailing sugar industry has been characterised by division, deceit and incompetence. The Minister for Primary Industries (Mr Turner) continually speaks about having the runs on the board. If these are all the runs that he has on the board, he is heading for an innings defeat.

It is a year since the industry first asked the Government for assistance and aid, and no progress at all has been made.

Mr Alison: Yes, but the Federal Government wanted the 100-day report, didn't it?

Mr De LACY: If the State Government had carried out the review which it promised to carry out in 1982, perhaps the Federal Government would not have had to ask for the 100-day report, which I will come to in a minute. I will explain to the honourable member for Maryborough just whose 100-day report it is.

Mr McElligott: You will have to use simple language.

Mr De LACY: If the honourable member for Maryborough is to understand it, I will have to do that.

After 12 months of toing and froing and hassling, there is no agreed position, no consensus and no policy on any issue at all, whether it be on restructuring, deregulation, production control, level of price support or anything else. The growers and the millers are a million miles apart. I guess they always have been and always will be. No industry position exists. The growers are fighting among themselves, and that was highlighted in the speech this afternoon by the member for Mulgrave. Obviously he spoke on behalf of the farmers in the superwet belt of the far north, that is, those in the Cairns area, and expressed the thoughts that they have in relation to the Queensland Cane Growers Council. He took to task the leaders of the industry, especially Mr Soper and some other members of the Queensland Cane Growers Council. An article from *The Cairns Post*, in part, states—

“Growers refuse to endorse statement—sugar industry dissension.”

The growers and the Queensland Government are at each other's throats. I have copies of two telexes, one from the Cairns Cane Growers Executive and the other from the Innisfail Cane Growers Executive, which bitterly attack the Queensland Minister for Primary Industries (Mr Turner). I also have an article in which the chairman of the Queensland Cane Growers Council attacks the State Government. It is headed, “State Government playing politics says Soper”. The growers are disenchanted with the State Government.

The National Party back bench is in bitter dispute with its own Government. That is substantiated by an article headed, “Joh's sugar plan a sell-out, claims NP man.” That National Party man is the honourable member for Mulgrave (Mr Menzel).

The Queensland Minister for Primary Industries (Mr Turner) was given riding instructions and shunted off to negotiate with the Federal Government. The Premier

and Treasurer was reported as saying, "I've given him his riding instructions." What sort of Minister goes to Canberra to negotiate and is not allowed to negotiate?

It seems to me that the Queensland Minister for Primary Industries does not have very many friends. He is not trusted at all by his Premier. As I have just pointed out, the National Party back bench certainly does not agree with him. If the copies of the two telexes that I have just produced are any indication, the growers themselves do not have any faith in the Minister, either. It seems that the Queensland Minister for Primary Industries has the confidence of no-one—certainly no-one involved in the growing industry or in politics. Perhaps he does have the confidence of CSR. However, I will return to that later.

The Minister did receive a bit of support from some of his ministerial colleagues. In an article in *The Sunday Mail* headed, "Ahern defends sugar stance", the Minister for Industry, Small Business and Technology (Mr Ahern) appeared to support his colleague the Minister for Primary Industries (Mr Turner). However, in the next breath another Minister, the Minister for Environment, Valuation and Administrative Services (Mr Tenni), was reported as saying that he was 100 per cent behind the growers. It is reported that he is opposed to the position paper that was produced by the Minister for Primary Industries. So the Minister for Industry, Small Business and Technology supports the Minister for Primary Industries but the Minister for Environment, Valuation and Administrative Services does not support him. It is a bit confusing.

Adding chaos to the confusion, honourable members have the spectre of a National Party official, Mr Charlie Holm, sitting in on meetings between the sugar industry organisations and the Minister for Primary Industries. I wonder which faction of the National Party Mr Charlie Holm belongs to? I wonder whether he belongs to the free enterprise, deregulation faction, which is lead and represented by the Minister for Industry, Small Business and Technology and the Premier and Treasurer—if one can believe his talk about supporting free enterprise—or to the agrarian socialist faction for which the honourable member for Mulgrave (Mr Menzel) appears to be the spokesman?

In the past three years, four inquiries—or so-called inquiries—have been conducted. A few years ago, when it amended the Sugar Acquisition Act, the Queensland Government promised an inquiry. I do not think that that inquiry was ever held. Apparently the promise of an inquiry was only a sop to disgruntled growers, as the sunset clause in that particular piece of legislation proved to be when it was repealed in 1984. In 1983, an inquiry was conducted by the Industries Assistance Commission. In 1984, a sugar industry internal review was held, and this year the 100-day working party report was compiled.

What conclusions have been arrived at as a result of all those inquiries into the sugar industry? None! All that has happened is constant wrangling, arguing, back-biting and utter confusion. And this Government talks about being strong, positive and giving a clear lead! I can see the Premier and Treasurer saying now that decisions have to be made in the interests of everyone and that those decisions must be adhered to. The sugar industry is crying out for decisions to be made, for a bit of leadership to be demonstrated. That has not been forthcoming.

Amidst all the chaos and confusion, what does the Queensland Government do? It blames the Federal Government for delaying tactics, for wanting to deregulate the industry, for not coming to the party, and for not putting up the money. The Federal Minister for Primary Industry (Mr Kerin) has said, "We have got \$150m waiting. We are prepared to give industry support to the extent of \$230 per tonne. We just want you to get your act together. Let us see if we can reach some agreement, and we will take it from there."

The State Government, which cannot agree on anything, which cannot get the industry together, which cannot make a decision on behalf of the industry, passes the buck and blames the Federal Government. What is it accusing the Federal Government of? Every Government member who speaks about the sugar industry accuses the Federal Government. Three or four of them have done so today. Really, the accusation is that

the Federal Government wishes to implement the *Sugar Industry Working Party Report*. What did the Premier say when that committee was formed? He, Turner and a delegation big enough to fill a Boeing 727 went to Canberra to negotiate with the Prime Minister and the Minister for Primary Industry. The report in *Queensland Country Life*, which was headed "High hopes for cash sugar aid", said—

"After the 2½ hour session, a relaxed Premier said while Queensland did not get the across-the-board aid it sought, the Prime Minister had undertaken to back a working committee involving both governments and the sugar industry.

'It will formulate a plan as a matter of great urgency and advise about administering it,' Sir Joh said.

'We prevailed on the Commonwealth ministers to ensure that a Queenslander chairs the new body.'

The result was a seven-member committee: two representatives of the Federal Government, two representatives of the State Government, two representatives of the Queensland sugar industry, appointed or nominated by the Queensland Government, and, "We prevailed on the Commonwealth . . . to ensure that a Queenslander chairs the new body." Therefore, five of the seven members on the 100-day committee were nominated by the Queensland Government. The Savage report, which resulted, made a series of recommendations. Now the State Government has the temerity to blame the Federal Government for wanting to implement the report.

While I have the opportunity, I say that I certainly disagree with many of the recommendations included in the report of the Savage committee. However, back-bench and ministerial members of the State Government are not in a position to attack the Federal Government for wanting to implement the recommendations of the committee. After all, the Queensland Government was happy with the committee, having nominated five of its seven members. Therefore, it is more responsible for the recommendations than is the Federal Government. It is certainly hard to win in this game.

That does not end the confusion surrounding the sugar industry's problems. Government members, in particular the Premier and Treasurer and the Minister for Primary Industries, have taken to quoting shonky statistics. The Premier speaks about the Federal Government's taking \$700m in taxes from the Queensland sugar industry each year—\$700m from an industry which returned to growers last year less than \$500m! In total, the industry last year was worth less than \$750m. Anybody who believes such a claim is just too silly for words. The Premier used Professor Harris from the James Cook University as his authority.

I issue a challenge. If the Government can substantiate 20 per cent of that figure from all sources—income tax from farmers, millers and others working in the industry, excise duty on rum, which the Minister for Primary Industries speaks about at every opportunity, sales tax on equipment, fuel tax and everything else—I will walk backwards to Bourke. I issue that challenge to Professor Harris as well. If he is prepared to put his name to such a ridiculous proposition, he is a Mickey Mouse economist, just as the Premier is a Mickey Mouse Treasurer.

On the other side of the ledger, the Government speaks about \$61m—since the Budget, I think it has jumped to \$81m—that the State Government has supposedly made available to the sugar industry to help it out of trouble. I suggest that such a suggestion is absolutely preposterous. The figure is certainly not sustainable.

Let me issue another challenge that will have the result that either Government members eat their words or I eat mine. If the Queensland Government can prove that over the three-year period since 1982 from its own sources, that is, from the Consolidated Revenue Fund, it has made available a net amount in excess of \$15m to be applied to all purposes in the sugar industry—the Government can throw in the \$2m that it gave to its National Party mate, Mr Metcalfe, and the interest subsidy that has been made available to increase the No. 1 Pool price, as well as the \$10m that has been provided to the co-operative sugar-mills—I will walk backwards to Bourke.

The money that I am talking about has to be money that has originated from Treasury and has been put into the Rural Reconstruction Fund. I emphasise that I am not talking about funds that have been paid out by the Rural Reconstruction Board to the growers, because the funds expended by the Rural Reconstruction Board have been supplied predominantly by the Commonwealth Government or have been obtained from interest and redemption payments made by the farmers themselves.

The Government is always skiting about the money that it has made available for assistance to the sugar industry, and I am asking the Government to come up with the goods. I put it to Government members that the Queensland Government has no chance of substantiating its figure of greater than \$15m; conversely, I am able to demonstrate that the Commonwealth Government has provided in excess of \$50m over the same period.

To put the Government's assistance to the sugar industry in its proper perspective, I invite all honourable members, after the Government has made its calculations, to compare Queensland Government assistance to the sugar industry with the \$57m it gave to Greenvale Nickel.

I turn now to the position paper put forward by the Minister for Primary Industries (Mr Turner) as a basis for negotiation with the Federal Minister for Primary Industry (Mr Kerin) on 25 September. That paper is the one that caused the growers to go off their brains and scream "Sell-out!" I want to know how the Minister for Primary Industries could ever have imagined that the position adopted in that paper even remotely reflected the views of growers. His plaintive cry in letters that were sent to growers throughout Queensland was—

"I was under the impression that the Position Paper . . . was a true reflection of the industry as a whole to possible deregulation. Now I find that there are still areas that need further clarification."

That is the understatement of the year. It almost brings tears to my eyes.

How could the Minister for Primary Industries be so naive or so misinformed? Is it possible that he was set up? I suggest that the Minister should have a good look over his shoulder, for Macbeth could be lurking there. Why did the honourable member for Mulgrave not advise the Minister for Primary Industries that the growers would not wear deregulation? After all, the honourable member for Mulgrave has been doing a good deal of singing on behalf of growers during the last two or three weeks. If the honourable member had spoken to growers in the far north of the State, as I do, he would have been aware—and he obviously was—that the growers would not wear the proposal. Why did he not tell the Minister for Primary Industries that the position paper was way out of line with the thinking of the average grower?

Mr Prest: Do you think that the honourable member for Mulgrave was having a little wager each way?

Mr De LACY: That is what I am leading up to. It may even be possible that he was setting up the Minister for Primary Industries.

When the Minister for Primary Industries was finally advised that the growers would not accept that proposal, it was too late. The Minister had already been impossibly compromised by the release of that position paper. Who released the position paper? How did it get to the growers on Thursday, 26 September? If it was not the honourable member for Mulgrave who released it, who was it? The position paper certainly got to the growers very quickly, and it must have come from this Parliament.

At about that time, following the unfortunate death of John Goleby, Mr Menzel prevailed upon the Babinda Mill Suppliers Committee of the Cairns cane-growers executive to send off to the Premier and Treasurer telexes that suggested that Mr Menzel would be a possible choice as a new Minister for Primary Industries. It is funny how all of this happened at the one time. The plot thickens. But, if the Minister was not set

up, if in fact he naively believed that what he was saying represented the point of view of the growers, and if it was just through ignorance——

Mrs Chapman: Why don't you wait until the member for Mulgrave leaves the chair so he can answer? You're not playing a fair game. The fellow is in the chair. You're attacking him and he can't answer you.

Mr De LACY: I realise that. I am really sorry to be in this position, and I wish that the member for Mulgrave was in his usual place. But I cannot give away my speech half-way through because the honourable member happens to be in the chair.

Mrs Chapman: You do it all the time.

Mr De LACY: That is not true. The honourable member misjudges me.

If the Minister did get into that position through naivety and ignorance, one can only conclude that he is a willing tool of CSR and the other proprietary millers. All the way along, the Minister has insisted that the sugar industry organisations come to an agreed position. That is ridiculous to start with because, on some issues, they will never agree. They are diametrically opposed, particularly on issues such as production control, the need for judicial arbitration of negotiations between mill-owners and growers, and so forth. They simply have completely different points of view, and the two groups will never sit down together and come to a compromise position. When two parties cannot agree, and will never agree, I believe that it is incumbent on the Government to meet with each of the parties and make a decision in the national interest or in the State's interest.

The Minister's pussy-footing and prevaricating means that he has abdicated his role. Not only is he pursuing the unreal and unattainable goal of a consensus between growers and millers, but also he is pursuing it through the medium of a gerrymandered court. This is an appropriate day to talk about a gerrymandered court, because the redistribution proposals were released today, and it is obvious that this Government is now presiding over the greatest gerrymander that this State has ever known. But it has been practising with the sugar industry. The gerrymander in the sugar industry, to which I have referred, is the fact that the growers own two-thirds of the crop—by tradition, by fact, by legislation, by whichever measure used—and have done for the past 70 years yet, when the Minister sits down and talks to the industry, he talks to four industry organisations, only one of which represents the growers and three of which represent the millers. So the growers, who have two-thirds of the crop, get one-quarter of the say. That is a gerrymander. The same thing can be said of this Government which, with 39 per cent of the vote, can get 60 per cent of the seats in this Parliament. The National Party has refined the art of the gerrymander to an extremely high level. But it now starts to use a gerrymander to discriminate against farmers. It is no wonder that it changed its name from "Country Party" to "National Party", because it now tends to represent the big milling organisations and not the farmers who, initially, it was given a charter or one presumes that it was given a charter to represent.

In the few minutes that I have remaining this afternoon, I want to bring up a subject that disillusioned me a little——

Mr Wharton: You are not obeying the rules. Your 20 minutes is up.

Mr De LACY: The subject relates to the Minister for Works and Housing (Mr Wharton), so I feel I have to mention it while he is in the Chamber.

Last week the Minister visited Cairns. I believe that it is common knowledge in this House—it is certainly well known round Cairns—that I have been pushing for three priority works in schools in the Cairns area. The first is a music block at the Trinity Bay High School. The second is a covered play area at the Woree State School. The third is a new tuck-shop, covered play area and walkways at the Hambleton State School. I spoke about them in this House on 27 August, before the Budget was presented. I wrote to the Minister on a number of occasions. He has always answered me civilly.

He said that it was the responsibility of the Minister for Education (Mr Powell). Ministers tend to do a good deal of buck-passing. The Minister for Works and Housing says that the priorities are decided by the Minister for Education, and vice versa. But when it gets close to Budget-time all one hears is, "We will make these decisions when the Budget is prepared." I raised this matter in the House. I wrote letters, and so did the p. and c. associations in Cairns. No mention of those three works priorities was made in the Budget, but I was still hopeful that they might be included in the normal works program. I sent another letter to the Minister. He sent a polite reply saying that they would be looked at and that priorities and other things had to be decided.

I must admit that last week—I think it was very late on Tuesday afternoon—my office received a telephone call to the effect that the Minister would be visiting a couple of schools in the Cairns electorate. That was news to me; I had certainly received no other communication. No reference was made to the schools that would be visited. Because I was out in my electorate, I did not receive the message until the next day. It seems that the Minister, almost under the cover of darkness and accompanied by the member for Mulgrave—and I regret again that, whilst I am speaking in this vein, he is sitting in the chair as Deputy Speaker—crept in at 8.30 in the morning and visited the Hambledon school. I believe that he had been organised by the local branch of the National Party to have a look at the terrible tuck-shop at that school. I can understand why the member for Mulgrave is interested in the Hambledon school. It appears that, after the redistribution, that school will be in the Mulgrave electorate.

Mr Wharton: We were on the way back from his electorate and we just called in there.

Mr De LACY: That was very nice.

It would have been courteous and the right sort of ministerial behaviour to advise the member for Cairns that the Minister was going to that school to have a look at the tuck-shop. I have often raised the matter with him. The Minister had a look at the tuck-shop and said that it was in a terrible state. The people there heard what he said. There was a report in *The Cairns Post*. I do not get my nose out of joint. All I ask the Minister to do is provide another tuck-shop, and I will forgive him for coming into my electorate in that way.

The other brief point that I make concerns the Trinity Bay High School. Again the Minister visited that school without inviting me to accompany him. Again I am not worried about that, provided that he gives the school what it needs.

Mr Neal: You are six minutes over your agreed time.

Mr De LACY: There are still four minutes on the timer.

I am pleased that the Minister announced that the Trinity Bay High School will get the new music block that for a long time, I, the p. and c. association and many others have been waiting for. I thank the Minister for that. Again, in terms of good manners and ministerial propriety, I have still not been officially advised that the Minister will do that. I have only read it in the press. I trust that I can believe what I read in the press.

In his press release, the Minister said that, as well as the provision of much needed musical facilities for the school, the music block would help overcome the present classroom shortage problems at Trinity Bay. Those words were taken from the speech that I made in Parliament, and I take that as a compliment. I take it that the Minister listens to or reads the speeches that I make. I am pleased that that much needed music block will be built at the Trinity Bay High School. The only one that the Minister missed out was the Woree school. I ask him to consider the request for another covered play area there.

Mr INNES (Sherwood) (5.48 p.m.): One of the matters that has been addressed inferentially this afternoon is the total national economic scene. It is interesting and

salutary to look at the value of Australian currency as measured by other countries. The movements in the Australian dollar in the last 12 months give some indication of the way in which the rest of the world views our situation.

In the last year, of the 43 countries that the Westpac Corporation surveys for currency movements, only against South African currency has Australian currency appreciated. It has appreciated 26 per cent against the currency of South Africa. If we look at the other 42 countries, we find that Australia is equal only with Tonga, that is, Australia has kept parity with Tonga. As I recall it, there is a relationship between the finances of Australia and Tonga. Certainly the Bank of New South Wales provides guiding facilities to the Royal Bank of Tonga.

The Australian currency has depreciated against the currency of the Solomon Islands by 0.36 per cent, China, Pakistan and Thailand by 2 per cent, Sri Lanka by 7 per cent, Indonesia by 9 per cent, Canada and Greece by 11 per cent, India and Saudi Arabia by 12 per cent, and Malaysia, Papua New Guinea (whose currency depends upon Australia's currency and Australia's annual commitment of massive sums of money), Vanuatu and Western Samoa by 13 per cent. In one year, the dollar has dropped against the USA, Kuwait and Portugal, by 14 per cent; against Brunei, Fiji, Hong Kong, the Philippines and Singapore, by 16 per cent; against Malta, by 19 per cent; against Italy and Spain, by 20 per cent; against Sweden, by 22 per cent; against Finland and Norway, by 24 per cent; against Austria, Belgium, Denmark and Japan, by 26 per cent; against the United Kingdom, France, French Pacific, Germany, Ireland, the Netherlands and Switzerland, by 27 per cent; and against New Zealand, of all places, by 28 per cent.

They were the figures in October, and they do not mirror the plummeting in trading yesterday of the dollar to 67c against the US dollar; so the figures are likely to be worse. That is an overview or a reflection of the way in which the rest of the world views and values the Australian dollar. As I say, it is a massive aggravation of the indications released this week that the rate of inflation in Australia is double that of our major trading partners. There has been a massive loss of world reputation in relation to our currency, and that has resulted in major problems concerning imports and massive problems for Australians travelling overseas.

Mr De Lacy: But a massive bonus for primary industries and exports.

Mr INNES: Hopefully, there will be a bonus——

Mr De Lacy: Tell the whole story. You have only put half of it. You are as bad as those fellows over there.

Mr INNES: I am trying to pursue my own speech. What the honourable member for Cairns has suggested has virtue, but as I understood the thesis of his speech, he was saying that, despite the favourable moves of currency, Australia still has dreadful problems in industries such as the sugar industry. Those problems are not related merely to the value of money. Over-production is looming in a variety of agricultural commodities and in base metals.

I have highlighted a set of figures to give people an insight into a cross-section of the view of the Australian dollar. Everybody quotes the US dollar, but, in a comparison with other currencies, especially those of countries that by our standards would be considered Third World, developing or impoverished countries, Australia is doing extraordinarily badly.

I will go through the national problem, which is addressed on many occasions in this place; but, firstly, I will look at the sum of money mentioned in this Appropriation Bill under debate. In the next year, the Queensland Government and its various authorities will appropriate and use in excess of \$13.5 billion. The population of this State is a little over 2.5 million persons. That means that \$5,381 per person, or \$13,072 per taxpayer, is to be appropriated for this financial year. I do not suggest that the money that will be appropriated from, among other things, the Trust and Special Funds will be raised by taxes. Some are Government charges such as coal freight rates or other rail

freight rates, or charges for services rendered by the Government. Nevertheless it is a massive indication of the vastness of the public sector over which the State Government presides. As I have mentioned in the past, despite the Government's verbal commitment to and the hype about smaller Government and lower taxes in the State, it runs a bigger public service and a bigger local government sector than the States of New South Wales and Victoria do per head of population.

If one thinks of such well-known gurus as Mr McLachlan of the National Farmers Federation, with whom primary industry people and small government people are finding a great deal of common ground, one finds that in performance this Government, the Commonwealth Government and other Governments in Australia have not really measured up in terms of reducing their level of activity to reduce the incidence of taxation and the burden that falls upon people as a consequence of governmental activity.

The Federal Government has produced a taxation package that the Liberal Party has attempted to have debated in this House. I propose to address some brief comments to that package.

Among all the debate and controversy that surrounded the introduction of the taxation package and the conduct of the alleged taxation summit, there did appear to be some common ground. The main common ground was that the so-called bracket creep—that is, the way in which the relentless general increase in wages had taken people into higher marginal rates of taxation that had not changed and that hitherto had been preserved for the very wealthy—had taken the middle-income-earner and the upper lower-income-earner into levels of taxation that were a disincentive to work and enterprise and were totally unfair and inappropriate for people in those categories.

As a result of the announcement of the taxation package by the Federal Treasurer, what does one find? Before the tax summit, in a roundabout sort of way, employers had recognised the problem of bracket creep and had introduced into very normal and ordinary work situations a level of non-taxable benefit. Many small-businessmen and many small and large businesses allowed the leading-hand, the foreman, after-hours maintenance people and others in selected positions to take a vehicle home with them, to use it to go to the dump at week-ends or occasionally for a bit of domestic transport, to top up with a bit of the firm's petrol, and perhaps to have a small expense account that did not have to be vouched for too critically and a telephone at home for call-outs which could be used for private calls. They were very modest ways in which employers recognised the predicament of pay-as-you-earn wage-earners in those middle and upper lower-income areas and gave them a few modest benefits.

Those are the very people who not only are affected by bracket creep but also will lose those benefits because of the taxation package announced by the Federal Treasurer. So the very people who were supposed to be relieved and who will not get any benefit whatsoever for 18 months—almost two years—suffer the immediate detriment of the loss of those entitlements, because employers have already shown that they cannot, and will not, bear the burden in its entirety.

At another level, the taxation package has caused fleet-owners to delay the turnover of their vehicle fleets. That will have an enormous impact on car-dealerships and car-manufacturing in this country. It will be of the order of tens of thousands of motor vehicles a year.

Sitting suspended from 6 to 7.15 p.m.

Mr INNES: Prior to the dinner recess, I was talking about the Federal Government's taxation package and its economic impact, particularly on Queensland.

The third area in which the Federal Government's tax package is having a significant impact has been well publicised by such organisations as the Restaurant-Caterers Association of Queensland. I refer to the restaurant industry and related employment.

Today, I have heard comments made by the honourable member for Townsville (Mr McElligott) which do not really reflect well upon him and show a shallowness or a political doctrinaire approach of which I do not think he was always guilty.

There is absolutely no doubt that the Federal Government's taxation package has had an enormous impact on the restaurant industry and on those service industries that depend partially upon it, such as the laundry industry in the provision of a 24-hour service of napkins and tablecloths in keeping with modern attitudes towards better quality hospitality. The impact on the provision of specialised areas of the fruit and vegetable market and the meat trade is significant. In due course, over the long haul, that will be revealed by the statistics.

I am quite satisfied that the employment impact on Queensland has resulted in the loss of not fewer than 1 000 jobs. A similar situation applies in each State. The development of the restaurant industry has been one of the very significant features of the rate at which Queensland has caught up with the rest of the world in regard to standards. If Queensland is to attract the international tourist market, or even the sophisticated or not so sophisticated interstate market, it must do what the rest of the world does and what people are used to. High standards within the restaurant industry are certainly a vital part of any holiday package.

Those standards are not insignificantly supported by the business community. One cannot simply exist on dinners and lunches. However, if a sector provides, say, one-third of a market, marginal or unprofitable businesses can be converted into profitable businesses. The lunch trade, which is the business segment of the industry, was entirely related to the credit-card-carrying business person. It is incredible to me that any member of Parliament can say that business people who attend lunches are indulging their own appetites.

Fraser said, "There is no such thing as a free lunch." That is true. I guarantee that 90 per cent of the lunches in restaurants in the towns and cities of this State are in that category. Such lunches provide the person who exercises control over an office, a workshop or a business generally, with an hour and a-half or an hour in which he can explore some other avenue of business. They provide sales representatives and people involved in service industries with an opportunity to take out a person and follow up a sale.

Mr Davis: Follow up a sale at our expense.

Mr INNES: That is not so.

Mr Davis: I will show you plenty of businessmen who take their whole families out and charge it all up.

Mr INNES: That just shows the sort of contacts that the honourable member for Brisbane Central has. I will show him 99 people who use it as a legitimate means of conducting business.

Rules could certainly have been established to require some evidence of the people who were taken to lunch. If any pattern evolved of the same person being taken to lunch once a week, of course the Taxation Commissioner could rightly make inquiries. The majority of business lunches were, without doubt, for business purposes. Claims for them as business deductions were totally justifiable. In this country, a great deal of business is done over lunch. The pettifogging, nasty, prejudiced pursuit of social differences provided the motivation for the measure. It is an absolute distortion of the truth for Mr Keating, the collector of Jacobean silver, to be snarling, "If it's good enough for the boiler-maker to have sandwiches, it is good enough for everybody else." It is a cynical use of prejudice by him and is completely contrary to the world that he lives in, as he well knows.

If a businessman from Queensland travels overseas to Taiwan, Japan or America, the people with whom he does business look after him for one, two or three days, showing him factories and doing business with him. He is made a guest for business purposes. When those hosts return his visit by travelling to Australia, what happens? Is

he supposed to tell his visitors to pick up their own tickets at a restaurant? It is ridiculous. The one-in-100 instance is being used to attack the legitimate, justifiable business expense incurred by the majority.

I turn from the effects of the taxation package to observations on matters that are very relevant to the finances of Queensland and to a debate on one of its Appropriation Bills. I refer to standards exhibited in recent times by the Government in its control of the public purse. Members of the Liberal Party object to the deliberate social engineering of the Labor Party, achieved by those policies that deliberately distribute wealth to the advantage of those who vote for it and to the disadvantage of those who do not. We object also to tactics such as compulsory unionism, forcing a worker who does not wish to join a union to give up tens of dollars annually—and the price is becoming very high. We object to the money of unionists who do not support the Labor Party being foisted forcibly into campaigns such as that for the Redlands by-election—against their will, without their approval and certainly contrary to their interests—to support a candidate from a political party other than that which they support. Members of the Liberal Party object to the misuse of other people's money. We object to the misuse of power.

By the same criterion, we must object to such misuse if it is done by Governments of our own persuasion or of an allied persuasion. The campaign in Redlands led to displays of cynical and total misuse of Government power. It is quite wrong of anybody in Government, no matter what his position—or of any Government—to say to the tax-payers—its employers—“Only if you vote for our candidate will you get the bikkies in this electorate.” My remarks apply particularly to the two-thirds of the tax-payers who do not vote for the Government. That has been said before. It had been hoped that such a tendency had died with the dam at Mount Isa.

It is absolutely and utterly wrong—certainly for any Government that pretends conservative persuasion and supports proper institutions and morality in the use of public moneys generally—to threaten voters that they will not receive a fair return of their tax payments if they do not vote for a particular political party. That should be condemned. One's voice must be raised in condemnation. It would be absolutely improper for a Government of any persuasion in the course of an election campaign to use a candidate in an allegedly Government-sponsored, Government-made five-minute television program.

Those are the tactics used by the socialists; those are the tactics used by the bully-boys in the unions. It is lamentable that parties and Governments of non-Labor persuasions resort to the tactics that are so readily condemned when attributed to Labor unionists. I hope that one will never have to say these sorts of things again, because Governments of a non-Labor persuasion are supposed to be conservative and are supposed to support institutions and reasonable morals when conducting public affairs and when using public money.

Hon. W. A. M. GUNN (Somerset—Deputy Premier and Minister Assisting the Treasurer) (7.26 p.m.), in reply: At the outset, I would like to thank honourable members who participated in this debate for their involvement. The length of the speakers' list reflects a healthy and laudable interest amongst honourable members of all parties in the financial and economic situation prevalent in this State.

I was, however, again disappointed to hear the approach adopted by the Leader of the Opposition, who, once again, tried to present a picture of doom and gloom—a picture that has, unfortunately, become typical of the response Government members have come to expect from those who sit opposite.

My concern about his speech was two-fold. Not only was the Leader of the Opposition negative, but he has also raised nothing new; rather, he has paraded out the same tired old cliches that have so often been answered in this House. There are approximately 2 500 000 people in Queensland, but the Leader of the Opposition seems to be the only person who cannot see the massive development that has taken place in the State.

For his benefit and the benefit of his followers, let me briefly recap the real position. He raised three issues: the Budget; the current economic situation here; and the State's international rating.

In regard to the Budget, the Leader of the Opposition concentrates on what he calls "services provided". I make several comments.

Firstly, there are two sides to every Budget—revenues and expenditure. The Leader of the Opposition seems to believe that expenditure can be increased without increasing taxes. This is simply not true. The Leader of the Opposition ought to ask his colleagues in Canberra about that. Under this Government, Queensland has been, and will be, a low-tax State. We pay the lowest taxes in Australia—a fact that is well realised by Queenslanders. I might add that many people acknowledge that as the reason why they migrate from the southern States to Queensland.

Secondly, this Government places great store on the provision of services in a cost-effective fashion. The Government would rather see basic services well provided than see tax-payers' funds spent on the political grandstanding that we have come to expect from Labor Governments in other States. Across the board, I have seen no evidence that the citizens of New South Wales or Victoria are better served by their Governments simply because those Governments spend more on high-profile schemes.

In Victoria, at the present time, a rail strike is in progress and the Government is unable to transport people. That is what is happening in that State, and I thank God that we do not have such a situation here. Indeed, I fear that the Leader of the Opposition has confused the basic questions of quality of service and cost and believes that there need be no relationship between the two.

Thirdly, I should again comment on the Opposition's rather curious notion that funds are somehow "spirited away" when they are transferred from the Consolidated Revenue Fund to Trust Funds. In fact, the bulk of funds transferred is put towards capital projects—towards schools, hospitals, roadworks and so forth. That happens in the electorate of the honourable member for Murrumbidgee.

Mr Kruger: Through my good representations.

Mr GUNN: One only need have regard to all the schools and roads that have been constructed and to everything that has been done by way of capital works in Murrumbidgee for proof of what I am saying. I am sure that the honourable member for Murrumbidgee does not think that he achieved anything, because he did not; and I am sure that the people know that.

I make no apology for the application of the bulk of funds to capital works. As all honourable members should well realise, it has been conscious policy of this Government for some years to divert funds from recurrent use to capital works. That policy has worked very well indeed. It resulted from restrictions placed on the State's capital funding by the Commonwealth Government. The Commonwealth Government did us in the eye, and it has been doing that for a long time. The action taken by the State Government has enabled many vital projects to proceed. I should add that this policy has resulted in the creation of many new jobs throughout the State of Queensland. In particular, it is no coincidence that the State's unemployment rate has begun to fall over recent months as the Government's \$600m Special Major Capital Works Program begins to take effect. A person would have to be blind Freddy if he walked down the street and was unable to see the buildings that are being constructed in the city of Brisbane. The same kind of construction is happening throughout the State of Queensland. Ironically enough, as I travel to cities such as Rockhampton and Townsville that have Labor mayors, I find that those mayors are very appreciative of what the State Government has done for their cities, and so they should be.

In regard to the comments of the Leader of the Opposition on the economy—he has again selectively chosen figures that appear to paint a gloomy picture. Let me repeat, however, some of the figures from the Premier's speech earlier today, because they

present a much more complete and accurate picture of this State's economic growth at present.

With 16.1 per cent of the nation's population, Queensland has provided 19.8 per cent of Australia's new employment in the year to September 1985; 18.8 per cent of the value of work done on all buildings in Australia in 1984-85; 19.8 per cent of new dwelling commencements in the same period; and 25 per cent—this is a crucial point—of Australian exports in the period July to August 1985. With only 16.1 per cent of the nation's population, Queensland now leads Australia. Queensland exports more than any other State. That gives some indication of what this Government is doing and the contribution that Queensland is making to the economy of Australia. In addition, retail sales in Queensland rose well above the national average in the 12 months to August 1985, and inflation was below the national average in the 12 months to September 1985.

Members should compare Queensland's performance with what is happening throughout Australia at present. I believe that, this morning, interest rates for business rose to 18 per cent. The Australian economic situation is becoming desperate. All that such an increase means is more unemployment and higher inflation. I believe that it was Buttrose who said this morning that he expects inflation to be 9 per cent by March next year. That is deplorable.

The Leader of the Opposition also raised the issue of the State's credit rating. I am not sure how many times this allegation needs to be put to rest. The facts are simple. I have said this time and time again. It is a story that has been told and retold. The reason Queensland does not have a rating from the Japanese Bond Research Institute is that the State has never applied for one. The Government has never felt it necessary to do so. It can get all the money it requires at a cheaper rate than that available to any other State. I regret the need to take up the time of the House on what is really repetition, but the record on all of those matters again needs to be set straight.

I thank Government members and members of the Liberal Party for acquainting the House with the latest undisputed figures published by the Australian Bureau of Statistics. They show the reasons why people continue to come to this State to make a living and to rear their families. There is no doubt that this is the State of the future. Queenslanders can look forward to the future with every confidence, based on this Government's performance over the past three decades during which this State has developed and matured into one of the most viable economies in this nation. That is due in no small way to the policies of this Government, which has been in power for such a long time.

I thank all honourable members who have contributed to the debate.

Motion (Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen) agreed to.

Committee

Clauses 1 to 5, and schedule, as read, agreed to.

Bill reported, without amendment.

Third Reading

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

LIQUOR ACT AND OTHER ACTS AMENDMENT BILL

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

“That leave be given to bring in a Bill to amend the Liquor Act 1912-1984 in certain particulars; and in connexion therewith to amend the Community Services (Aborigines) Act 1984 and the Community Services (Torres Strait) Act 1984 each in certain particulars.”

Motion agreed to.

First Reading

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

Second Reading

Hon. N. J. HARPER (Auburn—Minister for Justice and Attorney-General) (7.37 p.m.): I move—

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

This Bill makes a number of significant changes to the liquor laws of Queensland, including the establishment of two new classes of licence, one designed to cater for the requirements of casinos in this State and the other to provide for a number of public facilities which, at present, do not have available to them a type of licence precisely suited to their needs.

The first of these new licences, to be called a casino liquor licence, fulfils the State's obligation to provide such a licence pursuant to the Jupiters Casino Agreement Act and the Breakwater Island Casino Agreement Act. The Bill provides for the issue of a casino liquor licence to the holder of a casino licence issued under the authority of the Casino Control Act.

A licence will be issued by the Licensing Court, subject to the prior approval of the Governor in Council, and will entitle the licensee, his nominee or manager to sell liquor throughout the hotel-casino complex and in the casino itself during the hours and subject to the terms and conditions set out in the licence.

Provision is also made for a casino liquor licence to be regarded, with all necessary adaptations, as a licensed victualler's licence. This means that the retailing of liquor on casino premises will be regulated in much the same way as are sales from licensed hotels.

The second new class of licence, to be called a public facility licence, will provide for a limited number of large-scale developments that offer a substantial benefit to both the public and the State by attracting tourists or by providing entertainment or services for the public. At present, projects of this type, such as Kooralbyn and a number of cultural centres in provincial cities, are forced to trade under one or more of the liquor licences currently available under the Act, although none of those licences meet their unique operating requirements. A public facility licence will now be available to the operator of such a centre once the Minister has determined that it is a “public facility” as that term is defined in the Bill.

The Governor in Council must also be satisfied that the applicant for such a licence is not able to obtain any other class of licence that would be adequate or appropriate in the conduct of the facility.

A public facility licence will also entitle the holder to all the benefits and responsibilities of the holder of a licensed victualler's licence.

Another substantial amendment to the Act involves the expansion of the definition of “liquor” to include all beverages with an alcoholic content in excess of 0.5 per cent.

This will ensure that low alcohol beers can be sold only from licensed premises, and it should, therefore, prevent minors gaining access to alcoholic drinks in supermarkets and other similar retail outlets.

A further significant amendment provided for in the Bill will facilitate the prosecution of the owners of unlicensed premises used for the sale of liquor. At present, the Act makes the occupier of such premises liable if it can be proved “that he was privy or consenting to the sale”. This is difficult to prove and usually only the person actually serving drinks is charged, while the real offender, who may be either the owner of the premises or the tenant, avoids prosecution.

The Bill provides that the owner of unlicensed premises on which liquor is being sold is liable for an unlawful sale if he “knowingly allows” liquor to be sold.

The Bill further provides that knowledge is to be presumed if, in the preceding 12 months, there had been three convictions for the unlawful sale of liquor on the premises and the owner had been advised of these convictions and failed to exercise his power to evict.

The power that the Bill gives to an owner to evict an occupier upon receiving notice of convictions will ensure that, where the real offender is a tenant, the owner can take positive steps to prevent further breaches of the Act.

In particular, these amendments are aimed at closing down the illicit operations of a number of notorious unlicensed night-clubs, which, until now, have traded freely and in open defiance of the law.

The Bill also provides that the executive officer of the Licensing Commission will no longer be an ex officio member of the commission. The executive officer's duties are now generally of an administrative nature and there is no good reason why he should continue to be a member of the commission.

The Bill also corrects a problem arising from a recent decision of the District Court. The trial judge in that case found to be valid a provision of a lease under which the lessee (who was also the holder of a licensed victualler's licence) was obliged to pay to the lessor (the owner of the licensed premises) an amount equal to the sum the lessee was entitled to deduct from his rent pursuant to section 18B. This decision prevented the lessee from recovering that sum from the lessor.

The Bill prevents parties contracting out of the provisions of section 18B by making any such contractual arrangement an unenforceable "agreement to the contrary" under that section.

Provision is also made in the Bill for the correction of an anomaly that arose from the delayed proclamation of the 1979 amendments to section 22 of the Act. Amendments in 1982 to subsection (4) were made without knowledge of the unproclaimed earlier amendments and the subsection was thus rendered unintelligible.

The Bill remedies this situation and also permits the holder of a tavern licence to hold a bottler's licence. A licensed victualler is already permitted to do so under the Act.

As well, provision is made for a packet licence to be held by the holder of another class of licence with the Licensing Court's approval. This will allow resort-owners who already hold liquor licences to apply also for a packet licence for charter vessels owned by them and operated from their resorts.

At present, packet licences are issued to the masters of vessels rather than to owners. This has created many problems in the past, particularly when masters have left the employment of vessel-owners without attending to the transfer of the relevant liquor licences.

In addition, it is not uncommon for a vessel to be operated by a number of masters on a shift basis. This has resulted in the licence-holder being absent from the vessel at times when it is desired to serve liquor to passengers.

The Bill overcomes these problems by providing for the issue of packet licences to vessel-owners. The names of masters operating vessels will be endorsed on issued licences and this will entitle both owners and masters to sell liquor to passengers.

To avoid disruption to present packet licensing arrangements, the Bill also provides for the continuation of any existing licence until such time as an application is made by an owner under the new provisions.

In addition, the commission will be given the authority, in a particular case where it thinks fit, to permit trading for a period of 60 minutes before commencement of a vessel's passage and for 30 minutes after completion of its passage. This will enable the licence-holders operating large vessels for weddings, balls and similar functions to serve guests during the boarding of the vessel and immediately after its return to port.

This Bill also provides that a booth permit for the sale of liquor at an outdoor venue may be granted for "a function held by or under the auspices of a community organisation". This amendment will allow booth permits to be granted to persons on behalf of service clubs such as Rotary, Lions and Apex clubs where those organisations wish to sell liquor at fund-raising functions.

The Bill also provides that the holder of a vigneron-vintner's licence may apply to the commission to exempt his business from the hours of trading specified in the Act or to vary those hours to accommodate his business requirements. At present, trading is prohibited on Sundays, public holidays and at times when shops are not permitted to trade under the Factories and Shops Act. The Bill provides for the commission to refer an application, with its recommendation, to the Minister, who may grant or refuse an exemption or variation. This amendment will enable licence-holders in tourist areas to trade on Sundays and at other times when tourists are likely to require access to trading facilities.

Two additional grounds of forfeiture of a licensed victualler's licence, a spirit merchant's licence or a railway refreshment room licence are also provided for in the Bill. The first is that the licensed premises have been the resort of "drug dealers, sexual perverts or deviants or child molesters" and this amendment is consequential upon other amendments which make it an offence for a licence-holder to allow such persons to be in or upon licensed premises.

The second additional ground is that the licensee has supplied liquor to a person apparently under the age of 18 years or has permitted such a person to enter or remain on a part of the licensed premises prohibited to persons of that age. This is intended to discourage further licensees from serving under-age persons, an objective which will also be achieved by providing for better forms of identification of young people seeking entry to licensed premises.

The Bill provides that a licensee may, if he suspects that a person on his premises or seeking admission to his premises is under 18 years of age, request that person to produce for his inspection an electoral identification card or a certificate in the prescribed form. Failure to do so constitutes an offence, as does the production of a false or altered card or certificate.

In addition, the Bill creates an evidential presumption that any belief that a licensee had that a person on his premises was over 18 years of age was an unreasonable belief where it can be shown that the licensee did not ask that person to produce an electoral identification card. This amendment will be a strong incentive for young patrons to carry cards and for licensees to ask for their production in appropriate circumstances.

A further provision makes any licensee or permit-holder who supplies liquor to a person under 18 years of age or to a mentally deranged or intoxicated person liable to a penalty under the Act. At present, a penalty applies only to licensed victuallers or the holders of spirit merchant or resort licences.

The Bill also provides that the commission is able to determine the quantities of liquor that a licensee is required to keep on his premises to avoid forfeiture of his licence. This amendment will enable the commission to ensure compliance with the existing provisions, which require "reasonable" quantities of liquor to be kept.

The Bill further provides that the successful tenderer for a cancelled, surrendered or forfeited licensed victualler's licence pay the balance of tender moneys immediately upon acceptance of the tender. This will avoid problems that have occurred in the past when a successful tenderer has subsequently become insolvent and has been unable to complete payment after acceptance of the tender.

A major provision of this Bill is that licensees and permit-holders will be required to keep such books of account and records for the purchase and sale of liquor by them as the commission requires. The commission is given power to inspect such records and hold them for inspection purposes and it can give notice to a licensee to produce details of the volume and value of liquor purchased.

A licence-holder who fails to comply with any of these provisions is guilty of an offence and liable to a fine not exceeding \$20,000 or, where it can be assessed, twice the value of the licence fee evaded, whichever amount is greater. This amendment will greatly assist the commission in keeping track of liquor sales.

Large quantities of liquor are presently being sold in the State under "border-hopping" arrangements which result in substantial losses in licence fee revenue, as well as in unfair competition to the majority of licensees who are conforming to the law. At present, it is very difficult to trace this liquor because licensees are not required to keep records of liquor purchases or sales.

The Bill provides also that a licensed victualler can apply to the commission for permission to establish and operate a guests' bar on his licensed premises, and the commission can grant such permission subject to such terms, conditions and restrictions as it thinks fit.

This amendment will allow certain international-class hotels to operate bars on a 24-hour basis for the convenience of lodgers or their guests. The general public will not have access to these bars. The usual restrictions on serving minors and drunkards will be applicable.

Currently, the maximum number of permits that may be issued to licensed golf and bowling clubs for night functions is 52 permits per year.

Mr Davis: Not enough.

Mr HARPER: The honourable member for Brisbane Central says that that is not enough. I am glad that he is at least awake.

This Bill doubles that number and further provides that, if in a particular case the commission is satisfied that a special need exists for the granting of additional permits, it may, subject to the approval of the Minister, grant up to three additional permits per week, provided that the number of permits granted to a particular club in any week does not exceed five.

These provisions will not only benefit all golf and bowls clubs in the State but will also be of particular benefit to a number of large city clubs that have a need to cater for several night functions each week in response to local demand.

The Bill adds to the list of persons entitled to object to the granting of various classes of licence, persons who already hold a licence of that type or the owners of premises the subject of that type of licence, provided that their premises are in the same locality as the premises to which the new licence application relates.

Accordingly, the holders of restaurant, cabaret and tourist park licences or the owners of premises of that type will be able to object to the granting of a similar class of licence over premises in the vicinity of their already licensed premises. At present, licensed victuallers are the only licensees entitled to object.

The Bill provides further that the Licensing Court may grant a resort licence only in respect of premises on the mainland of Queensland that are so situated that, in the opinion of the commission contained in a recommendation to the court, special circumstances exist that justify the granting of a licence.

At present, the Licensing Court has to consider specific criteria such as means of communication and suitability of transport before granting a licence. These criteria are considered to be too restrictive, and the amendments give the commission greater flexibility in assessing applications for resort licences.

The Bill also repeals the section of the Act that provides that the Governor in Council may prescribe the maximum number of resort licences that may be issued. There is now no reason for limiting the number of resort licences and, therefore, this provision is no longer necessary.

Significant amendments to the cabaret provisions of the Act are also contained in the Bill. The holders of cabaret licences will no longer be able to trade at any time on Christmas Day or Good Friday. This places them in the same position as all other licence-holders under the Act. The Bill also extends cabaret trading hours by permitting cabarets to open at 6 p.m. rather than 7 p.m., and, in special cases in which the commission is satisfied that circumstances justify such an extension, the closing time may be extended from 3 a.m. to 5 a.m. This amendment caters for the needs of a number of large city night-clubs that attract patrons late into the night.

In addition, the Bill provides that cabarets no longer have to provide meals for patrons after 10 p.m., provided that food of such type and in such quantities as the commission requires is available on demand. This amendment to the Act recognises that many cabaret patrons have eaten before entering the premises and, accordingly, have no requirement for a formal meal.

The Bill provides further that cabaret premises may, if the commission approves in accordance with guide-lines laid down by the Minister, be used for day-time functions between the hours of 11 a.m. and 3 p.m., provided a meal is or both entertainment and a meal are supplied. This amendment will permit cabarets, subject to rigid guide-lines, to hold business lunches.

The Bill permits the commission, in a particular case, to extend the 10 p.m. closing time for a tourist park licence to 12 midnight, subject to such conditions as it thinks fit. This will allow certain large resorts in major tourist areas to trade until midnight.

The Bill also gives the commission a discretion to grant permission to a licence-holder or the holder of a certificate of registration under the Wine Industry Act to offer samples of wine produced by him at wine-tastings and similar functions not conducted on his premises. Offering wine samples from other than the premises on which the wine is made is not presently permitted under the Act.

Another very significant feature of the Bill is that it provides for the sale and supply of liquor to Aboriginal and Islander communities that presently come under the administrative control of the Community Services (Aborigines) Act and the Community Services (Torres Strait) Act. The sections of those Acts dealing with the supply of beer on trust areas are repealed and provision is made for individual Aborigines and Islanders or for trust area councils, on behalf of their communities, to make application for licences under the Liquor Act.

An application for a licence by other than an Aboriginal or Islander council is first referred to the appropriate council which, if it approves the application, then refers it to the commission. The commission, in turn, refers the matter, with its recommendations, to the Governor in Council. When a council rejects an application, an appeal can be made to the Governor in Council. Provision is made for a council to apply to the commission for a determination that the whole or part of a trust area is a restricted place and that certain types of liquor shall not be sold therein and, upon such a determination being made, the specified types of liquor are not to be sold there.

The Bill also gives councils the power to issue prohibition orders to persons who endanger the peace and well-being to their families, themselves or the community. This power is additional to the power of the court to issue prohibition orders under section 64 of the Act.

Provision is also made for the Licensing Court to issue a new type of licence to Aborigines and Islanders. This licence, to be known as a canteen licence, is intended to meet the specific liquor-retailing requirements of Aboriginal and Islander communities. This amendment reflects the unique trading conditions existing on trust areas and recognises that other licences available under the Act may not always be entirely appropriate to the needs of trust communities.

The Bill provides also that a successful applicant for a licence under the Act will not be restricted, as at present, to the sale of beer unless the commission, on an application from the relevant council, makes a determination to that effect.

The final amendment contained in the Bill provides that applications for unlicensed club permits are to be made to the commission rather than to the Magistrates Court as at present. The Licensing Commission, as the body charged with the function of processing applications under the Act, is best able to ascertain the bona fides of applicants for this type of permit and to ensure that the right to sell liquor is confined to genuine organisations and associations. However, the opportunity has also been taken to make provision for any appropriate increase in the rate of interest that may be charged on outstanding fees due to the Licensing Commission.

The Bill is further evidence of the Government's determination to respond to changing social patterns, whilst at the same time maintaining the traditional role of the Government to protect the community from exploitation and excesses.

I take the opportunity to thank all who participated in the two-day seminar held by me last year. The aim was to achieve understanding throughout the industry to the needs and aspirations of other sections. That was undoubtedly achieved, thanks to widespread participation, which included the Queensland Temperance League and Drug-Arm.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate, on motion of Mr Prest, adjourned.

RAILWAY PROPOSAL

Gold Coast Railway from Beenleigh to Robina

Hon. D. F. LANE (Merthyr—Minister for Transport) laid on the table working plan, section and book of reference for construction of proposed Gold Coast Railway from Beenleigh to Robina, together with report of the Commissioner for Railways.

The commissioner's report was ordered to be printed.

SANCTUARY COVE RESORT BILL

Second Reading—Resumption of Debate

Debate resumed from 17 October (see p. 2195) on Mr Hinze's motion—

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

Mr SHAW (Wynnum) (8.2 p.m.): In his second-reading speech the Minister referred to this Bill as landmark legislation. It is certainly true to say that it explores a great deal of new territory. It must have presented quite a challenge to the officers of the Minister's department as they worked very long and hard in trying to put the terms of the Bill together.

Because of the new ground that is covered by the Bill, it would be fair to say that it is inevitable that honourable members will see changes that will result in the legislation being brought back before the Parliament, or the subordinate legislation being amended in the light of experience. Opposition members have examined the proposal and cannot see a great deal wrong with it. However, that is not to say that there will be no problems with it, particularly from an environmental point of view.

It is almost inevitable that environmental damage to a section of the bay will occur as a result of the type of development proposed, but it is also fair to say that the damage that is likely to occur would not be any more than that which would otherwise occur in development with the same level of density.

The decision to develop the area was made some time ago. The proposal to develop the area round Hope Island was envisaged to be development of fairly heavy density. As I said, it is inevitable that, when a decision is made to construct a large number of homes in an estuary area in the bay, environmental damage will result.

The question of whether or not heavy density development in that location is wise is another matter. Unfortunately, I do not believe that the question of whether or not the area is an ideal site for heavy density development has yet been adequately addressed. The idea of undertaking project development there is reflected in the contents of the Bill, and the legislation presently before the house does illustrate a clear need for a plan of development for the Moreton Bay area.

Many suggestions have been made by conservation groups. It is interesting that, in 1980, a promise was made when a Government committee was formed. I refer to the contents of an article that appeared in the *The Courier-Mail* on Saturday, 10 May 1980, under the headline "Group formed to protect Moreton Bay." The article states—

"A State Government committee has been formed to look at ways to protect islands and other natural areas in southern Moreton Bay.

The National Parks Minister, Mr Gibbs, said the committee would produce a blueprint for nature conservation in the area from the Southport Broadwater to Jumpinpin."

The article then goes on to outline what the work of the committee will be. It is of some concern that nothing has yet transpired from that committee.

I now turn to a press statement issued by Mr McKechnie in 1984. It states—

"The working group of the Jumpinpin-Broadwater Nature Conservation Planning Committee will meet in Brisbane tomorrow to finalise its strategy for the region."

That was in December 1984. The statement continued—

"The Working group's report is expected to go to Mr Gibbs as planning committee chairman, and then the State Government in the near future."

"Near future" was not quite so near, because, on 9 April 1985, the honourable member for Ipswich West (Mr Underwood) asked the Minister for Mines and Energy (Mr I. J. Gibbs)—

"Has an interdepartmental committee chaired by him completed a report on conservation requirements for southern Moreton Bay?"

The Minister answered, "No." The honourable member for Ipswich West then asked—

"What are the recommendations of this report?"

The Minister said—

"See (1)."

That meant, of course, that nothing had been done. The honourable member then asked—

"When will the report be made public to enable public input into the plans for conservation requirements of southern Moreton Bay?"

The Minister answered—

"The matter has yet to go before Cabinet for consideration."

The honourable member also asked—

"Will the Government give a commitment that any lease applications or development applications in key conservation areas of southern Moreton Bay will be deferred until the report on conservation requirements is released to the public?"

The Minister replied—

"Any decision regarding applications will be considered on the merits of the application."

That brings me to the problem with Sanctuary Cove on Hope Island, because, although one looks at the harm that will result from this development in isolation—and it is fair to say that it is small—one should be looking at what will be happening with the development of schemes of this type in that area of the bay. The Government's committee should report, and it should do so as a matter of urgency. The decision to

allow the building of the Sanctuary Cove resort should have formed part of an overall plan. The committee has been in existence for five years, yet this resort is proceeding without any consideration by, or recommendation from, the committee. That is something of which the Government surely must not be very proud.

It cannot be said that this site was specially selected as the best area for the use to which it is to be put. In fact, an area of land was available, a group of people controlled it, and they sought a use to which to put their land—a development that would be suitable.

To illustrate that point, I quote again from *The Courier-Mail* of 3 April 1981. It stated—

“Owners of a \$4 million block of land, 12 km from Surfers Paradise, are hoping it will become the site for a Gold Coast casino.”

So it was not to be a resort of this kind at that time; it was hoped that the site would be developed as a casino.

The article continued—

“The Hope Projects Trust believes its 172ha property at Hope Island is ideally suited for a casino.

However, Trust director Mr Ivor Heffernan, of Surfers Paradise, said the company needed a partner it is were to be successful.

‘The land has the potential to be developed into a multi-million dollar tourist resort.’ he said. ‘This could include a casino, an international hotel and a Polynesian-style accommodation village.

. . .

‘With the proposed bridge to link Hope Island to Paradise Point, the Island has taken on increased investment significance.’ ”

That statement is itself significant because the owner of the property indicated that the value of his land had been enhanced by the Government’s decision to build the bridges to Hope Island—partly, at least, at public expense. The article continued—

“At a Gold Coast public meeting last year, the Main Roads Minister, Mr Hinze, said the bridge linking Hope Island to the Gold Coast would be completed within 18 months.”

Mr Davis: It was a bit of luck.

Mr SHAW: It was indeed fortuitous.

It is also of some interest to note a further report in the *The Australian* which might come under the heading of a Freudian slip. Referring to the bridges to Hope Island, the article states—

“It is anticipated that bridgework will begin within the next 12 months and that there will be a double crossing involved.”

Obviously, whoever wrote the article had some idea of the way in which the Government tends to operate.

The statement to which I have referred illustrates two points. The first is that the use to which the land was to be put has not been the subject of careful planning. Rather, it has been a matter of a developer seeking to put his land to the most profitable use. I do not blame him or criticise him for that, but it does indicate that those who represent the public at large are not fulfilling their responsibilities.

The second point that the statement illustrates is that the decision to build that bridge, partly at public expense, will increase the profits of that development and of other developments in that area. Although it would be fair to say that ultimately the bridge would have been built, the fact that its construction was brought forward does involve public expense and, as I said, increases profits for a developer. It means that it

cannot really be said that the risk associated with this development is entirely on the head of the private developer and that the people do not have any investment in the development. Obviously, for that reason and for other reasons that I do not think I will have time to go into tonight, they do have an investment in the development.

The decision to build that bridge should have been part of a plan for the development of the entire area. It is not hoping for too much to make a request for such a plan. As I said, this committee has been in existence for five years, so there has been ample time. It would have been fair to expect such a plan. I am not saying that there should be a mandatory plan that says, "This is what has got to happen, and if a developer wants to change it slightly or if development tends to move in another direction, that is not allowable under the plan that has been set out." I am saying that there should be an outline of principles. There should be an idea of the direction in which we hope development will head. Those sorts of guide-lines should be laid down.

After five years, the Minister for Mines and Energy said that the plan is still coming. How long can we wait before it becomes a reality? As I said, it is inevitable that, in the meantime, the environment will be damaged, and that will affect the viability of developments, such as the one that we are discussing under the Bill. Again, I am not suggesting, as probably some Government members will claim I am, that the whole area should be locked up and that we should say, "If you build something there, it will damage the environment. You are not allowed to touch it. We want to keep it in a pristine state." What I am saying is that we must recognise that, whenever a development such as this is approved, there is a price to pay by way of damage to the environment. What we must have clear in our minds is how far we are prepared to go and what price we are prepared to pay in terms of damage to the environment in order to get development and the jobs that go with it. We should know how much we are prepared to pay and in what way we are going to have to pay it.

At present, a number of inroads are being made into the breeding grounds of fish and the natural habitats of wildlife. The mangroves are a case in point. Over the years, we have been nibbling at the mangroves. When port development commenced at the mouth of the Brisbane River, environmental studies said, "Yes, it will destroy a few dozen hectares of mangroves but, as a percentage of the total number of mangroves—"

Mrs Chapman: Only 1 per cent.

Mr SHAW: By coincidence, the environmental study says that only about 1 per cent of the mangroves in this part of the Coomera River will be affected. I agree that that does not seem to be a very significant percentage; but what one must ask is how many 1 per cents there will be. Is the Government to grant this development exclusive rights and shut the door after it so that nobody else can get in? What the community must consider is the total percentage that it can afford to lose. What is the total price that it must pay for development at the cost of the environment? Instead of considering the future, the Government is nibbling away, a little at a time, and putting off that decision till sometime in the future.

The Hyatt hotel organisation and the Sanctuary Cove development company should be pressing for the adoption of a plan, and I expect that they will begin to take a much more active interest in the demands for a national park and for the protection of an adequate area of wildlife habitat because, quite obviously, it will be in their interests to do so. It will improve the viability of the proposal that they are now putting forward, because they are hoping to attract visitors from overseas and all round Australia.

It must be obvious to any thinking person that, no matter how good the golf course might be or how good the coach or the tennis courts might be, people will not come to the resort solely for the attractions that have been spelt out in the development proposal. They will want to see something that is a little bit different, something that they do not see in the environment in which they live. What could be better than an opportunity

to see some of the wildlife found in mangroves? Many will want to catch fish, and they will not be able to do that if the environment is damaged to a significant degree.

It will be in the interests of the developers to make sure that, as soon as possible, the question of just how far the Government and the community are prepared to go to protect the environment is resolved.

Mr Comben: All the way.

Mr SHAW: The honourable member for Windsor will probably argue that way, and I do not blame him for that; but had he been in the Chamber a little earlier, he would have heard me say that it must be accepted that development will occur. The environment cannot be locked up and preserved. Development must be approached in a sensible way, and if a start were made now, instead of putting it off——

Mrs Chapman: The wildlife was already there; the ponds are covered in wildlife.

Mr SHAW: It will not remain for long, if the Government and developers keep nibbling away at it.

When talking about wildlife and the need to attract visitors to the area, the subject of mosquitoes arises. As most fishermen know, in the southern end of Moreton Bay the most vicious type of mosquitoes in quite a long day's travel are to be found. The developers will need to do something about the mosquito plague, and that fills me with some concern. It is likely that pressure will be brought to bear to begin spraying with long-term residual, highly poisonous sprays. If my memory serves me correctly, spraying to combat mosquitoes has been carried out at the mouth of the river for about 15 years. When that program began, a dramatic effect was felt, and the sprays that are used have a very short residual life and have been selected carefully so as not to damage the wildlife and kill fish unnecessarily. They are not killing the mosquitoes any more, either. What seems to have happened is that the sprays have had a culling effect. I have lived in that area all of my life and I have never known the mosquito plagues to be as bad as they are at present.

Mr Simpson: What are they spraying?

Mr SHAW: I could not tell the honourable member what is being used at present.

I do know that the spray is not being effective. What will inevitably happen in the area covered by the Bill will be a growing pressure for the use of more powerful pesticides with a longer residual life. Certainly nothing contained in the Bill covers it and, so far as I know, nothing is contained in any other legislation that adequately covers the problem of developers wanting to conduct that sort of spraying. That is something that should be seriously considered.

The mosquitoes and sandflies in that area are prolific. The immediate reaction that that would provoke in many people is that any developer who wants to spend all that money in that area must be crazy. My attitude is that that is the developer's decision and that many people have made millions of dollars by doing things that others thought were crazy. It may well be that that will be the case with this development. Certainly, if it fails, it will present a severe problem for the Government to try to untangle the legislative web that is being woven here tonight. To sort out the problem will be quite a difficult job. However, I agree with the suggestion that was made by the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing (Mr Hinze) that it is a bridge that will just have to be crossed should that eventuate. Everybody hopes it will not eventuate. The concept is very new to this country. For that reason we should be a little fearful of it, but that does not mean that the concept should be rejected totally.

The question must be asked as to whether or not this State and nation are ready for that type of development. From a personal point of view, I must say that I hope they are not. What the concept involves is a locked-up sort of community in which people need to have paid security guards to protect their lives and property. Similar developments have already occurred overseas and they are becoming more and more

common. I would have liked to think that this country had not yet got to that stage and that it would not get to it. Unfortunately, that is one of the major factors that will decide the success or otherwise of the development. If it is a success, it is probably an indication that this country is moving towards that sort of a community. That, I believe, is to be regretted.

The residents who decide to live in this area will pay a high price in terms of money and in terms of loss of their individual rights. They will be the most governed people in the nation. Because of the high economic price that they will have to pay, they will need to be people who have had a successful career, who have been successful in amassing wealth. Probably they will be successful business people. Most people would like to believe that those are the types of people who have displayed a great deal of personal initiative and are people who like to do things their own way and enjoy personal freedoms. Those characteristics certainly will not be present in the sorts of people who will enjoy living in this sort of a community, because there will be few chances for them to do their own thing.

In this community the residents will be rigidly controlled in almost everything they do. They will live very regulated lives. As I said, because the legislation imposes on them extra levels of government, they will be the most governed people in Australia. The body corporate structure will almost be another tier of government that will impose laws on the way that the residents will live. The residents will be required to carry passes. Look at what is happening today with the suggestion that Australians should carry identity cards. They will not be cards that have to be carried on the person. I hope we never get to that day.

The legislation deals with a system under which people who voluntarily buy into a community will be required to carry an identity pass whenever they are in their home environment. That is a great personal liberty to give up. Quite possibly, more than one pass will be necessary.

The problem of people walking their dogs and creating work for the council because of the mess that the dogs make will be eliminated. People in that area will not be out walking dogs, because it is almost certain that no pets will be allowed. The people themselves will be allowed to walk only in the areas in which they have a pass authorising them to do so.

The body corporate will regulate people's lives and activities in a way that has never been known in this country. I wonder whether, in the long term, people will be prepared to accept such restrictions in exchange for the benefits that will accrue to them. In many ways, it is a life-style that can fairly be described as an exclusive commune. If it is a communal life-style, it is really a type of commune. The people will receive benefits. One of the most obvious benefits is the provision of security for the area. I am very concerned about that. Another benefit is the provision of services to the area.

If the security is to be of any benefit, the people who have the responsibility of ensuring that security will have to have fairly strong powers. I have always been very concerned about the growth of private security firms—private police forces. In similar developments overseas, the security officers are in fact a private police force. Those officers carry weapons and have guard-dogs. They have a number of powers that I believe should be restricted solely to a police force.

It is to be regretted that the Police Commissioner said recently that he could do with many more police officers. The Minister said that the commissioner was referring to the optimum number—the number that the commissioner apparently thought he really needed in order to carry out the job properly. In my opinion, it would be far better to provide the Police Commissioner with the additional numbers than to have people who can afford it taxing themselves to provide private police in their own areas.

Already, security firms are using so-called guard-dogs that are not properly trained. I cite the recent example of the RAAF guard-dog. Probably, that dog would be one of the best-trained guard-dogs in Australia, and the people looking after it would have more

expertise in that field than anybody in Australia and a standard that would compare favourably with that anywhere in the world. When the handler of that dog was to retire, the RAAF seriously considered putting the dog down because it was not satisfied that that dog would not be a threat to people's lives in the general community.

In this city at present, hundreds of dogs that are not nearly as well trained as that RAAF dog, and quite often not in the control of handlers, are roaming round. Dogs are used to guard car yards. One of these days, there will be a repeat of the very unfortunate incident in Great Britain in which a child wandered into some premises and was torn to shreds by a dog of that type. They are not guard-dogs; they are savage dogs.

I would like to see some provision in this legislation, or in legislation that covers this area, to control the use of such dogs and to ensure that they are properly trained and in constant care. At Sanctuary Cove, they will be in the midst of a residential area, where the opportunities for an accident could be far greater.

What about security people carrying weapons? Some time ago, a young chap called at an office block after usual working hours to pick up his fiancée, who was working late. A security guard confronted him. The young chap said what he wanted to do. The security guard drew a revolver, which he cocked and pointed at the young person, who was of course very nervous.

I know of licences to carry concealable firearms being given to people who, were they not members of a security firm, would never be given such a licence. Most people in the community who were asked to make a judgment about the worth of such people to be granted a concealable firearm licence would express a belief that they should never be given such a power. The member for Mansfield (Mr Kaus) is not in the Chamber. He is a very keen member of shooting clubs. He would be the first to admit that people in those clubs are told not to point loaded weapons at someone unless they are prepared to kill him. It is a matter of great concern to me that a person in the circumstances I have given should draw a loaded weapon, cock it and point it at someone about whom he should have had no ground for serious suspicion. Similar incidents could easily arise among homes at Sanctuary Cove.

It is extremely difficult to maintain security on the water. I cannot help wondering what powers would be given to security guards to maintain security over a boat harbour. This harbour will be privately owned. The general public will have no right to enter it. A speedboat would have easy access to homes constructed on the water's edge. Conceivably, it would be possible to drive boats virtually to the lounge-room. How would a security guard stop someone bringing his boat into this area? Will the security guards be equipped with high-speed boats? Will they be armed? It will be a very difficult job. Extreme pressure could be applied to the Government to approve stringent means by which security could be imposed, including the carrying of weapons. That is one of the matters the Opposition will watch closely when the by-laws are printed. It is unfortunate that the by-laws are not now available to allow us to form an opinion about whether or not they are fair and reasonable.

The Bill provides for a new concept—approval for floating houses. I heard a spokesman say that they will be the same as houseboats. That is not so. They are exactly what they are called—floating houses. It is an entirely new concept in Australia. I understand that the first country which approved the concept—Canada—did so where the land fronting a lake was very steeply sloped. In other words, the mountains came right down to the lake, making it impossible to build houses on the land. The idea of floating houses on logs at the water's edge was formulated. The principle has gained acceptance of some sort in such circumstances. However, I am not convinced that this country needs it at this stage. I place the principle very much in the gimmick category. I have no doubt that there will be a rapid turnover in ownership as people realise what it is like living on the water. It has very few advantages and quite a number of disadvantages.

The most important matter to be taken into consideration is the need for a code to govern the construction of the house. One thing that can probably be assumed is

that, unless the tops of the poles to which the "floating dwelling houses" are moored are in some way locked off, the dwellings will be immune from problems associated with flooding. If the poles were not locked off at the top, the dwellings would be able to float away and the owners may some day find them at Stradbroke Island. I do not really envisage that that will occur, but the likely impact of these "floating dwelling houses" needs to be seriously considered.

It is imperative that a code be brought forward as soon as possible. Indeed, it is important that the complete set of by-laws that will pertain to this development be brought forward as soon as possible.

I think I heard a Government member interject earlier that the requirements that I outlined relating to passes will not eventuate. I believe that the requirement will eventuate, but no-one can be absolutely certain until the by-laws have been either approved or rejected.

The next question that arises is that, because the by-laws will contain powers that are similar to those exercised by a tier of government, the process that will be engaged in for amending them is extremely important. In situations in which a local authority wants to change by-laws, the process provides for people who will be affected to make a personal objection. In this instance, however, I do not think that that will be provided for; I do not think that that will be a right that the people will have. Although their parliamentary representatives may make such a decision for them, people need to have the right to express a view publicly and be able to convince others of the correctness of their point of view.

The legislation should provide for changes to the by-laws to be debated in some forum before a recommendation is made to the Minister. I might add that the Minister has very strong powers under the terms of the Bill, including the powers to decide upon expenditure by the body corporate or to decide upon situations in which emergent expenditure by the body corporate will apply.

I am rather interested in the waterfront houses that are described as "special dwelling house". The legislation provides that such dwellings may be placed directly on to the waterfront and that people will be able to build their houses into the water or, alternatively, it may be possible for people to moor their boats virtually at their front door and have direct entry to the house itself. It is quite conceivable that the boat-house will form part of the house. My understanding is that it is not intended that those houses would be built on areas that front the Coomera River and that those houses would only be built on freehold land which would front the harbour that will be constructed. If that is so, I would like the Minister to explain in his reply how that will be achieved and where prohibition of construction will apply.

What would prevent a house-holder from purchasing a block of land in the appropriate zone that provides for this type of housing and building a house directly onto the water's edge, after approval had been obtained from the Gold Coast Waterways Authority? If that was to occur, that would be an example of bad development. I have said repeatedly in this House that development should be set back from waterfront areas wherever possible, and I believe that that principle applies particularly in this instance. I ask the Minister to explain to me exactly the conditions under which prohibition will still apply.

A special town plan will apply to this development, and it is probably too late to do anything about that now. However, I notice that the development will repeat some of the problems that have occurred in other areas. For instance, it is notable that some of the problems that the Minister for Industry, Small Business and Technology (Mr Ahern), the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing (Mr Hinze) and the Premier and Treasurer (Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen) have been so voluble about in recent times have arisen in connection with this development. They have complained about the rigidity of town-planning and the way that it restricts development. I can understand how it would have happened. The people drawing up this legislation probably had so

many other things to consider that they did not have the opportunity to break new ground.

I take this opportunity to say that it is a great pity that, having experimented with so many other things, the Government could not have experimented with the introduction of a set of principles that could be applied in particular areas. Instead of introducing rigid zonings and saying, "In zones 1, 2 and 3 you can do these things," the Government could have experimented with a more flexible type of zoning that might very well be able to be extended to the rest of the community. Had the Government taken advantage of that opportunity, it would have been better than the sort of quite outrageous proposal made by the Minister for Industry, Small Business and Technology of introducing as of right zoning for noxious industry. I do not think that that is the right way to approach the problem. In fact, I think it would increase the difficulties.

I mentioned earlier that the legislation provides a number of benefits for residents, one of which is the provision of service and recreation clubs. I noticed that the definition of "club" is very broad. It could apply to almost anything. It could certainly be a commercial enterprise. I know that you would not want me to be too specific in this second-reading debate, Mr Speaker, and I will not be, but I believe that members who have the time should look closely at that definition. As I see it, the definition of "club" includes anything from a Country Women's Association tea-room to a house of ill fame or a casino. It is certainly very broad.

I am also very interested in the proposals that are not part of the legislation but have been suggested by the developers—I think they were also mentioned in the Minister's speech—that people within the development will be encouraged to use golf carts for internal transport. That raises the question of whether the users of those golf carts will be afforded the protection of third-party insurance and, if so, on what basis and in what category. Under the by-laws, will the golf carts be allowed—I imagine they will be—on the primary thoroughfares and, if so, will they need to be registered? The major problem will be third-party insurance. It will almost certainly arise.

I find the whole project very interesting. As I have said, Opposition members are concerned about a number of matters. It is a bold step into the unknown, and it is almost inevitable that there will be some problems.

Speaking on behalf of the Opposition, I do not see any problems that would be of such magnitude as to say that the Opposition should oppose the legislation. With those reservations that I have outlined, we will watch the development with great interest.

Mr ALISON (Maryborough) (8.44 p.m.): It is with pleasure that I rise to support the Sanctuary Cove Resort Bill introduced by the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing (Mr Hinze).

Mr Comben interjected.

Mr ALISON: I will deal with the mangroves shortly.

I want to deal with some of the main provisions in this Bill, which may not be found in other legislation. As the Minister has pointed out, there has been no previous development of this type in Australia, let alone Queensland and, accordingly, special legislation is required. The fact of the matter is that this proposed development, which is now well under way with some \$21m already spent on site preparation works, simply could not be brought to fruition without a special Act of Parliament. This Bill will facilitate the development and ongoing management of this up-market, integrated, mixed-land-use resort, which is designed to be a complete resort destination in the true sense of the word.

The Minister expressed the hope that the Sanctuary Cove development will be the first of a new generation of resort communities. I concur with that hope, as I believe there is certainly a place in the Queensland tourist industry for such a complete resort destination at the top end of the market.

The provisions of the Bill are based upon existing Canadian and American condominium resort legislation but have been modified extensively to conform with existing Queensland legislation. It is necessary for this legislation to be site-specific, as objects, purposes and general matters relating to such developments will vary significantly from resort to resort. The Bill will, however, provide a general precedent for any future similar development.

It has readily been acknowledged by the Minister that local statutory authorities must be involved in the decision-making processes associated with this development. Therefore, the rights and obligations of statutory authorities, such as the Albert Shire Council and the Gold Coast Waterways Authority, are preserved to the maximum extent that is practicable.

The Bill takes precedence over the town-planning scheme for the Albert Shire Council so far as this site is concerned. However, a separate planning scheme is introduced by way of Schedules A and C of the Bill which, before it can have legal effect, is required, pursuant to clause 8 of the Bill, to be submitted to the Albert Shire Council for proper definition of the proposed zone boundaries, and the prior approval of that council is required before other provisions contained in the Bill can be implemented.

This Bill also establishes that the Albert Shire Council is required to approve all proposals that are normally its responsibility, such as the subdivision of land, the granting of building approvals and the setting of road-construction standards and the like. In fact, the integrity of the decision-making processes of the Albert Shire Council will not be compromised by the provisions of the Bill.

All the land encompassed in this development, including certain lands which may be inundated by tidal waters, such as the harbour area, will attract rate charges levied by the Albert Shire Council.

Similarly, the Gold Coast Waterways Authority retains its authority over all those matters that are normally within its province. For example, in relation to the proposed harbour, the Bill provides for that area to be privately owned but requires that the approval of the waterways authority be obtained in respect of all matters that would usually require approval by that authority.

In addition, the Gold Coast Waterways Authority is authorised to inspect and make orders relating to repairs, maintenance or other actions that may be required in respect of marine structures and navigational aids.

It is important to note also that provision is made for the unrestricted free movement of vessels across certain parts of the harbour, regardless of ownership, and it is required that fees usually paid in respect of berths and marinas elsewhere in the authority's area of jurisdiction be paid to the authority by the owner or any berthing facility within the site.

One unusual feature of the Bill is that it provides for those lands that will be used as roads to be vested in a body designated as being the principal body corporate. This body corporate has two major responsibilities, which are ongoing maintenance and reconstruction of secondary thoroughfares within the site on behalf of the individual body corporate and the administration of the development control by-laws.

The Bill provides for the establishment of an executive committee of the principal body corporate to handle the day-to-day running of the affairs of the body corporate. Provision is also made in the Bill for empowering the principal body corporate to prepare development control by-laws. These by-laws will deal with control of matters associated with the type and size, height and overall placement of buildings on the particular site.

Another interesting aspect of the Bill is the provisions that provide for establishing the primary thoroughfare body corporate, which is solely responsible for the ongoing maintenance of such road and other matters relating thereto. Provision is made for membership of the primary thoroughfare body corporate to comprise a representative of the owners of the pure freehold lots. As for the principal body corporate, the primary

thoroughfare body corporate will exist in perpetuity and may levy charges upon the owners of land or the principal body corporate, or both, to fund its operations.

The Bill establishes an executive committee for the primary thoroughfare body corporate to prepare by-laws for the control and regulation of activities on the primary thoroughfares. These by-laws will have to be approved by the Minister, with notification of such approval being published in the *Government Gazette*.

Another unusual aspect of the Bill is that the company will be allowed to purchase that area of land between the high-tide mark and half way between the high-tide and low-tide marks, which, of course, is usually Crown land, for the purpose of allowing a more uniform line of development and of permitting the development company to construct protective works along the river-bank. The company is not under any obligation to do this work, but it is in its interests to protect its development from erosion and, possibly, to carry out activities to control sand-flies. The company intends to stabilise the river-bank and to construct a promenade deck round certain parts of the development. Obviously, it could not do this without owning the land under discussion. I understand that the net increase in land area to the company will be 15.5 ha, much of which is very shallow at high tide and is certainly a breeding ground for sand-flies.

Mr Comben: What about the mangroves?

Mr ALISON: I will come to the mangroves shortly.

The Bill makes provision for the land within the development to not be developed until the land between high-water mark and half way between the high-tide and low-tide marks has been acquired by the company at a value to be set by the Land Administration Commission. I understand that the value has been set at \$6,500 per hectare. From all this, a benefit will flow to the Crown because that section of river bank will at least be stabilised by either rock-walling or revetment walls.

In relation to the economic impact of this development, it is relevant to note that the Sanctuary Cove Resort will provide mainly recreational services that are additional to any currently available in the Gold Coast region. I understand that it is expected that the facilities will attract mainly additional interstate and overseas visitors to the Gold Coast rather than simply take these visitors away from the patronage of existing facilities at the Gold Coast.

In the economic impact statements prepared by Coopers and Lybrand W. D. Scott, which was commissioned by the developers to assess the impact, it is interesting to note that, in the construction phase, there could be up to 2 500 employees on site for a full year during the peak of construction activity and, in the following five years, up to, say, 600 jobs on site. It is expected that an additional 500 jobs will be available in associated industries. It is also estimated by this firm that the multiplier effect of this economic generation will result in up to 3 200 more jobs induced indirectly because of this spending.

Coopers and Lybrand W. D. Scott also estimated that up to 1 050 jobs will be created directly by the operation of the retail and recreational services in the resort, some of which will be full-time and others part-time. In addition, it is estimated that, because of the multiplier effect of this activity, the total number of jobs in the area brought about as a result of the operation of the resort could be up to 2 500, some full-time and some part-time.

I also understand that it is estimated that municipal rates and charges paid on properties in the resort could contribute up to \$2m to Albert Shire Council collections and that the State Government could receive from State taxes, such as stamp duty, payroll tax and land tax, approximately \$2.5m over a five-year period.

I turn now to discuss the environmental impact on the surrounding areas, and I am sure that the honourable member for Windsor will prick his ears because he is a little unbalanced on these matters. He does not realise that human beings are part of the environment, along with the fish and little creepy crawlies.

Mr McPhie interjected.

Mr ALISON: Yes. I saw his latest escapade, jumping in the pool fully clothed. It was quite dramatic.

In relation to the environmental impact of the proposed development on the surrounding areas—as evidenced in the report by Oceanics Australia Pty Ltd, no great problems will result. Oceanics Australia prepared a report in relation to the proposed dredging for the Sanctuary Cove development company, and stated that the overall effects of channel construction are expected to be minor.

The report states—

“Two mid-channel banks along the south arm may be required to be removed and this potential change is viewed as the most significant affect. However, these shallow bank areas are still locally common in the estuary by being adjacent to shore-lines or nearer the more popular boating areas of the outer Coomera estuary and Broadwater. As these inter-tidal areas do vary in dimension over time, only an estimate of their area is feasible. In this instance, at least 215 hectares of shallow sub-tidal and inter-tidal banks occur within a 5 kilometre radius of Sanctuary Cove.

Given these extensive areas a reduction of 1.2 hectares of aquatic, bird and fish foraging habitat as a result of channel routing is viewed as being of minor biological significance. This area of disturbance is a conservative estimate as the design of the navigation channel and its route will be aimed at minimising interference to these banks. No roosting or breeding areas are located along the dredge path as these generally occur in open areas more isolated from human disturbance.”

I note also in the report that no sea-grass beds were located in the area subject to dredging and, other than the minor loss of shallow tidal banks, biological impact will be minimal. The engineers preparing the report note also that loss of the yabby banks is of concern. However, they say that efforts will be made in routing the channel to minimise any such loss. They point out also in their report that there are other seemingly more practical reasons for deviating navigation channels around shallow banks, and these will reinforce the need to observe this environmental constraint.

I believe that it is important to note also in the report that, as all of the dredge spoil will be recovered for reclamation purposes, its disposal will not adversely affect water quality or natural wetlands. I can see that the honourable member for Windsor (Mr Comben) has not yet read the report.

Oceanics Australia also states in its conclusions that reducing the hydraulic resistance of the south arm of the Coomera River will reduce the tidal prism in the north arm by approximately 31 per cent. Following the completion of the present gravel-extraction projects, reduction in tidal prism will be only 10 per cent. The increased flow in the south arm will not cause tidal velocities to increase significantly in the areas of concern because of the additional cross-sectional area provided by the dredging. Tidal ranges in Coombabah Creek and Coombabah Lake will be increased marginally and by approximately 6 per cent, but not sufficiently to cause adverse ecological affects or reduce navigability near low water.

The 31 per cent reduction in tidal prism in the north arm indicates that siltation would cause its cross-sectional areas to decrease by 14 to 22 per cent. The impact of this would be experienced as an average reduction in depth of 10 per cent at mean water level, after equilibrium has been restored. Such reduction would be noticed only in shoal areas where the river channel crosses from one bank to another.

I congratulate the Minister on this pioneering legislation. I also congratulate Mr Arthur Muhl from the Department of Local Government and other officers who have used their experience and spent a great deal of time in formulating this legislation.

It is also appropriate to congratulate the development company on its courage and faith in the Gold Coast in particular and in Queensland in general, and on the very high standard of resort that it is developing. I extend to the company my best wishes

for a very successful project. With the way it is going about the development, it deserves success.

It is my pleasure to support the Bill before the House.

Mr COMBEN (Windsor) (8.59 p.m.): I am always pleased to speak after the honourable member for Maryborough (Mr Alison), who has often asked me in the past what I think of logging on Fraser Island. Now that he has such a safe seat and the Labor Party need not be so concerned about the seat of Maryborough, I have no hesitation in telling him that I hope the logging of Fraser Island is stopped.

Mr Alison: Every time you come up and say that, you increase my majority by 500.

Mr COMBEN: That is not what happened the last time I was up there, and the honourable member knows that.

The Sanctuary Cove Resort Bill is the legal skeleton from which will be built a \$250m world-class tourist resort at Hope Island on the Gold Coast. The resort, to be called Sanctuary Cove, will have a 400-room Hyatt Regent Hotel, approximately 800 home units, an 18-hole world-class golf course, a 19-ha harbour, a 450-berth marina—the largest in Australia—a man made beach, a filtered sea-water swimming enclosure the size of 18 olympic pools and a village with more than 80 shops and restaurants. There will also be a tennis ranch and a sports centre with gynasium, swimming-pool, spa and sauna and squash courts. A yacht club will be open to residents and visiting yacht crews. An exclusive country club will also be open to visitors.

An article in *The Australian* of 1 June 1985 quoted Tom Ramsey as saying that he had never sighted a more enthralling resort development in his 15 years of covering the world's four great golf championships, the US Masters, the US and British Opens and the US PGA. Mr Ramsey went on to say that the development is more spectacular than anything he had seen in Florida or South Carolina where resorts such as Amelia and Kiawai Islands are quite famous.

The article went on to say—

“The project manager, Mr Neil Griggs, is a Canadian responsible for developing several of Canada's premier winter ski resorts including the outstanding \$175 million Whistler ski community in British Columbia.

Mr Griggs said Sanctuary Cove represented the first of a new generation of resort communities in Australia.

Mr Griggs expected 1.5 million people to visit Sanctuary Cove annually. ‘While this concept is new to Australia, similar resort communities in Europe and North America have been working successfully for many years.

‘The ideal year-round climate and its location are perfect ingredients for success. With new roads and bridges, we will be 35 minutes from Brisbane and Coolangatta airports.’”

The planners and promoters of this project deserve congratulations on the development of such an ambitious project. I am proud of the fact that such a project is taking shape in Queensland and will provide about 2 500 jobs. As the Leader of the Opposition said in his speech on the second Appropriation Bill this morning, the Queensland economy today is depressed and any reasonable development that will create jobs for Queenslanders is to be commended. I am also proud of the fact that Queensland has the climate, scenery and life-style that can and will sustain such an extensive international tourist project.

Having said that, I have no quarrel with the overall concept of the proposal. I wish to mention one area of general concern to me, that is, the environmental aspects of this proposal. It should be stated immediately that the firm of Winders, Barlow and Morrison Pty Ltd, trading as Oceanics Australia, has prepared a report on the environmental impact of the proposed dredging for the Sanctuary Cove development. This impact study

was referred to at length by the honourable member for Maryborough (Mr Alison). He started quoting sections from it. I should say that it was generally available to Opposition members only today. Opposition members were not told that it was in fact available. It is a document of about 60 pages.

At first glance, with its numerous maps and drawings and technical equations on flow charts and so on, it appears to be a substantial document that will add something to our knowledge of the environment in this region and the effects of this proposal on the environment. On a closer reading of the document, it suddenly becomes obvious that the Sanctuary Cove Dredging Proposals Environmental Impact Study is precisely what it says it is. It is an environmental impact study about dredging, and only dredging. From previous proposals that have come before the Chamber to revoke fish habitat reserves and similar landholdings, which require environmental impact studies, Opposition members have come to expect a general coverage of the flora and fauna of an area and an entire study of the local environment in such an environmental impact study. In this instance, none of that is to be found.

The first few pages effectively give only a very quick overview of the area. It mentions a couple of mangrove species. It mentions the salt marshes. It then finishes with an overview on page 7—and this is page 7 out of some 60-odd pages—that the loss of some yabby banks is of concern. Prior to that, no mention was made of yabby banks.

The document has a nice plastic cover. It has been expensively prepared. I notice that one of the partners of the firm that prepared the document is a constituent of mine, a Mr Max Winders. As far as it goes, the document is probably to be commended, but it is of limited import.

Mrs Chapman: Make sure you don't lose the vote.

Mr COMBEN: I do not think I will be losing a vote. Max Winders is a fine gentleman, but I do not think that he has ever voted for me. He is the same style of gentleman as my father-in-law.

The document is of no benefit at all when the environmental impact of this proposal is examined. The Hope Island proposal is, of course, part of the southern part of Moreton Bay. It is an area of wetlands, mangroves and salt marsh. It is one of the most important wetland areas of the entire east coast of Australia.

Mr Alison: In your opinion.

Mr COMBEN: In my opinion—formed after reading a number of learned authorities never considered by the honourable member for Maryborough. We are talking about one of the three major areas of wetlands on the east coast of Australia, which should be preserved at all costs.

Mr Alison interjected.

Mr COMBEN: The honourable member for Maryborough proves his own ignorance. He says that he has read the report on the dredging proposals. It says not one word about the large number of wading birds found there. It says not one word about the birds that are protected under the various international treaties to which Australia is a signatory.

Mrs Chapman: Did you go and have a look?

Mr COMBEN: Members of the Opposition have been down to Hope Island. They have viewed it from helicopters. Every person from Brisbane who is genuinely interested in and concerned about the environment has a broad knowledge of Jacobs Well, Hope Island and the southern area of Moreton Bay. It is an area with which every bird-watcher in Queensland is very familiar. Under the Convention on Wetlands of International Importance, Especially as Waterfowl Habitats, which came into force on 21 December 1975, it ought to be protected.

Mr Borbidge: Your side of the House would qualify.

Mr COMBEN: Pardon? The honourable member for Surfers Paradise again made an inane interjection, which he did not wish to continue. As usual, he has put his foot in his mouth.

A second convention, which came into force on 30 April 1981, resulted from an agreement between the Governments of Australia and Japan for the protection of migratory birds in danger of extinction in their environment. Both of the treaties to which I have referred concerned me deeply when proposals were made earlier this year for a bridge to South Stradbroke Island.

Mr Borbidge: Who were the co-signatories to those treaties?

Mr COMBEN: A gentleman named Donald Horne, who is not known as a supporter of Labor Party principles. On 30 April 1981, as I am sure the member for Surfers Paradise would realise, the country was governed by a good Liberal Government.

Mr Davis: Is there such a thing as a good Liberal Government?

Mr COMBEN: No, there is not. Any Government would be good in comparison with the National Party Government on Queensland, which constantly rapes and pillages our environment, as the member for Maryborough constantly does and as the member for Pine Rivers would do in the Pine Rivers Shire.

Mr Borbidge interjected.

Mr COMBEN: And which the member for Surfers Paradise would do at the Gold Coast.

Mr Borbidge: What about the other co-signatory to that treaty?

Mr COMBEN: There are two treaties. One is the convention to which a whole range of countries are signatories. The other is an agreement between Australia and Japan. I point out to the honourable member for Surfers Paradise that there were only two signatories to it. Both treaties came into being at the time of Liberal Governments. Both were considered by those Governments to be important. It shows just how far right of Atilla the Hun the Queensland Government is when it will not accept in any way conventions and agreements ratified by Federal Liberal Governments. These days, it believes that Malcolm Fraser is a socialist.

Mr Alison: Are you against this project?

Mr COMBEN: I am not. I have already said that. I am against unplanned development, however.

In May 1985, I wrote to the Federal Minister for Arts, Heritage and Environment asking him to invoke, particularly in Queensland, the Convention on Wetlands of International Importance, Especially as Waterfowl Habitats. His reply reads—

“The Japan-Australia Migratory Birds Agreement does not oblige Australia to protect every wetland where migratory or endangered birds occur, but it requires an overall commitment to protection of migratory and endangered birds and of their habitat. The Commonwealth implements the Agreement in areas under Commonwealth administration, including Australia’s external territories.

. . .

Elsewhere in Australia the agreement is given effect by State or Northern Territory legislation. Queensland’s existing nature conservation legislation enables Queensland authorities to assess the significance of natural areas as habitat for migratory and endangered birds and identify and protect areas of particular importance.”

The letter concludes with this sentence—

“Queensland has not nominated any wetlands for the list.”

Queensland is the home of two of the most important wetlands in Australia, one of which is in southern Moreton Bay, and the Government has not nominated either. The Government is not in any way promoting Australia's international agreements.

Mr Borbidge: What would it achieve?

Mr COMBEN: It would achieve a concerted, properly planned development for the southern part of Moreton Bay.

Mr Borbidge: That can be done by the Government without signing any of that rubbish.

Mr COMBEN: The honourable member for Surfers Paradise has said that the Government can do that without any help from anybody. I suggest to the honourable member that he should be moving the Minister for Mines and Energy (Mr I. J. Gibbs) to take action.

On 9 April 1985, in this House, the honourable member for Ipswich West (Mr Underwood) asked a series of questions of the Minister, as follows—

“(1) Has an interdepartmental committee chaired by him completed a report on conservation requirements for southern Moreton Bay?

(2) What are the recommendations of this report?

(3) When will Cabinet consider the recommendations of this report?

(4) When will the report be made public to enable public input into the plans for conservation requirements of southern Moreton Bay?”

In answer to that, honourable members were informed that the Minister had not completed the report and that Cabinet would consider the report when it became available. The impression gained was that Cabinet was not really doing very much.

It is time that the committee made its report so that areas such as Hope Island and southern Moreton Bay that are being raped at present will be controlled by a proper and concerted plan of development. At present, a great cancer is spreading up from the south coast to the north. I hasten to advise all honourable members that that cancer is not the honourable member for Surfers Paradise (Mr Rob Borbidge) but the development that is going on and destroying the mangroves, the wetlands, salt marshes and the area from Peel Island to the south. A whole range of areas is slowly being eaten away by development, with the result that an area which was previously protected by a complete range of regulations that apply in fish habitat reserves and fish-breeding reserves has been done away with.

Mr Davis: The Government will wake up to a silent spring.

Mr COMBEN: As the honourable member for Brisbane Central has said, one day the National Party will wake up to a silent spring. That day will be in October 1986—the day that it will indeed be silenced in this House.

Mr Borbidge: You mean that there will be none of you?

Mr COMBEN: There will be plenty of Labor members after the next State election. From what I have seen of the proposed boundaries of the Surfers Paradise electorate, there will not be many of his colleagues.

I come back to the Bill. An environmental impact study should have been implemented in the area under discussion. Honourable members should have been provided with a working document that properly assessed the extent of birdlife and fishlife that might be affected.

Mr McPhie: What about the crabs and the eels?

Mr COMBEN: The honourable member for Toowoomba North may well refer to his colleagues in this House, but I am talking about the real wildlife in Queensland that is found in the south coast area.

Mr Alison: Would you like to have my notes?

Mr COMBEN: No, thank you.

Mr Bailey interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Row): Order! I think that the levity has gone far enough in the Chamber and that the attention of honourable members should be brought back to the Bill.

Mr COMBEN: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker.

I merely wish to draw the attention of honourable members to a minor matter that appears in the Sanctuary Cove dredging proposal. This document is available for perusal by the honourable member for Maryborough. Figure 3 sets out a picture or a diagram of the Coomera River.

Mr Alison: Can you understand the pictures?

Mr COMBEN: I can well understand them, because the honourable member for Maryborough has shown me how to do that.

The figure sets out a plan of the Coomera River and it illustrates the position of the weir in the upper reaches of the river and the extent of certain gravel extraction permits. The thing that is of interest in this proposal, and is of vital concern in debating this legislation, is that the gravel extraction permit area that is shown in the line diagram clearly extends over certain small islands in the Coomera River that have been set aside from areas that are to be mined for gravel.

It is worthy of note by all honourable members that certain Ministers have said in this House that a certain island will not be mined for gravel; yet that small island depicted in figure 3, with its few trees and with its pair of Brahminy kites nesting there, is being destroyed by a proposal introduced into this House by members of this Government. The honourable member for Maryborough ought to have a close look at that. I will certainly be referring it to the legal gentlemen on this side of the House for further consideration.

To return to the importance of the southern Moreton Bay area as wetlands——

Sir William Knox interjected.

Mr COMBEN: I admit to being a bush lawyer, and that is why I am referring it to other people. The honourable member for Nundah would be giving us an opinion on his own behalf, and using his whole 30 minutes to do so. He thinks that because he was once Attorney-General he can lead this House.

I want to examine the position of Moreton Bay from the point of view of the conference held to develop a national conservation strategy for Australia. On page 17, paragraph j, under the heading "Priority National Requirements", the report of that conference states——

"Manage the impact of development on the coastline, on aquatic resources, on the quality of coastal waters and on critical habitats such as wetlands, estuaries, bays and reefs so that their ability to meet conservation and development objectives is not diminished."

There again is a requirement or a proposal from a whole group of industrialists, conservationists, farmers and ordinary people that there needs to be a national conservation strategy for Australia, and that one of the five requirements is the protection of our coastline——

Mr Alison: Do you realise that your proposal would tie us up with an army of public servants? You would do something to relieve the employment problem, I suppose.

Mr COMBEN: My proposal would mean that the coastline of Queensland would be protected for future generations. The honourable member's children would be able

to see a dugong out in the bay and would know what a mangrove is. If the bay was left to the honourable member's devices, it would be a barren shell. One might as well bomb the place.

The New South Wales Government has just declared a further 16 per cent of its coastline as national park or environmental park, so that now 34 per cent of the coastline of New South Wales is protected in some way. One of the most valuable, fragile and vital areas of conservation needs in Australia is the protection of wetlands and coastline as a recreational resource.

I support the concept of this proposal, but it has to be properly managed. It has to be sited back from the sea-shore.

Mr Stephan: Does that mean you can't fish in those areas either?

Mr COMBEN: If I can go fishing in the Botanic Gardens, I can go fishing anywhere. National Party members do their fishing with a stick of gelignite. As a result of the Botanic Gardens fiasco, I offered to give a prize to the scouts. One of the local groups came back and said, "Mr Alison said that we would be able to win your prize for fishing for eels if we used a stick of gelignite." That is the sort of fishing one expects from the National Party in this place.

The essential thing that should be discussed in this debate is southern Moreton Bay and the effect of these proposals on the environment, which is fragile. There is a need to properly protect Moreton Bay.

Recently, debates occurred concerning the proposed Boondall development just north of Brisbane. I know that the honourable member for Sherwood (Mr Innes) is vitally concerned about that. I can see that he is leaving the Chamber to do some more study prior to speaking in support of my proposals.

Mr Alison: Are you still a member of FIDO?

Mr COMBEN: I certainly am. We have increased our efforts on Fraser Island since we saw by how much the honourable member's electorate has been increased in size. The Labor Party knows that it can win Maryborough on the issue of the logging on Fraser Island.

I was referring to the Boondall development proposals, which are similar to those being discussed here tonight. Don Henry—

Mr Borbidge: Who?

Mr COMBEN: The director of the Queensland Wildlife Preservation Society, a great and honourable guy. I have here a report of a meeting which states—

"Don Henry spoke on the increasing importance of 'natural' environments within urban settings. He said as cities like Brisbane expand those few remaining pockets of bushland, the homes for wildlife, the food producers for fish, the 'green lungs of cities', the peaceful natural places, are easily lost. Unless we want to end up in sterile concrete 'jungles', it is vital that people develop an awareness of, and caring for the remaining natural environment."

Mr Alison: We've got to have balanced development.

Mr COMBEN: I have been told that I should not take any more clownish interjections. I will not take any more interjections from the only clown present tonight.

The report continues—

"The bushland and wetlands at Boondall are important. The mangroves and Melaleucas that are characteristic of this site are not uncommon on a State wide basis, but within the expanding Brisbane area they are becoming increasingly under threat. Brisbane's attractiveness owes much to the patchwork of natural green environments remaining around the city—Boondall bushland is an important part of this."

The importance of that is that tonight honourable members are discussing another part of the greenness that surrounds Brisbane that could easily be destroyed without proper planning. A proper environmental plan is needed in this State. Every other State in Australia has, in some form or other, a development/conservation strategy so that sustainable development can continue together with conservation.

Mr Borbidge: It did not work very well in Victoria.

Mr COMBEN: It is working perfectly well in Victoria.

Mr Borbidge: That was one of the main reasons for the bush-fire damage in Victoria.

Mr COMBEN: Would the honourable member care to explain that?

Mr Borbidge interjected.

Mr COMBEN: I will not take any further interjections from the member for Surfers Paradise.

In Queensland, there is a need to have sustained development with a conservation strategy. That is what the Opposition would like to see in the southern part of Moreton Bay.

As far back as 1976, a coastal management report in dealing with mangrove areas stated—

“As general policy . . . mangrove and salt marsh areas be preserved in their natural condition unless it be shown in future by detailed investigations that such areas are not important to the fisheries and other aspects . . . Exceptions should be made only where there are compelling reasons for such areas to be allocated for essential works, and where small or isolated areas are considered to be not of significant value to fisheries or for other purposes.”

Even though that report has been around since 1976 and the member for Surfers Paradise said that the Government can look after its own in southern Moreton Bay, there still are massive proposals to damage the southern part of Moreton Bay. Honourable members have seen the Raby Bay development; Coomera Island is being subdivided. Recently, a millionaire bought the terrestrial areas of another island in that area. The southern part of Moreton Bay, which is such an attractive area and is of world renown, is being destroyed.

Mr Davis: People build right down to the beaches in “Sufferers” Paradise and then they want us to pay for the damage to the beaches.

Mr COMBEN: That is one of the most hideous things that go on down there. I have never been able to understand it. People build on the fore-dunes. Erosion takes place and the buildings start to fall down. Then the member for Surfers Paradise comes into this place and asks for support to reconstruct the buildings. They should not have been built there in the first place. Those people should not receive any assistance to maintain what is effectively a private enterprise development. The user should pay. The owners of those units should pay. Development should be allowed only back from the foreshore so that the foreshore remains in its natural state. At present, people can drive their cars right down to the beach. Often I have seen the member for Surfers Paradise in his car down there.

Mr Davis interjected.

Mr COMBEN: The member for Brisbane Central says that the member for Surfers Paradise is often down there.

To get further support for the maintenance of mangroves in southern Moreton Bay, I need only look at *The Sunday Mail* of 3 November 1985 and at the article written by that great conservationist Bill Ord.

Mr Alison: Is that the guy with the beard?

Mr COMBEN: That is the guy with the white beard. It is different from mine; I have a brown beard. I know that the honourable member is colour-blind, which is a sign of certain sexual problems.

Mrs Chapman: You are colour-blind. Your beard is black.

Mr COMBEN: The only thing black around here is the honourable member's soul.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Row): Order! I regard that as an unparliamentary comment, and I ask that it be withdrawn.

Mr COMBEN: With pleasure, I withdraw the comment. I know that the honourable member has a heart of pure gold. My father-in-law tells me so, and we argue about it.

Bill Ord, in the column Green Scene, referred to the dugongs found in southern Moreton Bay. He bemoaned the fact that, in many places elsewhere in the world, the dugong—it is called the manatee in the Americas—is, sadly, being hunted or otherwise maltreated to the point of extinction. Bill Ord said—

“Oh, the pity of it, and all the more reason to safeguard our Moreton Bay dugongs by every and all means, not the least being the rigorous preservation of the natural order of the bay's shallows and channels from manmade intrusions.”

Properly managed, developments such as this present no problem; but the way in which this development has been introduced without a proper environmental impact study is a blot on the legislature of this State. It should demand environmental impact studies on 250 ha developments so close to a major city and in a fragile area.

Mr Borbidge: Are you saying that the project should be stopped?

Mr COMBEN: No, I am fully in support of the project. I have no problems with it; but it should be planned properly and placed properly in the environment where it will not do any damage. It is not yet known what the effect of the sewage treatment will be. It is not known what the water run-off from the roads will be. Once the project is developed, it is expected that one and a half million people will be on 250 ha of land, but it is not known what will happen to the waste disposal. A whole range of other matters will also affect the environment.

The proposal put forward at the week-end by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition (Mr Burns) should be implemented. He stated that the Opposition is seeking an all-party parliamentary committee to plan for the future development of Moreton Bay. He said that plans should be drawn up and that they should include Bramble and Waterloo Bays as well as all bay islands, North and South Stradbroke Islands, and Bribie Island. A select committee should review existing decision-making procedures affecting Moreton Bay and recommend desirable changes. Moreton Bay is a rich fishery and recreational resource, and it generates millions of dollars annually from tourism and amateur and commercial fishing and attracts thousands of visitors. A select committee should be set up from members of the Assembly that should plan properly for the development of Moreton Bay.

All developments in the State should have proper environmental impact studies. Indeed, if environmental impact legislation were introduced, this State would be better off.

Mr Stephan: Are there any horses on Moreton Bay?

Mr COMBEN: I would think that they would drown, and if the honourable member is too stupid to realise that, it is not my fault. I remember that when I maltreated a goat, my mother told me that it would come back and haunt me. Tonight it is coming back to haunt me from that side of the Chamber.

Mrs CHAPMAN (Pine Rivers) (9.28 p.m.): I rise to support the Minister on the Sanctuary Cove Resort Bill, which, I believe, will be a tremendous asset to the Gold

Coast area. The development will, no doubt, bring to the coast many man-hours of employment to those persons who may otherwise be unemployed.

The development consists of a resort hotel, which is due for completion by mid-1987. This will be managed by Hyatt International and consist of 265 hotel suites, 235 condominium suites, and associated food and beverage facilities. The accommodation of this development has the potential to deliver to the area a commercial development for retail and service outlets, arts and crafts retail outlets, and workshops associated with these businesses. There will also be constructed a first-class restaurant, marine and retail services, boat rental and instruction facilities, small offices, a tavern and, of course, a brewery on site.

Mr Davis: A brewery?

Mrs CHAPMAN: Yes, a brewery. It will brew the resort's own special lager.

The employment opportunities provided by the development are countless. Car-parking facilities provided will cater for the expected flow of short-term visitors and day trippers to the resort. The complex is not a project of a minor nature. An estimated \$320m will be spent on Hope Island, the site for this absolutely magnificent project.

Mr Davis: It will kill the locals.

Mrs CHAPMAN: If it were left up to Opposition members, we would all be living in tents at Ayers Rock and still paying the Aborigines rent to live there.

Because members of the Labor Party would not move an inch, the people of Australia no longer own Ayers Rock. Members of the Opposition would have environmental impact studies done on absolutely everything. If it was up to them, there would be no places such as Brisbane or the north coast. Members of the Labor Party have a higher regard for trees than they do for human beings. That is where they are on the wrong track.

Along with some of my parliamentary colleagues and some members of the Opposition, I have been fortunate enough to fly over the project in a helicopter. I do not know why members of the Opposition came. They do not seem to favour the project; in fact, I think they are against it. Most certainly, it was plain to see that the sum of money already spent is definitely in excess of \$21.5m.

Mr Davis: I reckon you would fall for the three-card trick.

Mrs CHAPMAN: One thing is for certain; I would not fall for the honourable member for Brisbane Central.

Needless to say, because of its size, this development will have to be done in stages. I am sure that everybody fully understands that the project will be completed within a period of five years. If any member of this House has not been to see the project first-hand—I dare say that the member for Windsor (Mr Comben) would be one of them—and is concerned in any way, I suggest that he take a trip to Hope Island. I am sure that Mr Neil Griggs, the project officer, would be good enough to show him over the project.

All up, approximately 2 500 jobs will be created over a long period. One cannot estimate the number of other industries that will benefit from the Sanctuary Cove development. I ask the House to consider the benefits to the Government alone from, for instance, pay-roll tax, stamp duty and land tax, not to mention the benefits to the local shire council in rates and charges. Can honourable members imagine how a resort such as this will attract visitors from overseas? The first-class accommodation will have every conceivable mod con. The boost to the State's tourist industry will be unbelievable.

The reasons for the Bill are, of course, to change the mode of ownership—in this case, ownership of the harbour that is being dredged from land on Hope Island. That will turn land originally owned by the developers into a beautiful harbour with 400 berths. Because the land will be inundated with water, it is only right that the developers

have the right of ownership of the harbour. At the moment, the future harbour area is 45 acres of land not yet covered by water. When the harbour is completed, obviously the land will be covered with water. Although the developer now has freehold title to the harbour site, present legislation will not allow the harbour to be freeholded. Under the Building Act, the Albert Shire Council is prevented from allowing commercial shops to be built on piles in water—that is, the subdivision of areas over water—which would mean, if allowed, the extension of the Albert shire beyond the high-water mark.

Mr Davis: Did you know that, during the 1974 flood, Hope Island was 15 feet under water?

Mrs CHAPMAN: Was the honourable member there at the time?

Mr Davis: No, I flew over it in a helicopter.

Mr Borbidge: The honourable member is obviously unaware of the drainage works that have been carried out.

Mrs CHAPMAN: That is exactly right. After these developers have completed their work, there will be no flooding in that area.

Because of the way in which areas close to the water's edge, or over the water, are developed, the existing legislation needs to be changed. People are sure to go to look over what in this case will be a beautiful harbour. The Government needs to allow for the plan for floating homes and concrete barges that will be anchored by piles within the harbour. The development also plans shops, restaurants, a yacht club and 60 waterfront villas, each with a portion of their decks and/or verandas adjacent to and over the water.

The Gold Coast Waterways Authority will reap the rates, if they can be called that, from all of this development over the water and, consequently, an amount of approximately \$40,000 per year will be paid in annual fees by Sanctuary Cove. This, of course, will be a positive cash flow, an unexpected bonus, could I say, to the Gold Coast Waterways Authority.

Once this legislation is passed, the harbour becomes the responsibility of the developer, letting the waterways authority off scot-free for any dredging that may be necessary. People often think of Hawaii and Tahiti as islands in the sun, and that it is always best to go to those places for a holiday. Queensland now has Sanctuary Cove, which will consist of an 18-hole golf course, six tennis courts, squash courts, a gymnasium, a sauna, a marina and a boat charter, not to mention a 1-ha swimming-pool enclosure and lawn-bowling rinks.

Mr Davis: How many shares do you have in it?

Mrs CHAPMAN: Unfortunately, at the moment, I do not have any. I would say that, if the honourable member for Brisbane Central is thinking of spending some of that very easily earned money of his, Sanctuary Cove is the place to put it.

Queensland has the weather. Sanctuary Cove will be the spot. It will be quite accessible by an access channel from Paradise Point. While building this channel, the company, through its environmental impact study, which the honourable member for Windsor (Mr Comben) tried to explain to honourable members and only succeeded in confusing himself, has been sure not to disturb the yabby banks situated in the wetlands of the Coomera River.

The company has also decided to reclaim all dredged soil so as not to affect the water quality in the natural wetlands. That proves to Opposition members that developments of this nature can go ahead without any detrimental effect on the environment.

Mr Davis interjected.

Mrs CHAPMAN: I could answer that interjection, but I may offend the honourable member for Brisbane Central if I do so, so I will not.

Opinions from the Water Quality Council and the Queensland Fisheries Service do not view the proposal as a major alteration to existing conditions, particularly in view of its short span of operations. As a matter of fact, the usual control measures employed during the dredging, and the range of natural variation of sediment concentration within estuarian water, are bound to improve navigation between the Coomera River and The Broadwater.

It is important to note that, of the 900 ha of mangroves in the Coomera River system, approximately 4.5 ha of mangroves is on the site. As only 1 per cent of that 4.5 ha will be affected, there will be only a small amount of disturbance to the mangroves in the area. That is hardly significant in such a vast area.

Mr Borbidge: Mr Comben said that they are being destroyed.

Mrs CHAPMAN: The honourable member for Windsor would not know. He gets lost on a horse. I am sure that he gets lost in an environmental impact study.

Mr Davis: He is fair dinkum when it comes to conservation.

Mrs CHAPMAN: The honourable member for Windsor could not even conserve a jar of strawberry jam.

Mr Davis interjected.

Mrs CHAPMAN: It is a pity that the honourable member for Windsor is not in the Chamber to hear it. He does not like being spoken about when he is not present.

The situation of Hope Island makes it an ideal place for the Sanctuary Cove development. It is 15 minutes from Surfers Paradise via the Paradise Point bridge, which will be completed in 1986, 35 minutes from Brisbane via the Pacific Highway and Hope Island Road, and only one and a-half hours' easy access from major population centres through national and international airports, such as Brisbane and Coolangatta.

Mr Davis: You would agree that that bridge is required?

Mrs CHAPMAN: Yes.

Mr Davis: We have been waiting for 14 years for it to be built.

Mrs CHAPMAN: It is absolutely amazing that the Queensland Government will receive such a contribution towards building the bridge. That is wonderful. Because of this development, the bridge will not cost the tax-payers of this State any extra money.

Mr Davis: They have paid their rates; they are entitled to a bridge.

Mrs CHAPMAN: It is not falling back on the council, is it?

Assurance is given that a number of berths will be set aside for use by day trippers using the resort.

The Bill will provide protection for the total residential community of Sanctuary Cove, thus keeping intact the way of life chosen by the community. While I am on the subject of protecting that way of life, I refer to golf buggies. They will have to be registered and will thus be definitely covered by third-party insurance. That will obviate all of the problems envisaged by the Opposition.

The Bill will establish a primary thoroughfare body corporate, which will represent all parties with an interest in land within the complex. That body corporate will be operated and maintained in perpetuity so that access to any initial lot cannot be removed. The body corporate of the development also has a management concept which acts as an umbrella for the large-scale development and will ensure ongoing maintenance for a development of this type.

Mr Davis: What about the second development on Hope Island?

Mrs CHAPMAN: I am talking about Sanctuary Cove at the moment. Let us deal with one matter at a time. That is why Opposition members are confused. They attempt to talk about too much all at once.

Because of the staging of the development over many years, a body corporate of this nature is essential to ensure the protection of the residents over such a long period.

Is the member for Brisbane Central talking about the development that had 15 feet of water over it in the flood? He flew over it by helicopter; so he could not see it, anyway.

The principal body corporate will be responsible and will represent bodies on the site, which includes the operating and maintaining of secondary thoroughfares which are vested in it upon registration of a group titles plan, as well as the administration of the design and development control by-laws. The development control by-laws are designed to control the particular type of development, particularly in buildings, and will safeguard all those who desire to build within Sanctuary Cove. One has no fear, then, as to how the amenities of the area will be protected from the time one purchases land within the site.

Overall, Sanctuary Cove will be a great development, of which Queensland, and, in particular, the Gold Coast and our tourist industry, will be proud.

Mr Davis: Will you guarantee it? I want your word in *Hansard* that you guarantee the development.

Mrs CHAPMAN: Since entering Parliament, I do not even guarantee that the sun will rise tomorrow.

I commend the Minister on his introduction of the Bill.

Mr BRADDY (Rockhampton) (9.43 p.m.): This is the first major legislation of its type relating to private tourist development since the enactment in the Parliament in 1978 of the Queensland International Tourist Centre Agreement Act, which related to the establishment of the Iwasaki resort. This debate, therefore, provides an opportunity to consider the attitude of the Government and of the people of Queensland to developments of this type, with particular emphasis on the safeguards incorporated in legislation.

Some members of the Opposition have had the opportunity of inspecting the Sanctuary Cove area. I am very grateful that the developers gave members of the Opposition as well as members of the Government party a chance to do so. As the shadow Minister pointed out, it is not really the responsibility of the Opposition to decide whether private individuals are going about their business in a sensible way; but it is the business of the Opposition to examine legislation to see whether it is relevant to its purpose and whether the Government is maintaining sufficient control. It is in that context that I wish to speak this evening.

The Opposition says that, in principle, the developers are entitled to go ahead, as long as they are not given special benefits that are out of proportion to those afforded to other residents in the State. The Opposition has no objection in principle, therefore, to development that is calculated and sensibly prepared.

My real concern, however, relates to the responsibility of this Government in relation to both the introduction of the legislation and the way in which the legislation is supervised, because the one previous experience in Queensland has been provided by the Iwasaki resort. This Government has been extremely remiss in the way in which it has carried out its duties in relation to both the legislation itself and, more importantly, the supervision of that legislation. Therefore, in the light of that experience, one can only have certain reservations in relation to this legislation.

The Iwasaki resort was supposed to produce many of the advantages that members of the Government have referred to tonight. It is supposed to produce hundreds—indeed,

thousands—of jobs. It was supposed to provide a great deal of employment in the districts of Rockhampton and Yeppoon. It was also supposed to provide plenty of business opportunities for the people of Rockhampton and Yeppoon, and other people in Queensland. The same sorts of things were said about that project as have been said about this particular project; but what has been the experience with the construction of the Iwasaki resort?

The experience has been that it will be approximately two years behind the expected opening date, if it is opened early in the new year. The 250 people who were supposed to be permanently employed there now, given the expected opening date of 1984, have still not been able to take up that employment. It is significant that some of the impact of the failures arises from the particular legislation that was introduced by the Government.

In that legislation, the Government ensured by its provisions that local authorities were excluded in certain areas, and that is similar to the provisions contained in this legislation. However, I will admit that, under the provisions of this Bill, the local authority has not been excluded to the same extent as the local authority excluded under the Iwasaki resort legislation. Perhaps in that respect, the Government has learnt something.

Section 8 (1) of the Queensland International Tourist Centre Agreement Act, which set up the Iwasaki resort's establishment, contains a provision as follows—

“8. (1) Notwithstanding the provisions of Section 33 of the Local Government Act or any By-law made pursuant to such Section or any Town Planning Scheme in force in the Shire of Livingstone the use of and operations of the Company or any Statutory Authority on the lands described in Schedule A and Schedule B to this Agreement in conformity with the use as designated in Sub-clause (3) hereof may be undertaken and carried out thereon without any interference or interruption by any Local Authority or by any other Corporation or Instrumentality of the State or by any person on the grounds that such operations are contrary to any Town Planning Scheme or Town Planning By-law of any such Local Authority.”

A similar provision is to be found in the legislation that is presently before the House in section 9, which provides as follows—

“9. Town planning provisions. (1) Notwithstanding that the site or any part of the site may at any time be within a zone under any town planning scheme in force in the Shire of Albert, the site or that part shall be deemed not to be within any such zone and the town planning scheme (and any by-laws in force pursuant to section 34 of the *Local Government Act 1936-1985*) shall not apply to the site.”

Of course, other provisions of the Bill are related to that section insofar as town-planning is concerned, and I will come back to that later.

What has happened with the experience of development of the Iwasaki resort? I suggest that that development has been a disastrous experience both from a developmental point of view and from a governmental point of view. I wish to deal firstly with the developmental point of view.

The Act I have referred to provides that the developer is required either to satisfy the commissioner that sufficient water supplies were available or to enter into an agreement within three years with the Livingstone Shire Council to have reticulated town water supplied to the resort.

At this date, about seven years after that provision was introduced into the House, agreement has been entered into: yet, no real adequate water supply for long-term use has been approved. Under the National Party Government, the experience of the people of Queensland has been that the Government does not stay involved, nor does it make developers conform to legislative provisions in cases in which developers have been given special rights such as exemptions from town-planning provisions.

I must say that one can only express the concern that similar events may occur in relation to this resort. This Government seems to believe that, if it passes legislation,

all the good things that are supposed to flow from it will automatically flow, including all the jobs and business developments about which Government members have been speaking so glowingly this evening. As I say, the experience in relation to this Government's ability to supervise its own legislation in relation to these development resorts shows only that the Government is not capable of, or interested in, carrying out its requirements in that regard.

I wrote to the Premier pointing out the various problems that have arisen in relation to the Iwasaki resort. I pointed out that it was about two years behind schedule, that the developers had not signed the water agreement with the Livingstone Shire Council, and that they had not asked Parliament for amendments to the Act, as they are required to do in the event of their not meeting the requirements of the Act. The Premier has yet to reply to me by letter. He has replied publicly to the effect that, "We have got the benefit of this wonderful resort and we should all be pleased and grateful for it."

Everybody knows that the buildings are there, but the building stage should have been completed a couple of years ago. It was, to a large extent. However, the Premier and the Government of this State are allowing a developer, once he starts, to proceed at his own pace and ignore the legislation of this Parliament. It will not be enforced. He will not even be asked to show cause why the agreement should not be changed by a subsequent Act of Parliament, or even told to hurry up and complete the project. He will not be asked to present an amendment if he wants more time to do things, even if the Act requires him to do so. It can be seen, then, why the Opposition does have some qualms about special legislation for special developers, particularly, as I say, where there is any watering down or diminution of the Local Government Act in relation to planning or anything else.

The Opposition is concerned because this Government's performance makes it obvious that it does not supervise. It does not let the developers know that if they do not do the right thing there will be some intervention at a Government level, whether it be by legislation or some other means.

Mr Yewdale: They're not interested.

Mr BRADDY: No. The Government is interested only in producing monuments.

Opposition members would like to see development for Queensland, but that in turn requires the Government to keep its eye on its special legislation for developers. I would like to see the Iwasaki resort operating as it should have been almost two years ago, and with the 250 people who were offered jobs actually working there. Government members are the ones who are not interested in real development, because in relation to the Iwasaki resort they have allowed a deliberate, flagrant flouting of the legislation of this Parliament. They did not enforce the legislation of this Parliament. If they had enforced the legislation, people would now be visiting the resort—if it was fair dinkum—and people would be working there. That is what real development is about; not erecting buildings but getting jobs and businesses going. On that experience, I can only say that some doubt must be cast on this Government's ability to take a real interest in this legislation and the development.

It is not good enough if tomorrow this legislation is passed. As I have pointed out, in several instances the Iwasaki special legislation has been flouted. Government members can bray as much as they like, but the clear facts are that it will be two years behind schedule and still not working properly. People are not working there. The water agreement has not been signed. The developers have not come back to this Parliament asking for an amendment following their failure to comply with the Act as it was passed. There are three clear areas in which they are in breach of the Act, and no Government member can deny that. They are clear instances in which the Act and the agreement have been flouted.

I say to the Government, "Do your job as a Government and insist on these particular Acts being complied with." If the Government is really interested in development, that is what it will do. When Government members announce these projects, they are

interested in making a big splash. They are not really interested in ensuring that the projects reach fruition. In the instance of the Iwasaki resort, the Minister mainly at fault is the Premier and Treasurer. He is defined in the Act as being responsible for the enforcement of the Act. He says, "Well, they built these buildings. The Iwasaki people are good fellows. Leave them alone. They will get there eventually." If that is the correct attitude to adopt, why was a special Act of Parliament passed laying down specifically the agreement and the staged development? That Act was passed to give the Iwasaki resort people special privileges. Similarly, under this legislation, special privileges are being given to the developer.

Our only experience of the Government in relation to developments of this type is that it has been remiss. The Opposition charges the Government to be more responsible and more careful in supervising this development than it was in supervising the Iwasaki resort development. In my electorate and in my neighbouring electorate, people are still looking for the jobs that they were promised in 1978 because of the development that was supposed to come. Those jobs would be there if the Government carried out its responsibilities. Frankly, I have more concern about the supervision of this legislation by the Government than I have about the supervision by the developers themselves. If the Government carried out its responsibilities, it would ensure that the developers carried out their responsibilities.

This Government is interested in monuments, not in development for people. If this legislation, which gives special rights and privileges to the Sanctuary Cove Resort complex, follows the same track as the Iwasaki legislation, again the people of Queensland will suffer a giant let-down. If the Government does not heed the warnings that are given, it will be very much mistaken.

Only last week I was in Yeppoon. Many supporters of this Government in Yeppoon are disgusted with the Government's failure in relation to the Iwasaki resort. It will be interesting to see what happens in the proposed electorate of Livingstone. The people in that area congratulated me and others for raising this matter in the media. They are totally disgusted with the Government's failure to make the developers comply. If the Government wants to sneer and ignore the warnings, so be it. If the Government allows the Sanctuary Cove Resort development to proceed and not comply strictly with the legislation that has been introduced, it will pay a penalty similar to the one that I assure the Government it will pay in the proposed Livingstone electorate at the next State election. The Government has alienated many of its own supporters who expected the development on time and in tune with the legislation.

It is the Government's responsibility to investigate carefully all the background to this legislation. It is the Government's responsibility to ensure that the developers do the right thing. If that is done, subject to all the environmental safeguards that should be provided, the Opposition has no objection to the development. It welcomes development that is carried out in accordance with the legislation and proper developmental practice. It appears to the Opposition that the Sanctuary Cove Resort has possibilities and will bring employment and business opportunities to the people of the region. We all welcome that. The Opposition will not welcome it if, in seven or eight years' time, a member of Parliament has to stand up and say, yet again, that special legislation has failed mainly because there is no will or determination in the Government to supervise the special legislation that it has introduced into the House.

Mr GYGAR (Stafford) (10 p.m.): The Liberal Party supports the Bill, as it supports the concept of the Sanctuary Cove development. It is a bold and imaginative venture, which, instead of the carping criticism that it has received this evening, should receive the enthusiastic support of all members of this House.

I do not mean to say that all members should agree with all aspects of it; but what is very disturbing about this debate is that members of the Opposition do not seem to be able to grasp the idea of where development comes from. Development and progress come from individuals with vision who are prepared to put their money, their time and their efforts behind that vision. That is exactly what is happening at Sanctuary Cove.

The two outstanding features of this debate so far have been the negativism of the Opposition and the apparently appalling lack of knowledge on the part of the Government back-benchers of what is actually going on down there. On the one hand, honourable members listened to Government back-benchers with hand-up briefs (at least on this occasion they could pronounce the words in them, which is an improvement); on the other hand, Opposition members tried to find holes in the legislation that they could pick at. I will deal with a couple of points that they raised.

I was disturbed to hear the honourable member for Wynnum (Mr Shaw) ask whether Australia was ready for such a development and whether the community should allow it to happen in Australia. Australia is ready for it when somebody is game to put his money up to back it. It is not up to the Government to say to people, "We are not going to let you spend your money." It is up to the Government to provide an appropriate framework in which people who want to attempt things that are not contrary to the public interest are provided with an environment in which they can do so. That is what the Bill proposes to do. Certainly, it does contain a number of unique measures, which I will cover later; but just because it is different does not mean that Governments should have the right to say, "Yes" or "No".

Honourable members heard from Opposition members a diatribe about environmental impact statements, and whining that they had only seen such a study half an hour ago. I wonder what they did when they went down to look at the site. Did they all go round with their eyes closed and their mouths shut? I have an environmental impact statement with me tonight that I have had for a fortnight. I asked for it, and it was given to me by the developers, freely and openly, along with every other piece of information that I asked for. I invite Opposition members to say that they were refused anything—information, plans and documents—that they requested from the developers of this project.

One of the striking features of the development has been the aggression, if I may put it that way, of the developers to make sure that anybody who had questions to ask had ample opportunity to have those questions answered. In that respect, they have set a good pattern that could well be followed by any other developers who seek special legislation from this House and from the representatives of the people of this State. The developers of this project were quite non-political about it. They wanted the Parliament to know, and if any members of this Assembly had asked, I am quite sure that they would have been given any support or any information that they required. Had I not known that Opposition members had been to the site, I would have said that they had not been there.

It is not up to the House to tell Mike Gore and his backers where they ought to spend their money or what they ought to spend it on. It is up to the House to determine whether the changes that are required to the legislation should be made, and whether, in the public interest, it is the appropriate time to exercise the discretion that falls within the purview of the House to facilitate this development. The question is not whether the Assembly supports the proposal; the question is whether the Assembly sees anything in it that is against the public interest. If honourable members ask themselves that question, the answer must be a resounding, "No". I have not heard any member mention a substantive issue involved in this legislation that is against the public interest.

One question was raised that, in other circumstances, might be a legitimate one. That is: Is the Assembly letting itself in for another Iwasaki?

The Bill contains nothing that provokes a phased-development program with guarantees from the developer that things will be done and money will be spent at certain times. That was a question strong in my mind until I went there, when that question was immediately dispelled. The money is being spent, and I venture to suggest that the developers are not very many lengths ahead of their bankers in making sure that the resort comes on-stream and generates a cash flow. The structure of it and the way it is being put together and being managed give a clear indication that there is

every intent that the project will, and must, go ahead to ensure the financial viability of the backers and promoters. So the House need have no fear.

As other members have already said in the debate, I do not want to see another Iwasaki development—an open-ended development in which supposed commitments are not met. However, because of the obvious activity that is taking place and that is scheduled to take place in the area, in this project I do not think it is necessary for the House to look for that firm commitment in legislation.

The Opposition asked: What happens if it fails? Well, if it fails, the same thing will happen here as happens elsewhere. The people who backed it with their money will lose their money and there will probably be a mortgagee sale. That is a usual business risk, and it is not the role of this Parliament—I repeat this—to stop people from taking ordinary business risks and from spending their money the way they want to spend it. If this project fails, there will be another helicopter pilot on the market. I think that all Mike Gore will have left will be a helicopter licence and a pair of underpants. If he is prepared to back it, and if his financial supporters are prepared to put their money up, it is not the role of this Parliament to second guess them, either here or anywhere else. I hope that our allegedly free enterprise system has not so deteriorated that the stage has been reached at which the House will stand over people in that regard.

The development has some unique aspects. The ownership of water, or the land under it, is something that has not previously been approached in this State. That does not mean it should not be done. What it does mean is that the House should look carefully at the precedents that are being established by this legislation. The question that must be asked is not whether it is necessarily right for Sanctuary Cove but rather whether a foundation or precedent is being laid here that can appropriately be followed in the future.

One thing that the Parliament must guard against is passing legislation that gives specific advantages to certain people that it will not be prepared to give to others who come with equally meritorious schemes. What we as members of Parliament are doing under this Bill is not saying that we will allow Sanctuary Cove to develop this new and unique form of title, that we will let Sanctuary Cove own the harbour, establish house boats, have these complexes that overlook the water, or have complicated two-tiered body corporate arrangements, or transfer land just to Sanctuary Cove where it abuts the river; we are setting precedents and, as members of Parliament, we have to ask ourselves whether we are prepared to live with those precedents. That is the real question here, because there will be no role for this Parliament in refusing similar concessions to those who come after this project if they can be justified in the way in which this project has been justified.

Are these developments going to work? I do not know. They are unique. I do not know whether Australians are ready for them. But that does not mean that I say the development should not go ahead. If Australians want to invest their money in this form of living in this totally alien life-style—I use the words advisedly, because it is not an Australian life-style at the present stage; it is being imported from overseas—they have every right to do so. It is not for this Parliament to say that these unique proposals should be refused to the people of Australia, either now or later—I emphasise “or later”. If the Government does it now, it must be prepared to do it again. Undoubtedly, wrinkles will be found in the Bill and the project. Things that look good on paper, even with the best will in the world and the best planning, will not work. I suggest very strongly that, when the Government knows how it should work, the role of this Parliament and of this Government is to ensure that, in future, special Bills are not needed. When the Government knows how it should be done, the appropriate head legislation, whatever it might be—be it legislation to deal with harbours and marine, zonings, construction or building permits—should be amended to allow this sort of thing to happen at large.

I hope that, when the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing (Mr Hinze) returns to the Chamber to reply to this Bill, he will give honourable members an indication as to whether or not that is his intention. Is this one-off legislation or is

it to be the trial run for a whole new series of means of ownership, construction and organisation that are now being introduced in this country? If it is not, something is wrong with this Bill. It should not be just for one group of people; it should be for all Queenslanders, and the challenge is to make it for all Queenslanders once the Government knows that it works and that its methodologies are correct.

The Liberal Party has studied the Bill closely. As I have said, Liberal Party members have inspected the Bill. They have been through it chapter and verse, and they have some doubts about it. Liberal Party members have asked some questions, and I must say that all of them have been answered openly, frankly and quickly by either the Government department involved or the developers. However, that does not mean that all of our fears have been put to rest.

I do not know whether the two-level body corporate system will work. I foresee tremendous administrative difficulties and a need for a high level of goodwill and professionalism by all those involved in this project to ensure that it works and that they are flexible enough to be able to adapt their methods and procedures when things do not work. Frankly, I believe that it is a minefield. I do not know how it will be organised, and I am glad that I do not have the job of making it work. I look forward to seeing whether it does or does not work.

I believe that the Bill contains adequate protections for the rights of the individuals who will be affected by it and provisions for appropriate paths of authority to flow down to them. I do not believe that this Bill will allow for the setting up of a concentration camp in the area, which seems to have been mooted. Honourable members have heard all sorts of horror stories. The only thing that was not mentioned was the machine guns on the guardposts and the searchlights sweeping the yards. That is not the intent. All people, apart from a few schizophrenic members of this House, know that. The rights of individuals certainly appear to me to be adequately protected in the Bill. That does not mean that I will not be prepared to say that I was wrong if it does not work out that way.

Mr Veivers: Having two bob each way, as usual.

Mr GYGAR: The honourable member for Ashgrove says that I am having two bob each way. That is a classic example of the way that Labor Party members operate. Unless members of the Labor Party can screw everybody down, regulate them, know when they will get up in the morning and what they will have for breakfast, they will not do anything in case it goes wrong. The honourable member for Ashgrove would make an excellent Stalinist. However, I must tell him that his theory has been tried and it just does not work. If that is typical of Labor Party thinking and what it would do for this State, thank God its vote is so low.

An Opposition Member interjected.

Mr GYGAR: I will divert from the subject-matter and talk about voting. I will begin by talking about the party that just received an 8 per cent swing towards it. Now the honourable member for Ashgrove wants me to return to the Bill.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Row): Order! I think that the honourable member for Stafford should return to the Bill.

Mr GYGAR: I bow to your ruling, Mr Deputy Speaker. I will return to the Bill. However, I cannot help mentioning who are the most popular political leaders and who are the most unpopular political leaders in this State at the moment.

I will give *The Bulletin* a plug. I am sure that it will be well read by the anti-Warburton faction of the Labor Party tomorrow when they see the results of the by-election. Poor old Warbie; he is a great guy but he just has not got it.

I return to the provisions of the Bill. The Government must be prepared to take risks, to do things that look right and seem right, to give developers a go and, if the

concept is wrong, to change it. The problem with the hidebound Opposition is that it can never admit that it is wrong.

Mr Palaszczuk: What are you?

Mr GYGAR: I am certainly not in Opposition. The honourable member again merely betrays his ignorance of the parliamentary system. It becomes embarrassing to be a member of the Parliament when neither the Government nor the Opposition seems to have the vaguest idea of the Westminster system or how it should operate. I could take another diversion, Mr Deputy Speaker, but I am sure you would not let me.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I would show the honourable member how it operates before he did that.

Mr GYGAR: You confirm that you would not allow me to explain to the Opposition the difference between Government, Opposition and the cross benches. Perhaps Opposition members could go back to their books and read about it.

Mr Innes: They are confused by the semicircular configuration.

Mr GYGAR: They are confused by many things, some of them extremely simple.

The Bill deals with something that will be worth while for the State—and that is a category in which one certainly would not include the Opposition. The entire concept behind the development, the efforts that have been put into it, the developers' preparedness to take a gigantic gamble with their money—that is what makes them different from Governments; Governments like to gamble with our money, but these people are gambling with their money—deserve the greatest praise and support from the House. The development might not be perfect, but it is Bills and projects such as this that made Australia great. It is only by the encouragement of such developments, by the provision of the environment in which they may grow and prosper, and by the encouragement and support of the Parliament, that our nation will be restored to what we hoped it would be. If we want to reach the grand vision that we have for our country, I say thank God we still have people who will propose projects such as this and be prepared to back them up. Members of the Liberal Party do not know whether it is right, but we are prepared to give them a go. That is quite a difference from some of the sentiments we have heard expressed tonight, especially by members of the Opposition.

Mr CAMPBELL (Bundaberg) (10.18 p.m.): The Bill has a number of connotations, especially relative to the Bill introduced by the Minister for the abolition of third-party appeals. The Bill effectively removes the public right to object to such developments. Honourable members should be concerned about developments of this type that provide special concessions. My attention was drawn to this by something said by the member for Stafford (Mr Gygar). He asked: What happens if the project fails? Who pays? The question to be answered—and it has certainly not been answered by the Government—is: Who protects the individual who buys into the development which subsequently goes broke? The Government does not know.

An analogy can be drawn with Russell Island, which does not stand out as one of the Government's great achievements. No-one has spelt out how protection will be afforded if the project does not proceed as planned. The Opposition is concerned and has the right to ask that question. Changes are made by the Bill. It provides for staged rezoning, from 1 to 7. One of the provisions is that the development may be changed. If things do not go as planned, the lines can be moved. A brewery is permitted in one part of the development. What happens if people say that a brewery is not a desirable development near houses? People may not like the smell of a brewery, but a brewery is allowed in this development. I believe that these are matters of concern and that these matters have been overlooked in terms of the interests of the individual.

Analogies have been given previously, not only in relation to the special legislation that enabled the Iwasaki resort to be built, but also in respect of precedents that have been set. I did not go down to Hope Island and inspect the development area, because

there was insufficient room in the helicopter; however, it is interesting to note that honourable members who did go came back and said that the development is already taking place and that work on the construction has already begun.

To my mind, that raises a question, because it indicates that the development has pre-empted the passage of legislation through the House. Work has already been undertaken on the assumption that legislation will be passed. In the event that concerns are expressed by residents of the area, redress has been pre-empted because the construction work has already started. That is something about which all honourable members should be concerned. Moreover, the development has already started before the environmental impact study has been completed.

Because no real or complete environmental impact study was undertaken, again the right of the public to question this development has not followed through. When any development is proposed, the right of members of the public should be preserved, as is usually the case when a proper environmental impact study is carried out. An environmental impact study allows interested parties to examine the development, question its impact on the environment, and say whether or not they think the impact of the development will be too great. However, in the case of this development, that has not been done.

The honourable member for Stafford has said that he hopes the development is the first of many and that it will set a precedent for other aspects of development. I believe that the reservations I have outlined should be upheld in respect of this Bill, because the correct procedure for development has not been followed. In the light of what has been said and the provisions contained in the legislation, all honourable members should be questioning whether the correct procedure has been followed.

Speakers on the Government side have espoused the virtues of the development. The role of the Opposition is to voice concerns that are felt about developments of this kind. The concerns arise because of changes that will take place in the environment as a result of development. At that site, wetlands will be drained, filled and developed; yet a full environmental impact study, with the assistance of community input, has not been carried out. The development company did not have a right to go ahead with construction before the environmental impact study was carried out. How can honourable members say that there will be no environmental problems, when honourable members have not had a chance to assess the impact of the development, and when the likely effect has not been examined by experts? How can honourable members be satisfied that the development's impact on the environment has been investigated or questioned, not only by members of the House but also by environmental experts, when the impact study has not been carried out?

Other aspects of the development cause concern. What will happen if the development goes into liquidation? Who will pay? The Government ought to let honourable members know who will pay, because provisions of the Bill set out that, as far as the Coomera River is concerned, the Gold Coast Waterways Authority will not have to dredge the river or the channel. However, if the company goes bankrupt, who will have to do it? It will, of course, be left up to the Gold Coast Waterways Authority, which at present has to pay off \$32m for earthworks involved in stabilising The Spit at Southport. I would like to know where the money will come from when the Gold Coast Waterways Authority is brought into this development.

Another aspect that has not yet been examined relates to the individual and the control placed into the hands of the developer by the by-laws. The by-laws seem to give overriding authority and overbearing powers to the developer that perhaps it should not have. In other words, by virtue of the two corporate bodies, the developer can just about decide to do anything it wishes. It is important to protect the rights of the individual so that when an individual purchases a block of land he will know exactly what he is getting. When people sign up for one of the lots, will they know whether or not they can let the property? Will they know whether they can sell to anybody? Will they know exactly what type of house or structure they can erect? Suddenly, it is said that the body corporate can control the type of structure to be erected. Suddenly, a person will find

that he owns a block of land but it is doubtful whether he can get rid of it. Members must look at what will happen to the individual. I draw an analogy with time-sharing. There are no State laws relative to time-sharing. The developer has been given such wide powers that an individual buying into this resort will be in the same position as a person buying a time-sharing unit for 52 weeks a year. The all-encompassing powers of the developer need to be looked at.

Reference has been made to the ownership of land between the high-water and low-water marks. This Bill is setting more precedents than members have appreciated. Extra care needs to be taken in this area because, suddenly, one might see the development of land on beaches. Care needs to be taken to ensure that overdevelopment of such areas does not occur.

I am also concerned about the lack of real penalties in the legislation. It relates to what is, so far, a \$25m development, but just about anything that the corporate body does wrong attracts a penalty of only \$500 or \$1,000. It seems that no regard has been had to the extent of white-collar crime in Queensland, because such small penalties have been provided for breaches of the legislation.

Another precedent has been set in the granting of Crown land to the company. There seems to be very little obligation on the company to do anything on that land. It seems to have been given a totally free rein. There is nothing to say what can or cannot be done on that land. That lapse must be investigated.

I am also concerned about secondary roads and the fact that the Government is not retaining control over roads giving access to different lots. That control has been given to the developer, through his body corporate, rather than given to a local authority. That is another major precedent that I believe has to be looked at.

I am also concerned about that part of the legislation that provides that the principal body corporate shall not be required to make any payments or provide any consideration for any transfer of land for these thoroughfares. In other words, the developer has also been given a concession that will save it a considerable amount of stamp duty. As a matter of fact, everything seems to be going the developer's way.

The Bill provides that the Companies (Queensland) Code does not apply to or in respect of the principal body corporate. I do not know whether the rights of individuals are fully covered or protected by any other legislation or by this legislation if the body corporate is outside the ambit of the Companies (Queensland) Code. If that is the case, things could go wrong at a later stage.

Opposition members have a duty to raise the issues that they have raised. We hope that the development will go ahead, and will be successful. However, the Opposition believes that the rights of the individual have to be protected. If things do not go according to plan, what rights will the individual have?

A proper environmental impact study has not been carried out. In many ways, the right of the public to question development has been overridden by this legislation. If this is setting a precedent for other legislation, I do not believe that it is in the interests of the Queensland public.

Hon. Sir WILLIAM KNOX (Nundah) (10.31 p.m.): The Liberal Party supports the Bill. This innovative measure will certainly create history in this country. As the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing (Mr Hinze) pointed out in his second-reading speech, this is the first occasion on which this type of legislation has appeared in Australia. The concept is quite common in the United States of America, Canada and certain parts of Europe. I and other members have seen the operation of this concept.

Some years ago, the Building Units and Group Titles Act was introduced into this Chamber. It took about two years for it to be accepted. When it was accepted, it became quite fashionable. Now we are getting into an area in which titles will extend over land that is covered by water and over land that will be created under this project.

The number of people to be employed on the project is impressive. It is certainly not being run by a fly-by-night operator, and it deserves every support.

It is always strange to me how socialists seem to worry about people going broke. The fact that their Federal counterparts are causing restaurants throughout the country to go broke does not matter. Yet, when a project involves tens of millions of dollars, the socialists seem to worry about people going broke. All I say is that there are risks to be taken. People do their homework and they know the risks involved. They take precautions to guard against the risks adversely affecting them.

As I say, they know that the risks are there. Often, because they are prudent people, those risk situations do not occur. Also, those people financing them do their homework and are prepared to take a calculated risk, too. Nothing would be done in this country if the risk-takers or entrepreneurs did not set about doing things that other people said could not or should not be done. The history of this country is peppered with people who have taken those sorts of risks. Many people have gone broke along the way. I wonder why the socialists get so worried about people going broke.

Mr Campbell: Because somebody else pays for it.

Sir WILLIAM KNOX: I shall give the honourable member a good example. I think that the ownership of the International Hotel at Broadbeach has changed hands about three or four times. On each occasion, financial difficulties were encountered. Recently, the ownership of the hotel changed hands for \$23m. Along the way, some people lost money. Does everybody who takes a known risk and gets into difficulties have to be picked up?

Mr De Lacy: Mostly we do.

Sir WILLIAM KNOX: We do not. The Federal Government does not seem to worry about pushing people out of business. It does not rush round to pick them up. According to the member for Bundaberg, people should not do anything if there is a risk that they will go broke.

Mr Campbell: When people sign a contract, they know exactly what they are buying.

Sir WILLIAM KNOX: We live in a community in which people have to inform themselves of those matters. The onus is on them to inform themselves. If they do not want to find out when the information is there to be found out, and if they do not get advice when there are competent people to give them advice, that is something that they have neglected to do.

Surely honourable members do not have to go round holding people's hands for every entrepreneurial exercise in this nation. Where would Australia be if Captain Phillip had to carry out an environmental impact study before he set out on his journey to Australia? He would still be doing it; he would never have got here.

Mr Innes: It was the right of the ALP to pour \$100,000 into Redlands and lose it.

Sir WILLIAM KNOX: If ALP members had their way, that would come out of the public purse. They would pass legislation so that the financing of election campaigns comes out of the tax-payer's pocket, as has happened in New South Wales and federally. They do not think that it is proper to lose money in an election campaign. The great concern expressed publicly by the socialists about people who take calculated risks does not hold very much water.

At this stage, this legislation is a one-off model. As the Minister has pointed out, it may well become a standard. As the member for Stafford suggested, it is to be hoped that this model will become a standard piece of legislation for future developments so that it is not necessary to introduce special legislation on each occasion.

Mr Innes: What about private roads?

Sir WILLIAM KNOX: Under group titles, such as the developments at Mount Ommaney, private roads can be found. The common property is virtually a private road.

The legislation provides for the access of community services, that is, police, fire brigade and ambulance as of right. One would expect that; nevertheless, it is entrenched in the legislation.

As has already been mentioned in this debate, perhaps it is a pity that the thought that went into the development of this project was not applied to the Iwasaki development. If it had been, the hindrances might have been averted and the progress of the project might have been different. What is important is that maturity has been reached in the development of projects of this nature.

The first of its type along the evolutionary track was Centenary Estates, which, over 25 years, has developed extremely well.

Mr Innes: It is a very fine development.

Sir WILLIAM KNOX: It is obviously in the honourable member's electorate, and that is why he is proud of it. It may even be in his new electorate.

The community has taken advantage of strata titles, and group titles have added very much to the standard of living enjoyed by the community.

One of the reasons why this development can take place today, with the prospect of marinas being patronised and with the use of The Broadwater and the watercourses in the area, is the development of the Nerang entrance. The significance of the new Nerang entrance and the effect that it will have on the entire Gold Coast waterways system has been overlooked. It will be eight years tomorrow since I inspected that area.

Mr Lickiss: You will not forget that.

Sir WILLIAM KNOX: I am not likely to. It is known as "Knox's Leap", and I broke my leg in the process. That happened when the Government was first considering the real possibility of developing this new opening for the Nerang River.

Mr Innes: You weren't investigating those submarine leases then?

Sir WILLIAM KNOX: No, but what I did see were the underwater remains of the stumps of buildings that used to be on dry land. They used to be on South Stradbroke Island, but the sand has been eroded and all those foundations are now well and truly under water in The Broadwater, and the stumps of the old hotel can be seen as one goes past in a boat.

The reverse to the situation envisaged by the Bill was the case; an island was disappearing. Honourable members may recall that special legislation was passed by the House a little while ago to cater for any difficulties that may arise from any claims that may be made to those lands.

Mr Comben interjected.

Sir WILLIAM KNOX: The honourable member was not here at the time that legislation was passed.

The new opening to the sea for the Nerang River plays a very important role in developmental projects that will now appear in The Broadwater area of the Gold Coast. The project to which the Bill relates is one of them. I forecast now, as I did then, that The Broadwater will see a very big growth in the boat-building and maintenance industry, an industry that can employ many hundreds of people. That is but one of the possibilities.

Many of the boats that have been passing The Broadwater and going farther north will now be able to call in and use the facilities that will be provided at Sanctuary Cove. So a whole new world is opening up. This sort of project becomes more feasible and interesting because of other developments. I am pleased and proud to have been associated

with that particular operation as it developed. The feasibility studies were conducted, the money put together, and now it is almost ready for use.

One of the features of the Bill is that the local authority is involved. Many operations tend to overlook the role of local authorities. Honourable members will note that, as well as the authority of this legislation, the authority of the local authority is required in regard to town-planning requirements. I hope that the Minister will be able to tell me in his reply what legal process is to be adopted by the resort owners and developers and by the Government and the local authority to ensure that any future change of zoning within the complex—that might be five or 10 years away—is effective and is done with the least amount of delay and inconvenience whilst at the same time taking into account the needs of the people who then live in the area.

At this stage the zoning is pre-ordained. No people are currently living in the area. The zoning of the whole area is pre-ordained by the legislation and the schedule to the legislation. Because clause 8 refers to it, obviously the legislation makes provision for any future change in zoning, whether that be desirable for commercial or social reasons. As I see it—the Minister can correct me if I am wrong—the local authority would have a role to play in that. However, if there is any involvement associated with the schedule to the Bill, any future change of zoning would require amendment to the Act. Perhaps the Minister could explain how that will be attended to if the proprietors and the shareholders think it is desirable to make a change to some part of the zoning of the complex.

I wonder whether this sort of legislation might be suited to the Boondall development, about which much has been said. That will have marinas and possibly canals. If it all goes ahead, a small township of a few thousand people will be established. That does not necessarily assume that the Olympic Games bid will have to be successful, because the project could go ahead without that. I wonder whether this form of legislation could be adapted for that purpose. I am quite sure that this legislation will be the forerunner of other legislation of a like type. I hope that it is successful. With the sort of money that these people have marshalled for this purpose, the project deserves to be successful. I am sure that the usual promotion, letting the world know what the project is capable of doing, will mean that the resort is a success. Liberal Party members hope that it will be and that, at some future time, they will be proud of being associated with the passing of this Bill to enable it to happen.

Mr PREST (Port Curtis) (10.46 p.m.): Opposition members, together with other honourable members, were privileged to inspect the Hope Island development project. The people who are involved in the development of the Sanctuary Cove resort were very open about what they were doing. After speaking with the developers and seeing the work that is being carried out, Opposition members were also impressed. Undoubtedly, Opposition members join with other honourable members in saying that the people who are spending about \$230m to establish this resort deserve all the success that they hope to achieve. The Opposition joins with the Minister in saying that the development will create many jobs. It is a very exiting project.

The project has the full support of the Albert Shire Council—that in itself is very pleasing—because it appears that the developer, at no cost to the council, is taking care of the infrastructure connected with this major development on Hope Island.

Honourable members are told that perhaps approximately 1.5 million people will visit the resort each year.

Mr Shaw: That could be optimistic.

Mr PREST: As the honourable member for Wynnum says, it could be a little optimistic.

In his speech, the Minister said that there are resorts such as this one in Hawaii, Palm Springs, Phoenix and other places. That brings me to the subject of exaggerated figures. Recently, the Minister for Environment, Valuation and Administrative Services (Mr Tenni) was talking about Phoenix having a population of 4 million people and only

100 firemen. However, that was corrected in the "Day by Day" column in *The Courier-Mail*, which pointed out that, in 1984, the Fire Protection Directory stated that Phoenix had a population of 690 000 people and 800 firemen. I suppose that, if the Minister went on a short trip to Phoenix at the expense of Queensland tax-payers, he would find that his figures were somewhat misleading.

When one considers that the resort will have about 900 units or houses as well as golf courses, swimming-pools, tennis courts, squash courts, lawn bowls rinks and a sauna, 30 000 visitors to a 252-hectare island seems a tremendous number of visitors. I suppose many other facilities, such as cricket or football fields and netball, hockey, softball and croquet facilities will be necessary. Many other sporting amenities will have to be provided to cater for the needs of the people who will live at the complex permanently.

It is understood that people who purchase a block of land will build a home on it solely for their own use. The rental of premises will not be permitted. With the approval of the body corporate, a lease may be entered into for a period of longer than 12 months. Such provisions must be made known to those buying into the development. With the passage of time, problems may arise, although the Opposition sincerely hopes that everything flows as smoothly as the investors and developers are hoping.

I am concerned about the amount of money owners would be asked to contribute to the body corporate for maintenance if the development is not successful in the early stages. I trust that that will be pointed out to purchasers when contracts are drawn up and that people will enter into transactions with their eyes open. The complex is not for the average worker—for the low-income-earner. It will be an expensive, high-class resort.

Everything has been said that ought to be said. I echo the sentiments of the Opposition spokesman (Mr Shaw) that we wish the developers well, but that we will be following the progress of the development. Local authority requirements will be complied with in every shape and form. As the leader of the Liberal Party (Sir William Knox) said, it is an exciting development, as a result of which similar complexes will follow in other parts of Australia.

Debate, on motion of Mr Wharton, adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. C. A. WHARTON (Burnett—Leader of the House): I move—
"That the House do now adjourn."

Practices in Horse-racing Industry

Mr PREST (Port Curtis) (10.54 p.m.): I wish to address matters of concern in Queensland's horse-racing industry. In the last few months, on major racecourses in Queensland, punters have witnessed one ring-in and many shocking form reversals, but not a thing has been done by stewards to give an explanation to the public. It ought not to be forgotten that \$500,111,322 was invested on the TAB in the 1984-85 year. In addition, millions of dollars is placed with on-course book-makers. The matter of the ring-in is before the courts; so honourable members may not advert to that. However, one may ask: Why are more people placing money on Sydney and Melbourne horse races than on Queensland races? It is because of the form of horses that race in the southern cities, which is more consistent than that of the horses that race in Queensland. Let me ask the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing (Mr Hinze) just what is the real reason why three very good horses from one stable were close to a state of collapse. Let me also say that I have the utmost faith in the trainer, Jim Griffiths, a person who has been involved in the industry for many years, whose record is very good, and whose character is unquestionable.

From one stable, three very good horses were on the point of collapse and fears were held for the life of Prince Strome earlier in the year. However, he recovered and

raced a short time later. Then Lord Penn finished a couple of hundred yards last when heavily backed by members of the public, and fears were held that that horse may have had a heart condition. Again, he raced within a couple of weeks, and has in fact won on more than one occasion since that time. The third horse from the stable was Basic French, which was taken to Melbourne and entered in a race there. That horse also almost collapsed and was returned to his stable in Queensland. She is now ready and fit to race again.

I admit that two out of three of the horses were not in a race when they were affected, but it surely cannot be considered a coincidence that all three horses that were affected came from the one stable.

Let me now examine the contents of the steward's report and see whether the stewards did inquire into all or any one of the performances of these horses. Surely, if Lord Penn was suspected of having a heart condition when he finished last as a favourite, he should have at least been turned out for a long spell or possibly banned from racing, even if only in the interests of protecting the jockeys from injury and not thinking in terms of giving the public a fair chance of success.

Basic French was in a state of near collapse after a trial, and Neil Williams said that he feared that Basic French would collapse after her sizzling gallop. He said—

“The sweat was pouring out of her and she coughed something awful . . . She's pretty crook.”

Jim Griffiths had trained Basic French and she sped over 600 metres in 36.75 seconds. However, the mare is unlikely to speed again before 1986. That opinion was expressed on 18 October 1985; yet on 5 November, that horse has been nominated to race again. If it had not been for the condition of the track, that horse would have raced today.

Members of the Opposition believe that if a horse is near a state of collapse, or if it is suspected of suffering from a heart condition, it should not be racing. The stewards should do everything possible to inform the punting public as to why the form of that horse was so bad. I refer particularly to Lord Penn.

I understand that a movie will be made about the racing industry in Queensland and that it will focus on the Fine Cotton affair. There can be no doubt that if a movie is to be made in Queensland, consideration should be given to making a serial instead. The film could be made in serial form, because what is going on at Queensland tracks happens not in one week but week after week, month after month, and year after year. Not a thing is being done about it.

Time expired.

Persian Carpet Sales Companies

Mr BAILEY (Toowong) (10.59 p.m.): I return to the subject of carpet rip-offs tonight, and concentrate on a Brisbane company that has mounted a public relations campaign to attempt to convince the public that its proprietors are totally upright businessmen who made just one error of judgment, but apart from that are wonderful, honest and upright carpet-dealers.

Mr De Lacy interjected.

Mr BAILEY: I thought the honourable member for Cairns would be interested in this matter.

This company, Dela Persian and Oriental Carpets, of Adelaide Street, is not even a company. It is a trade name, which makes it rather difficult for the Trade Practices Commission to do a great deal to the operators.

I am also surprised that the two operators, Ayaz Haffaz and Ahmad Djaffari, did not bother to read the transcript of my speech, which is available in *Hansard*, because they have circulated a letter to members which is almost as inaccurate in its contents as their misleading advertisements have been.

It is worth while to clear up straight away that I am not accusing these people of involvement in drugs, or offering buy-back deals, but, as I told them and the media, their specific method of conning the public is by way of misleading advertising, price manipulation and selling carpets of dubious quality.

Having visited their premises at their invitation, I was told that they had placed the "Under threat of receivership" advertisement, the one I have here in my hand——

Mr Davis interjected.

Mr BAILEY: I notice that the honourable member for Brisbane Central is not in his correct seat but that he is still allowed to shout as usual. I was told that that advertisement, which announces the most outrageous prices and reductions, had been placed on their advertising agency's advice, but that that was the only time they had done such a thing and how awful it was for me to attack them for one mistake. I notice that the Trade Practices Commission was not overly impressed by their reasoning.

Having heard this argument I did more research. Lo and behold! In the editions of *The Courier-Mail* back in March of this year I found more classic fraudulent claims.

One was headlined "Financial Collapse", then stated in smaller print "overseas supplier", and then the claim "over 70% off".

Firstly, it is impossible for a Pakistani supplier to get into that financial trouble, because in Pakistan the Government sets the prices and takes over any company that might fail, so that minimum prices are set and kept. That can be confirmed by the Pakistani Embassy in Canberra.

The only other major supplier to Dela and other companies world-wide is a company in Britain called Kelaty. It is a vast operation with almost a monopoly on most oriental carpets. It is still going strong.

I refer once again to the extraordinary prices that were advertised. The Princess Bokhara—which, by the way, is not a Princess Bokhara but a Saroq—costs \$370 to land here wholesale. Dela claims that the carpet is worth \$1,875 and that it has reduced it to just \$700.

Members can just imagine what will happen when the investor goes to resell that carpet in a few years' time. The price would be unlikely to be very much more than he paid, but the purchaser would think that his so-called bargain would be worth much more than the almost \$2,000 he paid. If that is not deceit and fraud, what is it?

Mr Haffaz and Mr Djaffari feel that, because they are not into the really expensive carpet rip-offs, they have been maligned. I have news for them. To the client with little money a rip-off of \$100 or \$500 can mean as much as thousands to someone more wealthy, and I do not find an argument that they deal with the lower end of the market an excuse; in fact, I find it even more contemptible that they are conning people with virtually no capacity to pay.

I now return to the advertisements. The Afghan Bokhara that is advertised is not an Afghan but a Pakistani carpet. The Isphahan silk base carpet is advertised at \$5,950 reduced to \$1,950, an impossible price and a ridiculous and totally fraudulent claim.

One of the other problems that the uninitiated face is with the quality of the products. At least one other oriental carpet dealer in Brisbane makes a very good living repairing poor-quality Persian or so-called Afghan carpets when they unravel. It is a matter of buyer beware and deal with those that have unblemished reputations.

The advertisement was run as part of a campaign, but the final advertisement did not bother to mention that it was an overseas company that had collapsed financially.

The advertisement just says, "Financial Collapse". The inference for those seeing it for the first time is that Dela was in trouble. The advertisement was almost identical to the "Under threat of receivership" advertisement which Dela ran again in August.

I have not had time to look further into its advertising, but I find it amazingly similar to advertisements run by very suspicious companies that have already been prosecuted in the south, and yet Dela claims that it is totally above board in its operations.

Once can be a mistake; twice can be stupidity. But how many times can Dela get away with it before it becomes straight cheating of the public on a grand scale?

An enormous number of people have been caught not only by Dela but by operators who are much worse. It is up to the buying public to check out the real value of their potential purchases before buying and be very cautious, because there is a smell of putrefaction surrounding the dealings of quite a number of oriental rug dealers.

Time expired.

Cairns Base Hospital Coronary Care Unit

Mr De LACY (Cairns) (11.4 p.m.): I want to use this Adjournment debate to raise once more in the House the problem of the coronary care unit at the Cairns Base Hospital. As honourable members may or may not know, a coronary care unit was established at the Cairns Base Hospital about 18 months to two years ago. It has been fitted out with expensive electronic cardiac monitoring equipment, but it has never been opened because the hospitals board has not been able to provide sufficient people to staff it. Unfortunately, most of the equipment ran out of its warranty period without ever having been used.

In a speech in this Chamber on 29 August, I drew attention to this issue and referred to the whole exercise as demonstrating shoddy planning, inefficient use of tax-payers' money and a general run-down of the health services in Queensland. The people of Cairns are concerned not only about the waste of tax-payers' money but also that this facility is badly needed in the area. The Cairns Base Hospital is the central hospital for the whole of the far-northern area. Heart patients in that hospital have to use the intensive care unit which, in some instances, does not provide the best environment for people recovering from a heart attack.

In the last few weeks, the matter has been complicated by the Government's announcement, as an election gimmick, that it will construct a new 40-bed hospital in Redlands to the value of \$4m. How does the Government intend to staff a completely new hospital when it cannot staff the wings and different units in the hospitals that presently exist?

This matter has become a public issue in far-north Queensland. It has been consistently in the media and has been the subject of a number of editorials in *The Cairns Post*. I note that the Mulgrave Shire Council discussed the matter at a recent meeting and undertook to contact the Minister for Health directly. The local branch of the Australian Medical Association has written to me, to the Minister and to the Cairns Hospitals Board, as has the Cairns Base Hospital Specialists Association. The Queensland Nurses Union is circulating a petition calling on the Government to provide the necessary staff to make this much-needed facility operational. That petition is circulating in Cairns. I understand that many hundreds, if not thousands, of signatures have been attached to the petition, and, in the near future, I hope to present it to Parliament.

I have taken the matter up with the Minister for Health. I must compliment him. When I take something up with him, he is prompt in his response. For some time, we have been exchanging correspondence. In a letter dated 4 September 1985, he said—

“As I advised in my letter of 3rd July, 1985, staffing of the Coronary Care Unit at Cairns Hospital has been listed by the Cairns Hospitals Board in its 1985/86 staff submission. This application will be considered following the State Budget announcement of the numbers of staffing positions available for 1985/86.”

The Premier and Treasurer said that 270 additional nurses would be provided for the Queensland hospital system. The people of Cairns were hoping that sufficient nurses would be provided from that allocation to staff the coronary care unit.

Subsequently, on 9 October, I received the following letter from the Minister—
“... the Cairns Hospitals Board has been given approval to increase its staff establishment for the Coronary Care Unit as follows:—

Registered Nurse 4-1”

I contacted the Cairns Hospitals Board and was told that the ratio 4-1 means four full-time staff positions to one shift position. That makes 21 shifts a week, which of course, is the employment of one person round the clock.

I understand that the Cairns Hospitals Board has written to the Minister. The question that I ask is: How can a coronary care unit be staffed with a single person working round the clock? The board has asked the Minister to clarify the position. I hope that he can. I suppose the Minister was hoping that the board would be able to provide staff from other sections of the hospital. The rest of the hospital is already understaffed. There is no way in which scarce staff can be provided from other sections of the hospital. I hope that the Minister will look at this matter and provide staff for the hospital.

Time expired.

Mudginberri Abattoir Dispute; Legal Aid

Mr INNES (Sherwood) (11.9 p.m.): Tonight, I rise to call for legal aid from private sources to be sent to the people fighting the Mudginberri Abattoir court cases. At this point, a bill of over half a million dollars has been incurred in fighting a variety of actions. The end bill is likely to be \$1.5m.

At the top end of the Northern Territory—on the Marakai Plains, in the plains surrounding the Alligator Rivers and in the low country of Arnhem Land—very little happens in the wet season. This year, not only will the buffalo-killing works be closed down, as will many other enterprises in northern Australia, but Mr Pendarvis will have to come south to pursue the court actions.

That man, with initiative, drive and an enormous financial commitment to his small, family company, decided to make money and an enterprise out of the buffalo-meat industry. He decided to do it lawfully. He approached the Arbitration Commission and sought a special award for the circumstances of the abattoir that he proposed to open. As a result, a Northern Territory meat-workers award was made, bearing in mind the special circumstances at the abattoir at Mudginberri.

Mudginberri is 250 km to the east of Darwin in a remote location where there is little to do apart from work, and when the work is done and the workers have made their money, they leave and go to other places. That is what Mr Pendarvis intended; that is what his workers want.

The award that was entered into involved a contract rate for killing, not the usual tally rate that applies, particularly in those abattoirs that are close to settled areas in which people can live in some comfort in a suburban or town environment. Everything was done lawfully. The commission investigated abattoirs round Australia, it investigated the proposed site at which Mr Pendarvis intended to operate his facility, and it decided that it was a special case, and an award was granted. Mr Pendarvis complied with the award and honoured his part of it, with the result that his workers gained and could earn up to \$1,000 a week, which is more than they could earn under the tally system.

Of course, the unions moved in. Despite the lawfulness of the award and the complete propriety of the employer's seeking such an award, the Australasian Meat Industry Employees Union ordered its members working at Mudginberri to cease work. That led to the dispute, which led to the picket, which led to the Commonwealth Government-sanctioned or connived disappearance from the site of the Commonwealth meat-inspectors, rendering all operations at the site and export from it impossible.

Mr De Lacy: One thing that you forgot is that he has a pathological hatred of trade unions and that he is conducting a vendetta against them.

Mr INNES: That is the rubbish that I would expect to come from the mouth of the honourable member for Cairns. It is absolute nonsense. One could not find a quieter man. If he had a pathological hatred of trade unions, he would not have gone lawfully through the Arbitration Commission, within the existing and established arbitration laws—

Mr Davis interjected.

Mr INNES: Now the unionist is talking; the honourable member for Brisbane Central has joined the fray. Trade-unionists will never accept any decision that is not completely to their liking, but employers and everybody else are supposed to abide by the letter of the law all the way along the line.

Mr Pendarvis had contracts with Taiwan for buffalo meat worth \$2.5m. He had contracts in Sweden that would have contributed export earnings worth \$5.5m to Australia this year.

After taking the unions to court, after risking his own hide and his family investment in legal costs of the order of \$500,000, and after pursuing his legal rights, the net result for this year will be only a \$2m take from the lawful operation of his abattoir.

The National Farmers Federation and the Australian Small Business Association have set themselves up as sponsors, supporters and vehicles of voluntary donations. Business, large and small, throughout the length and breadth of the land should support the brave stand by this small operator in the Northern Territory of Australia on a very important and fundamental principle. That principle is the upholding of the law by both parties.

Time expired.

Boating Facilities

Mr EATON (Mourilyan) (11.15 p.m.): I wish to mention the Government's policy of absolving itself from any responsibility for harbour and other maritime services. With a coastline as long as this State has, I know that is not an easy job, but the Government is absolving itself from its responsibilities by, in many cases, trying to get local authorities, port authorities or harbour boards to take over the responsibility for servicing the facilities required by the boating public and ship-owners.

If this State is to be developed, the responsibility for that development lies with the Government. It is the administrator of the departments and it has the duty to set an example by not only building these facilities but also maintaining them for use by the Queensland public, particularly when the Government claims credit for attracting people to Queensland. The facts prove that many people are coming to Queensland because they believe they have a bright future here. The pioneering attitude towards development in Queensland has come about not because of the newness of the developments but because of the lack of Government support. That keeps many developers in the pioneering era.

I wish to deal with the proposed closure of the Clump Point jetty in my electorate. I shall highlight this matter in an endeavour to display the Government's common sense in constructing that jetty more than 20 years ago to aid in the development of the area, which has practically reached its peak. A number of projects have been commenced. Because they are being built in stages, they are not yet complete. In the next 12 months to two years, \$15m worth of development will take place in the Mission Beach/Bingil Bay/Clump Point area.

The Government spent a great deal of money in constructing the jetty. Through the provision of that facility, the area progressed. However, if the jetty is closed, the tourist boat owners will not be able to operate from there seven days a week and will not be able to provide a service for tourists and holiday-makers to enable them to enjoy a wonderful day touring round the islands—Dunk Island, Bedarra Island and Beaver Cay—and the reefs in the area, and interstate bus operators will no longer bring their

passengers to stay in the area for a couple of nights. No longer will they stop and enjoy the beauty of the north Queensland rain forests, the Great Barrier Reef and the many tropical islands in the area. Not only should the Government provide more boating facilities but also it should keep up the maintenance of the existing ones so that tourist operators and others can expand their operations without any concern or worry.

I know of the trouble that the Government has caused by closing jetties in other areas. The proposed closure of the pier at Urangan caused quite a furore. As a result, in its wisdom and with a great deal of charity, the Government decided to dismantle only half of it. The local people and the tourists are making good use of the remaining part of the jetty. People have been going to that area for many years. The Urangan pier was established long before the development of the Mission Beach area, which has shown rapid and great development over the last few years. I am sure that, in the future, many people will return to that area with their children or grandchildren and reminisce about the early days that they spent there.

The Government has to take into consideration the amount of help that it should provide to those who wish to carry on business in the area. If the wharf is closed, two operators with three boats operating seven days a week will be faced with great difficulties. The jetty has fuel and water facilities for boats. The next closest place for fuel and water is Mourilyan Harbour. However, by the time the operators went up to Mourilyan Harbour, returned to Clump Point and did their trip to the reef, they would find that they had insufficient fuel to complete the round trip to Mourilyan Harbour. I appeal to the Government to take into consideration all the benefits that have accrued so far and the projects that are under way.

Time expired.

Postal Workers Embargo on South African Mail

Mr BOOTH (Warwick) (11.20 p.m.): In the Adjournment debate, I will comment on union action that I believe is particularly foolish and ridiculous. I will not bash unions. That is not the way I go about things. During the week, several people approached me about action that they believed was quite wrong. Those people had endeavoured to post mail to South Africa.

When people approach the post office to buy a stamp for or to post a letter to South Africa, they are immediately told, "You can put a stamp on your mail and post it, but it will never be delivered." People are not told why or when the embargo was imposed or what good it will do.

I suppose that some people are bitterly opposed to apartheid and they believe that any action that damages South Africa will stop apartheid. That is quite ridiculous. One person who approached me told me that he wanted to post a bereavement card to South Africa. Another person wanted to send a letter to a friend in South Africa whom he knew had been sick for a lengthy period. He wanted to express his sympathy to her. It is quite possible that the people who would receive such letters may be opposed to some of the things that people find objectionable about the present South African Government.

The action being taken by the postal workers will damage everybody in South Africa, irrespective of their colour, creed or any ideals that they might have. In the final analysis, in trying to harm the South African Government, such action will probably embitter all the people in South Africa, and that bitterness will flow on. Australia could find that it has done a certain amount of harm.

Some people think that they can influence the South African Government and damage it by the banning of sporting links with that country. I am not convinced that that is so. The strike by the postal workers is even more foolish. I am not sure that the economic sanctions being discussed will be effective either. I believe that it would be better for Australia to try to make an impact merely by saying that this country believes that the South African Government should change its ways, if that is the case. It seems to me to be quite irrational to say suddenly, "You cannot post a letter to South Africa

regardless of the content of the letter." In my opinion, when such action is taken, it is unionism gone mad.

I do not believe that the average person working in a post office would be interested in a letter going to South Africa. The postal workers have simply been given an instruction to tell everybody who wants to post mail to South Africa that it will never get there. I do not believe that that is in the best interests of anyone. It is certainly not in the best interests of Australian and South African relations. I believe that the effects of the strike will be varied and that, in most instances, all that Australia will get from it is a tirade of bitterness from the great majority of people who live in South Africa.

If Australia wants to influence other countries, it must realise that the actions of some people to try to straighten others out by the banning of postal services, the placement of economic sanctions or the banning of all sport will result, one day, in Australia being faced with the same type of international ratbaggery. Australia should start to think about what it is doing. It should only take such action as will have a good impact. I do not believe that across-the-board action should be taken. It would be very dangerous to do that.

I believe that the Australian Postal and Telecommunications Union should think twice about the action that it is taking. If that union feels that it wants to make a protest, it should put a time limit on the current embargo. At present, no-one knows how long it will continue. It may go on for years, or even for ever. In my opinion, the embargo is quite foolish, and a time restriction should be placed on it.

Motion (Mr Wharton) agreed to.

The House adjourned at 11.25 p.m.