Queensland

Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

THURSDAY, 13 MARCH 1986

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

THURSDAY, 13 MARCH 1986

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

PRIVILEGE

Sale of Lindeman Island to East-West Airlines (Queensland) Pty Limited

Mr WARBURTON (Sandgate—Leader of the Opposition) (11.1 a.m.): I rise on a matter of privilege. I remind the House that the Governor in Council has caused a revocation proposal to be laid on the table of the Legislative Assembly. All honourable members must be concerned that, despite the withdrawal of East-West Airlines from the Lindeman Island deal, the Minister for Tourism, National Parks, Sport and The Arts (Mr McKechnie) has not taken the opportunity afforded him under the provisions of Standing Order 54 to withdraw his motion seeking the agreement of the House to revoke the greater part of the Lindeman Island national park.

It is not my intention to move again that he do so, but until he accepts his responsibility in this important matter, Queenslanders will remain unsure of the Government's intentions. The Minister has the opportunity to act today. I believe that the majority of members in the House would urge him to do so.

PETITIONS

The Clerk announced the receipt of the following petitions—

National Park, Lindeman Island

From Sir William Knox (41 signatories) praying that the Parliament of Queensland will reject moves to eliminate or reduce the area of national park on Lindeman Island.

[Similar petitions were received from Mr Innes (294 signatories), Mr Gygar (111 signatories) and Mr Lee (130 signatories).]

Electricity Industry Inquiry

From Mr Innes (274 signatories) praying that the Parliament of Queensland will provide for an inquiry into the electricity industry to ensure efficient services.

James Cook University

From Mr McElligott (675 signatories) praying that the Parliament of Queensland will allow students at the James Cook University to retain their control of student affairs.

Petitions received.

PAPERS

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

Report of the Licensing Commission for the year ended 30 June 1985.

The following papers were laid on the table—

Orders in Council under—

Rural Training Schools Act 1965-1984 and the Statutory Bodies Financial Arrangements Act 1982-1984

Grammar Schools Act 1975-1984 and the Statutory Bodies Financial Arrangements Act 1982-1984

Auctioneers and Agents Act 1971-1985

Elections Act 1983-1985

Inspection of Machinery Act 1951-1982

Regulations under—

Elections Act 1983-1985

Inspection of Machinery Act 1951-1982

Private Employment Agencies Act 1983-1985

Prisons Act 1958-1974

Report of the National Companies and Securities Commission for year ended 30 June 1985.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

Bartlett Property Trust

Hon. N. J. HARPER (Auburn—Minister for Justice and Attorney-General) (11.4 a.m.), by leave: My statement to the House is about the Bartlett Property Trust. It is important that, in view of wild accusations that have been made in the House over the past two days by the member for Woodridge, the Parliament and the investors in the Bartlett Property Trust are informed as to the correct position relative to the trust.

Property trusts are constructed to include protective mechanisms for investors. The property is vested in a trustee and it is the duty of the trustee to act in the interests of the unit-holders. No statement has been made by me previously, since I believe that the protective mechanism should have been given an opportunity to work. Now that Queensland Trustees Ltd has appointed a receiver of Bartlett Property Management Limited, the management company of the trust, I set out for reasoned consideration the sequence of events leading to the present position.

On 27 February 1986, Mr A. Kootsookos advised the manager of the Brisbane Stock Exchange by letter that he had become aware, on 13 February 1986, that the trading results and liquidity position of the Bartlett group might well adversely affect the Bartlett Property Trust. With the concurrence of all other directors of Bartlett Property Management, Mr Kootsookos made arrangements for Queensland Trustees Ltd to be informed.

On the same day, Sir Thomas North and Sir Frank Moore advised the chairman of the Brisbane Stock Exchange that the recent trading operations of the Bartlett group of companies might possibly result in diminishing the interests of unit-holders in the Bartlett Property Trust. The possibility had become known to them only in the previous few days. Having discussed the position with Queensland Trustees Ltd, they had resigned as directors of the trust.

On 28 February 1986, Queensland Trustees Ltd made a public statement. The company referred to Mr John Bartlett's informing it that week that the Bartlett group of companies had a significant liquidity problem. Although the trust was in a liquid position, the trustee expressed concern that the market be informed of the possible impact of the liquidity problems of the group on the trust and on the ability of the guarantor companies to the trust to meet their obligations. The trustee concluded that it was urgently considering the actions available to it to protect the interests of unit-holders in the trust. Also on 28 February 1986, the Brisbane Stock Exchange asked Mr John Bartlett to comment on the statement made by the trustee.

On 3 March 1986, Mr John Bartlett provided a detailed response to the trustee and the stock exchange, and this information was made public by the stock exchange the following day. The information provided by Mr Bartlett provided an overall view of the financial position of the Bartlett group and the Bartlett Property Trust.

In particular, in relation to the group, Mr Bartlett said—

> "The group currently has severe liquidity problems which can be resolved only by the injection of further funds and the continuation of the realisation of assets now underway. The liquidity problem arises from a slow-down in the property market caused by the high level of interest rates combined with substantial borrowings."

And all honourable members know, Mr Speaker, who is responsible for those high interest rates!

In regard to the trust, Mr Bartlett mentioned as part of the current status—

> "The Bartlett group's ability to continue to generate the level of income streams required to pay rentals may be affected seriously if the Bartlett group is unable to resolve its liquidity problems."

On 5 March 1986, the trustee made a public statement advising that it had appointed investigating accountants to obtain urgent information on the financial status of the group.

On 7 March 1986, a provisional liquidator was appointed over three of the Bartlett group of companies at the request of an unsecured creditor. Following that, on 10 March 1986, a secured creditor appointed receivers of certain of the group companies.

On 12 March 1986, the trustee announced that it had appointed receivers of the management company. The statement advised that the appointment was agreed to by Mr Bartlett, who would provide his continued co-operation. The appointment will give the receivers the requisite status to continue their investigations into the financial affairs of the lessee companies of trust properties and to make recommendations to the trustee in respect of any realisation of assets and any related matters. The trustee also advised that it is proceeding with the appointment of valuers to obtain current market valuations of trust properties.

Contrary to the allegations made by the member for Woodridge, it is clear that the investors in the trust have been kept informed by public statements about recent events.

Queensland Trustees Ltd has acted swiftly and decisively to ensure that the interests of the unit-holders are properly protected. Yesterday's appointment of receivers of the management company will enable the correct decisions to be made concerning the future of the trust. The trustees have already said that they will write to unit-holders directly as soon as more complete information is obtained, and I expect that there will be a meeting of unit-holders at the proper time.

The units remain quoted on the Brisbane Stock Exchange and therefore a market exists for dealing in them. After serious and detailed consideration, the committee of the exchange has exercised its discretion and allowed the units to continue to be quoted.

The member for Woodridge has made allegations about two of the three directors who have resigned. He has done this in ignorance of the provisions of the trust deed. One of the protective mechanisms in the deed requires that a certificate, signed by two directors of the management company on behalf of all directors, is to be provided to the trustee each quarter. The certificate is, amongst other things, required to state whether there exists at the date of the certificate any item, transaction, event or circumstance which, in the opinion of the directors, affects adversely or is likely to affect adversely the rights or interests of the unit-holders and, if so, give particulars thereof.

In the letter of 27 February 1986 from Sir Thomas North and Sir Frank Moore to the chairman of the Brisbane Stock Exchange those directors begin by advising that the recent trading operations of the Bartlett group of companies may possibly result in diminishing the interests of unit-holders in the Bartlett Property Trust. Clearly, in writing that letter, those two directors of the management company were properly bringing into play the protective mechanisms in the trust deed.

It was as a result of the directors' deliberations that the liquidity problems of the group first came to light, as I have indicated in reference to Mr Kootsookos's letter also of 27 February 1986.

The member for Woodridge has sought to imply that this Government is involved with the Bartlett Property Trust. I state categorically that the trust is completely independent of the Government and that the trust and directors of the management company are completely independent of the Government and have acted as such. The directors of the management company were not appointed by the Government, and the Government did not seek their appointment in any way.

The member for Woodridge has also sought to raise again debate about the prospectus. These questions have been answered by me previously in the House, and I repeat that the Commissioner for Corporate Affairs has advised me that the trust deed and prospectus complied with the Companies (Queensland) Code and the then National Companies and Securities Commission (NCSC) policy requirements.

In particular, the valuations of the properties transferred to the trust were made by properly qualified independent valuers. The financial projections made by the directors were expressed to disclose all significant assumptions, and the calculation of those projections was checked by the investigating accountants. With regard to the guarantees provided by Bartlett Holdings Pty Ltd and Bartlett Investments Pty Ltd, the directors of the management company stated that they were satisfied that those companies, if called upon to do so, would have the financial ability to meet their obligations under the guarantee contained in the trust deed. In addition to this, commercial inquiries made by the Office of the Commissioner for Corporate Affairs indicated the ability of the guarantor companies to meet their obligations under the guarantee. Further, the guarantors were made parties to the trust deed and, as such, came under the scrutiny of the trustee.

As the member for Woodridge has indicated, I have shown a personal interest in the regulation of property trusts. Indeed, it was at my request that the most recent policy statement prepared by the NCSC was prepared.

In the case of the Bartlett Property Trust, the difficulties that have been encountered have come as a result of adverse economic conditions—and honourable members know where the adverse economic conditions have their origin—in the form of high interest rates, and these have made it difficult for the real estate properties being developed by the group to be sold.

In these unfortunate circumstances, which may arise in any commmercial venture, I am satisified that the protective mechanisms built into the trust deed have operated to preserve the interests of the unit-holders as far as possible. The properties in the trust are available for realisation or other management by the receivers of the management company under the supervision of the trustee. I am confident that the best decisions possible will be made in regard to the future running of the trust. It must always be remembered that the assets are vested in the trustee. There is no investigation into the affairs of the trust by the Office of the Commissioner for Corporate Affairs since there is no allegation of impropriety relating to the trust, but the commissioner will continue to monitor the situation closely in conjunction with the trustee and the stock exchange.

WITHDRAWAL OF NOTICE OF MOTION

Government Business—Notice of Motion No. 2

Hon. P. R. McKECHNIE (Carnarvon—Minister for Tourism, National Parks, Sport and The Arts) (11.14 a.m.): Quite apart from the grandstanding of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr Warburton) earlier this morning in this House, I seek leave to withdraw Government Business—Notice of Motion No. 2 standing in my name.

Leave granted.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

Comments by Member for Lytton about Mr E. Deeral and Mr G. Mye

Hon. R. C. KATTER (Flinders—Minister for Northern Development and Community Services) (11.14 a.m.), by leave: Yesterday in the House an attack was made by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition (Mr Burns) not on two leaders of the Aboriginal and

Islander people but on all Aborigines and Islanders. The attack was specifically aimed at Aborigines and Islanders who are the democratically elected leaders of their people. They are not appointed by this Government or any other Government; they are democratically elected in local authority elections that are held throughout Queensland. The attack was also aimed at those who choose to involve themselves in free enterprise. Obviously anyone who opens a business will be attacked by the member for Lytton.

Mr Fouras: Do you call ripping off the people free enterprise?

Mr KATTER: When I deal with that interjection, the honourable member for South Brisbane will regret that he opened his mouth.

I can only conclude from the attack by the member for Lytton, who is a very senior member of the ALP in this State, that his party does not support the National Party Government's aim of self-management on reserves and the development of private enterprise on them.

The black people of Australia should now realise that the Labor Party, after breaking its promise on land rights, wants to shackle them to the flagon mentality of previous Federal Labor Governments. The Labor Party is not interested in having the black people of this nation improve themselves.

Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen interjected.

Mr KATTER: That seems to be a habit of the member for Lytton at the moment.

Honourable Members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! For the member for Salisbury to be pointing at the Speaker of the House in an endeavour to draw his attention to anything in the House is disorderly. I realise that interjections have been made. I have warned members on both sides of the House that ministerial statements are to be heard in silence. I will say it again: they are to be heard in silence.

Mr KATTER: Mr Speaker, I was conferring with my leader. That most certainly was not an interjection.

The Labor Party wants to give blacks "sit down" money. It says, "You sit under that tree, Jacky Jacky, and we'll give you money for grog." That is the Labor Party's traditional treatment of blacks. That is Labor Party mentality.

Yesterday in the House, the member for Lytton alleged that Mr George Mye, a respected leader of his people for more than 30 years, was operating a private business. What nerve, what gall, that a black man in Queensland should have the audacity to run his own business!

The honourable member for South Brisbane (Mr Fouras) interjected by saying that George Mye was ripping off the people by running his store. I tell the House that the island has two stores. If the people do not want to be ripped off, they can walk down the street and purchase goods from the other store. The privately owned store was originally opened because of continuing attacks upon the Island Industries Board and this Government by George Mye on the running of that store. He said, "If you are not prepared to reduce the prices, I will open my own store." The IIB took no action, so he proceeded to open his own store. I repeat to the House that two stores operate on Darnley Island. People who do not wish to shop at one of them can do so at the other.

The second allegation was that Mr Mye was a member of the IIB and, therefore, was manipulating the IIB to his benefit. Executive control of the IIB rests in the hands of the Government. The three-year conversion period has not concluded. The State Government takes full authority for the pricing and stocking of the store on Darnley Island. If any member wishes to bring any deficiencies to my attention—the member for Cook (Mr Scott) is one—I will certainly take the matter up.

Yesterday the member for Lytton claimed that the Government tried to keep secret the payment of two $10,000 cheques to Mr Deeral and Mr Mye. He said that the

Government did not want the fact of the two "gifts" to become widely known. They are interesting statements. The Island Co-ordinating Council cheque was handed over at a public ceremony attended by the entire population of Darnley Island, the chairmen from all Torres Strait islands and representatives of the Australian media—Jamie Collins of AAP, David Landers of *The Sunday Mail*, Damien Murphy of the Melbourne *Age*, a full television crew from *State Affair* and another television crew from Telemission. That is how the Government hid the handing over of the cheques. That the cheque was handed over in the presence of all of those persons is an indication of the veracity of the people involved and the homework and research that has been done in this instance. I assure honourable members that it was "a very quiet, secretive deal"! The deputy chairman of the Island Co-ordinating Council moved a vote of thanks for the handing over of the cheque.

The honourable member for Lytton made two other allegations that need answering. He said that I had been advised that the cheques were to go to the chairman and that the department wanted clarification. I never saw such a memo. To protect themselves, my staff keep a record of all incoming memos. I never saw such a memo. My private secretary informed me that there is no such record on file and that he has never received a memo of that description. It might well be the case that one has been concocted by the people who have been leaking information to the honourable member for Lytton. The three members of my staff have told me that they are prepared to sign statutory declarations that such a memo never came into their possession, and I would be happy to table those statutory declarations in this Chamber.

The matter of grog-running is not a matter for me, and I will never take responsibility for it. It is a responsibility of the Minister for Police. I suggest that the honourable member for Lytton direct his allegations to that person.

George Mye has been attacked in this Chamber. I emphasise to honourable members that, during the last 30 years, George Mye has been constantly re-elected as chairman of the Darnley Island council. The voters live with him and know everything about him. As I have said, they choose constantly to re-elect him. The chairmen of the Torres Strait Island councils meet and elect an overall chairman. George Mye has been elected and re-elected as the chairman of the Island Co-ordinating Council. George Mye is a battler for his people. He is a battler who was born to lead. For 35 years, he has fought for his people. Because George Mye has trodden on influential toes over the years, he has been victimised, as has his home island of Darnley.

Darnley Island has a population of more than 200, making it the second-largest populated island in the Torres Strait. Yesterday, the honourable member for Lytton claimed that Darnley Island was receiving preferential treatment. At the moment, an airstrip is being constructed on the island. Although Darnley Island is the second-largest island, it is one of only two islands in Torres Strait that does not have an airfield. All the islands have some sort of water supply, except Darnley.

Mr De Lacy: That's a disgrace.

Mr KATTER: I agree with the honourable member that it is disgraceful that there is no water supply on Darnley Island.

Mr De Lacy: What are you doing about it?

Mr KATTER: The Government is most certainly working on it at the moment. The minute it begins work upon it, the honourable member for Lytton attacks it.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I cannot allow this matter to be turned into a debate.

Mr KATTER: Very well. I will return to the matter at hand.

The honourable member for Lytton said that, at present, a great deal of work is taking place on Darnley Island. Effectively, it is the only island without an airfield, a water supply, any sort of council chambers and any form of freezer. Out of the 15 islands, it has been left out on all four counts.

In answer to the earlier interjection from the honourable member for Cairns——

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I have asked the Minister not to turn the matter into a debate.

Mr KATTER: I will not do that. I will answer a matter that has been raised in this Chamber. It was suggested that it is a disgrace that the water supply was not fixed up sooner. The Government fully accepts that. At the moment, it is working hard on that matter and on the airfield. In fairness to some of the other back-bench members of the ALP, I say that I know that they are deeply embarrassed by the position taken by the honourable member for Lytton and, undoubtedly, that will hurt them very much at the next election.

At the moment, Darnley Island does not even have a working freezer, an airstrip, council chambers or a water supply. Why did the people of Torres Strait democratically elect such a terrible man to head the Island Co-ordinating Council, which speaks for all of the Islanders in the Torres Strait? Why have the people of Darnley Island, who have known George Mye all their lives, kept electing him as chairman of their council over a period of 30 years? Why did they do that for such a terrible man?

The honourable member for Lytton referred to George Mye's house as a mansion. The so-called mansion is a corrugated iron shed with fibro walls. Most of the shade is provided by a blue polythene tarpaulin, which can be bought at any supermarket. If that residence is a mansion, I would like to see what the honourable member for Lytton describes as a modest dwelling.

The Government is closing in on the source of information of the honourable member for Lytton. It has been narrowed down to one of three people, all of whom have stood to lose their jobs as a result of the implementation of this Government's policy of self-management—and a few of the Opposition back-benchers well know it!

The Government supports the Island Co-ordinating Council, and it will continue to provide that council with financial support. The Government hopes also to be able to increase payments to community council chairmen and their councillors because—and I must make this point—as decision-making powers are handed over to the local black people by the executive officers of the Department of Community Services, obviously the time of those black people is being taken up. They must be paid for that time. Why pay the white man but refuse to pay the black man for doing the same job? Obviously, that cannot happen.

If the Government phases out public servants from Brisbane who are typically of European descent and replaces them with local decision-makers, obviously the local people have to be paid. That is what the Government is presently being attacked over.

Mr De Lacy: Do they have to be members of the National Party?

Mr KATTER: No, they do not have to be members of any party. In fact, two or three of the people presently being paid are members of the Labor Party.

The honourable member for Lytton has always liked giving the impression that he is the fighter for the underdog, the little Aussie battler. The honourable member missed the last half of the ministerial statement that I made last week, so I will quickly summarise it.

Mr Deeral, who is the person whom the honourable member for Lytton has been persecuting, is an extremely poor man. He cannot defend himself. My department has difficulty communicating with Mr Deeral because he does not have a telephone and he lives in the bush. Mr Deeral has one leg. He is an Aborigine. I hope that attacks on people such as Mr Deeral will not continue.

The honourable member for Lytton obviously thinks that black people should not be able to own their own businesses. Obviously, the honourable member believes that that should remain the sole prerogative of people of European descent. What great regard the honourable member for Lytton and his party have for the black people of Queensland!

If the honourable member for Lytton wishes to attack every democratically elected black person in Queensland—and from a reading of his speech last week it seems that he is down on the second-last wrung of the ladder—and call them "National Party flunkies", all the Government can do is smile with satisfaction. Government members view it with satisfaction and take great delight in continuing the debate because every day that it continues the honourable member for Cook (Mr Scott), the honourable member for Mount Isa (Mr Price) and the honourable member for Cairns (Mr De Lacy) lose more votes. The Government has photostated copies of the speech that the honourable member for Lytton made last week and the week before and is distributing those photostat copies throughout areas of Queensland that are inhabited by black people.

In conclusion, I call on the back-bench members of the Opposition who know what is happening to either state their support for the honourable member for Lytton or to deny it. I hereby challenge them to do so.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr CAMPBELL (Bundaberg) (11.28 a.m.), by leave: Yesterday in this House the honourable member for Mount Gravatt (Mr Henderson) had the gall to imply that I personally had partaken in a campaign of misinformation and smear tactics. I find those remarks personally offensive. Yesterday his speech related to the Opposition's exposure of the lack of care and financial help given by the National Party Government to the pensioners of Queensland. By his own figures, the State Government of New South Wales provides a 50 per cent rates concession, Victoria 50 per cent, Western Australia 50 per cent, South Australia 60 per cent, Tasmania 30 per cent and Queensland only 20 per cent.

The honourable member for Mount Gravatt further stated that the Opposition took part in a campaign of lies and untruths. I reject that totally and find those remarks personally distasteful. The honourable member then had the hide to quote, in a deceitful manner of misrepresention and distortion, figures prepared by the Parliamentary Library staff.

It reaches the depths of hypocrisy for a National Party member to claim credit on behalf of the State Government for concessions that have been provided by the Brisbane City Council, which were introduced, as all honourable members would be aware, by a Labor administration.

QUESTIONS UPON NOTICE

Questions submitted on notice were answered as follows—

1. Inquiry into Plant Variety Rights

Mr De LACY asked the Minister for Primary Industries—

With reference to the committee of inquiry into the plant variety rights in Australia being carried out by Professor Alec Lazenby, vice-chancellor of the University of Tasmania—

(1) Have individual plant-breeders working with the Queensland Primary Industries Department been forbidden to talk to the committee of inquiry?

(2) If so, was this a Queensland Cabinet decision?

(3) As the Lazenby inquiry will eventually lead to Federal Government legislation on plant variety rights, how can the interests of Queensland agriculture and particularly, tropical agriculture, be protected and embodied in the legislation, if this significant and highly regarded group of plant-breeders has been muzzled for what must surely be narrow-minded political reasons?

Answer—

(1 to 3) The short answer to the honourable member's question is "no". However, this is an important subject and has significance to Queensland agriculture.

Rather than restricting its input to the Lazenby inquiry, my department has been an active and willing participant.

For the information of the honourable member, I would advise that, firstly, my department made a written submission to the inquiry, a submission which has the endorsement of Cabinet. Secondly, Professor Lazenby has been received in the head office of my department, where he had discussions with senior officers, including the Assistant Director-General (Research), the Director, Division of Plant Industry, the Director and Assistant Director of Agriculture and the Director and Assistant Director of Horticulture.

Professor Lazenby also met with departmental plant-breeders from head office as well as from Applethorpe, Nambour and Redlands. Any suggestion that departmental staff—senior officers and plant-breeders included—have been forbidden to talk to the committee of inquiry is therefore plainly ridiculous.

The honourable member may rest assured that the interests of Queensland agriculture are being well looked after with regard to plant variety rights, as well as with all other matters. For some years, the issue has been the subject of consideration by the Australian Agricultural Council. The council is awaiting the Lazenby committee's report, and I am set to give consideration to appropriate complementary Commonwealth-State legislation at that time.

From Queensland's point of view, both the concept of plant variety rights and the role of the Lazenby committee have been publically supported strongly. I am appalled that the honourable member has implied otherwise, and I can only conclude that his spectacular lack of knowledge is exceeded only by his inability to research the subject.

2. Queensland Ambulance Service

Mr ELLIOTT asked the Minister for Health and Environment—

With reference to the Queensland ambulance service for 1984-85—

What assistance did the Government give towards the running costs of the service and how much was given towards building projects for the service?

Answer—

The Government contribution to the ambulance service in 1984-85 totalled $19,621,286.74, comprising $19,521,286.74 by way of endowment and $100,000 towards ambulance training costs and special grants for committees in necessitous circumstances. This contribution is provided towards all ambulance costs, including capital costs, where such may be incurred.

3. Immunisation Status for Children

Mr ELLIOTT asked the Minister for Health and Environment—

What has been the change in immunisation status for children in relation to triple-antigen/CDT, poliomyelitis, measles and mumps?

Answer—

I refer the honourable member to the publications *Australian Health Survey Sabin and Triple Antigen Vaccination (persons aged 2 to 5 years) 1977-78*, catalogue no. 4316.0 and *Children's Immunisation Survey, Australia, November 1983*, catalogue no. 4352.0, published by the Australian Bureau of Statistics, Canberra. Those give immunisation rates for children aged 2-5 years in each Australian State and for the Commonwealth of Australia. It will be noted that the rates in Queensland compare favourably with those for Australia as a whole, and are better in some instances.

4. Kirwan Hospital

Mr GYGAR asked the Minister for Health and Environment—

With reference to the fully completed but completely unoccupied new $6.5m hospital at Kirwan in Townsville—

(1) Was a certificate of practical completion issued by the builders of the Kirwan Hospital in early June 1985?

(2) How much has it cost to maintain and secure this hospital since that date?

(3) Why has this specialist obstetrics and gynaecological hospital been unoccupied for nine months despite the totally unacceptable standard of the obstetrics and gynaecological facilities at the Townsville General Hospital?

(4) What action is he taking to ensure that this hospital opens as quickly as possible?

(5) On what date will the hospital accept its first patients or, if he is still unable to give that answer nine months after the hospital was completed, when does he estimate the Kirwan Hospital will accept its first patients?

Answer—

(1 to 5) The certificate of practical completion was issued by the builders of the Kirwan Hospital in early June 1985 and the building was ready for occupancy soon thereafter. Security and maintenance costs since that time have been negligible.

Staff establishments have been set, and the Townsville Hospitals Board has advised that the only area in which a problem exists in recruitment is in certain categories of medical staff. The co-operation of the local specialists groups has not been forthcoming and could have facilitated the commissioning of the new Kirwan facility, thus providing an upgraded standard of obstetrical and gynaecological care for the people of Townsville.

It is my intention to announce an official opening date for the Kirwan Hospital in the relatively near future, after which those facilities will not be provided at the Townsville Base Hospital.

5. Payments to School Cleaners

Mr GYGAR asked the Minister for Education—

With reference to the fact that cleaners employed in schools by his department on a twice daily basis for 30 hours per week have an award wage of $253.40 per week while those employed on similar conditions for 40 hours are paid $259.80 per week—

(1) Why is it that an extra 10 hours of work attracts only an extra $6.40 per week?

(2) As this amounts to only 64c an hour for the extra 10 hours, does he believe that the 40-hour cleaners are being fairly dealt with?

(3) Will he review this situation to ascertain whether this 64c an hour marginal rate is just and appropriate?

Answer—

(1 to 3) The honourable member should be aware that the rates of pay referred to in his question are set out by an award of the Conciliation and Arbitration Commission. The rates referred to were increased to $263 and $269.70 respectively as from 11 November 1985.

The rate of pay established for the 30-hour-week cleaners refers to those employees who report for work twice a day—that is, they report for duty before schools open in the morning and then work after schools close in the afternoon. Forty-hour-week employees report for work only once a day. The difference in pay rates awarded by the commission reflects this position.

6. Population Figures in Police Reports

Mr VEIVERS asked the Deputy Premier, Minister Assisting the Treasurer and Minister for Police—

With reference to the 1985 annual report of the Police Department, which says that Queensland has a population of 2 568 000, while the 1984 report said that the State had a population of 2 582 000—

(1) Will he explain why his department's reports show that Queensland's population fell by 14 000 in the last two years, contrary to claims by the Government of a population increase of 1.5 per cent?

(2) Is this discrepancy in police annual reports an attempt at cooking the books to give a more favourable police-to-population ratio?

Answer—

(1 & 2) The commissioner has informed me that the population figure shown in the 1985 annual report as 2 568 314 persons is more correct, based on that projected by the Australian Bureau of Statistics. Unfortunately, an error was made in the 1984 annual report and the population figure was calculated as 2 582 000. That error was not detected until after the report had been printed.

One could hardly state that the discrepancy was made in an attempt to give a more favourable police-to-population ratio, as the figure stated for 1984 would have been to the disadvantage of the department.

7. War Game, "Skirmish"

Mr VEIVERS asked the Deputy Premier, Minister Assisting the Treasurer and Minister for Police—

With reference to a war game called "Skirmish" played in the Brisbane area recently—

(1) Does this game or any of the equipment used in the game contravene any Queensland law?

(2) Who were the organisers of the Skirmish game held at Redland Bay on 23 February?

(3) Has the Police Department or his office been approached previously by people wishing to organise such a game?

(4) If so, what advice was given to those people?

Answer—

(1) Police inquiries are being made in this regard.

(2) According to newspaper reports, Messrs Peter Bailey, Ross Alexander and Earle Bailey were associated with the organisation of the Skirmish games held at Redland Bay on 23 February 1986.

(3) Yes.

(4) At the time approaches were made, it was proposed to use a concealable firearm to discharge the paint/dye missile. Inquirers were advised that an exemption would not be granted under the Firearms and Offensive Weapons Act for that type of weapon to be used.

8. Promotion of Japan Air Lines Services

Mr SIMPSON asked the Minister for Tourism, National Parks, Sport and The Arts—

(1) Is he aware of the forthcoming airline services to be operated by Japan Air Lines commencing in early April?

(2) What is the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation doing to promote these flights?

(3) Has any material been printed specifically to promote the services?

(4) Is he aware of any activity within the Japanese tourist industry to ensure the success of these services?

Answer—

(1 & 2) I am informed that the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation has put together a task force, which will be led by Mr Les Duthie, OBE a director of the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation, in late May. That task force will include representatives of the far north Queensland, Capricornia, Brisbane and Gold Coast regions, and Mr Watanabe of the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation. Joining the task force in Japan will be representatives of Qantas and Japan Air Lines, the Australian Tourist Commission and the Queensland Government Representative Office in Tokyo. The task force will conduct seminars and workshops in Tokyo, Osaka, Nagoya, Kyoto, Nara, and Fukuoka.

(3) The task force will be supported by a special brochure produced in the Japanese language by the corporation, together with promotional material.

(4) I understand that organisations such as Jalpac, the Japan Tourist Bureau and Jetabout Tours have compiled packages featuring Queensland to include Cairns, Brisbane and the Gold Coast.

9. Development of Tourist Potential, Sunshine Coast Hinterland

Mr SIMPSON asked the Minister for Lands, Forestry, Mapping and Surveying—

With reference to the applications by the Kenilworth Chamber of Commerce and a Maleny group to establish a tourist complex in forest in the Conondale Ranges—

What is the Queensland Government doing to develop the tourist potential of the Sunshine Coast hinterland?

Answer—

The Queensland Government recognises that the Sunshine Coast hinterland, and in particular the State forests and national parks in the Conondale Ranges, have considerable potential for recreation and tourist development.

The Department of Forestry has already established five major camping areas in the Mary Valley/Conondale Ranges area. It recently engaged a consultant, who, in conjunction with the staff of my department, is preparing a review of the recreation and tourist potential of the area. Following that review, a developmental plan will be prepared that will recommend on the feasibility of the establishment of further camping areas, walking tracks and scenic tours in the State forest area.

Additionally, the desirability of establishing tourist developments such as accommodation lodges, log cabins and camping areas, either on State forest or on adjoining freehold land, is being examined. I expect to report to Cabinet on this and other State forest recreation proposals in south Queensland in the very near furture.

The people of Queensland can be assured that the Government is anxious to see further well-planned developments in this area for the benefit of both local citizens and interstate and overseas tourists.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

Legal Action by Premier and Treasurer and Ministers against Members of Parliament

Mr WARBURTON: In directing a question to the Premier and Treasurer, I refer to the legal action being taken by him and other Ministers of the National Party Cabinet against members of this Parliament. I now ask him: Does this legal action stem from a fear that the public concern is developing about corruption within the Bjelke-Petersen Government? More importantly, is it true that State Cabinet has decided that public

funds will be used to pay any costs incurred by him and his Cabinet Ministers in pursuing these legal proceedings?

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: If anyone is concerned or worried, it will be some members of the Opposition, including the Leader of the Opposition. He has every justification for being concerned because he will go right through the cleaners to the other end. Opposition members cannot go round saying what they have said in public, in a light-hearted way, but that is what they attempt to do. They know that what they are saying is not true.

Mr Burns: We'll prove it.

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: They will have a chance to prove their case in court; my word they will. They will have an interesting time. Members of the Labor Party continue to act in a very irresponsible way. They are given to telling deliberate untruths consistently. Again and again, Opposition members are not telling the truth. They are fabricating all sorts of allegations and innuendos against Minister after Minister. Their tactics are typical of the tactics used by Labor in every other part of the nation. The morals and actions of the Labor Party are at rock bottom.

Opposition Members interjected.

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: Labor members support everything, including homosexuals, the growing and use of marijuana and other such things.

Opposition Members interjected.

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: Opposition members get tickled under the ribs when I remind them of their misdoings and the attitudes and policies that they adopt. If they stick to the truth, they will have nothing to worry about, and every case will be dealt with on its merits.

Mr WARBURTON: I gather that Cabinet is paying the bill, that the costs are coming out of the public purse. I am sorry, Mr Speaker, but I could not hear for the noise.

Government Members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Mr A. Callaghan

Mr WARBURTON: In directing a question to the Minister for Tourism, National Parks, Sport and The Arts, I refer to the Queensland Film Corporation and other areas under the Minister's direct ministerial jurisdiction. I now ask: Bearing in mind that charges against Allen Callaghan are related to certain of Mr Callaghan's activities between 1979 and 1982, have investigations been carried out, or are they being carried out, into the activities between 1982 and now of Allen Callaghan or any other persons associated with the Film Corporation? Do the investigations extend to financial transactions involving the Queensland Film Corporation and an advertising agency, and did the Minister approve the spending by a particular board member of $800 a month under the guise of incidental expenses? I want to know whether investigations are taking place relative to Film Corportion members during the period between 1982 and 1986, and whether the Minister approved certain spending.

Mr McKECHNIE: I say to the Leader of the Opposition, with due respect, that he is trying to get round the rules of sub judice. Whether he realises it or not, that is what he is trying to do. I will not be answering questions on the matters that he raised.

Mr WARBURTON: I rise to a point of order. This is an important point of order. The charges against Mr Allen Callaghan relate to the period between 1979 and 1982. Nothing that has happened since 1982 can be sub judice. I have simply asked the Minister: Are investigations taking place, or have they taken place, to cover that period?

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The Minister has indicated that he will not answer the question that has been asked.

Electoral Legislation

Mr NEAL: In directing a question to the Minister for Justice and Attorney-General, I refer him to the reported written guarantee that the Prime Minister has given to the Australian Democrats that the Federal Government will seek to use its external affairs powers to attack our electoral legislation. I ask: Does the Minister consider that to be the most blatant attack ever launched by any Federal Government on our Federal system for political motives?

Mr HARPER: I thank the honourable member for drawing the attention of the House to the Prime Minister's back-room deals with the Australian Democrats. The capacity of the Federal Government to pursue political expediency rather than tackle the massive economic problems that it and its cohorts have created—they have created the present instability in Australia—is nothing short of a national disgrace.

Once again, the Federal Government has been exposed as abandoning what little principles it has—not to mention the interests of the Australian people—in its pathetic attempts to buy votes and curry favour. If the Federal Government expended as much time and energy on solving the economic disaster that it has brought upon Australia as it has in attacking Queensland, we would all be far better off. Unfortunately, the Federal Government has totally misplaced its priorities.

The Federal Government and its comrades sitting opposite stand alone on this matter. Even the Labor Premier of Western Australia, Brian Burke, as late as 20 February—less than a month ago—said that the matter of electoral systems should be resolved "at the State level by State Parliament".

Let there be no mistake about the effect of any Federal intervention. It will lead to the virtual disfranchisement of the people of the west and the north.

Mr Davis interjected.

Mr HARPER: The member for Brisbane Central is not interested in the rest of Queensland. He is interested only in his own pocket-handkerchief area in Brisbane.

Mr DAVIS: I rise to a point of order. I regard what the Minister has just said as an insult, and I ask him to retract it. For example, the member for Balonne has 10 000 electors and I have 21 000. That is not bad for openers!

Mr HARPER: Let the Opposition make no mistake about the effect of any Federal intervention.

Mr DAVIS: Mr Speaker, I want a withdrawal.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I consider the point of order is fraudulent. There is no point of order.

Mr DAVIS: I rise to a point of order. I have asked for a withdrawal. If any member thinks that he has been wronged, he can ask for a withdrawal.

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

Mr HARPER: Because Opposition members are not really keen to understand what I am saying, I repeat: let there be no mistake about the effect of any Federal intervention. It will lead to the virtual disfranchisement of the people of the west and the north. They will lose more than five seats. I see the honourable member for Mount Isa mouthing away. I cannot hear what he is saying. I wonder how his constituents and those of the honourable member for Cook and of other honourable members who have some interest in the west and the north will react when they know that their representatives in this Chamber are actively seeking to harm their interests. Do those honourable members

support this further step in the abandonment of country people by their socialist comrades in Canberra?

What a farce it is for the Federal Government to claim that it is seeking to further democracy by attacking Queensland. It does not have the courage to seek a referendum to amend the Constitution.

Mr Hamill: You are frightened.

Mr HARPER: The Canberra comrades of the honourable member for Ipswich (Mr Hamill) have not the courage to take the issue to the people of Australia by referendum. Rather, the Federal Government is seeking to use—and this is what the people of Queensland must understand—the non-elective and non-representative Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission to investigate our laws.

What wonderful words—"Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission"! All honourable members know how that body will report, which is the reason why the Federal Government use it. The editorial of *The Australian* of 20 February said that the use of the external affairs power to impose an electoral system on the States was, and I quote again—

> "A distortion of the democratic process. It is ludicrous to claim the changes are being imposed in the name of democracy.
>
> If any constitutional amendment is needed it is that this extended and artificial use of the external affairs power be curtailed and that the power of the Constitution be given to those to whom it rightly belongs—the people."

Those are the words of *The Australian.* They are not the words of a politician, but those of a respected newspaper.

I assure honourable members that the Queensland Government will not stand idly by and allow the Federal Government to amend the Constitution by the back door, by stealth and deception. It will not allow the Federal Government to harm the interests of the people of the west and the north or tolerate its frontal attacks on the Federal system. I assure honourable members that the Queensland Government will explore every legal and political avenue open to it to ensure that sanity prevails.

Tertiary Entrance Qualifications

Mr NEAL: I ask the Minister for Education: Bearing in mind recent publicity about tertiary entrance scores—TE scores—some of which has placed the blame for weaknesses in the system on the Education Department, can the Minister advise the House who is responsible for determining the method of selecting students for Queensland tertiary education institutions? Is blame attributed to the Education Department justified?

Mr POWELL: I thank the honourable member for Balonne (Mr Neal) for raising the question. The honourable member for Brisbane Central (Mr Davis), who has already been warned in the Parliament this morning, shows a total lack of interest in what is happening in the Parliament and in what is happening in Queensland. He continuously makes a row in the Parliament and tries to speak honourable members down. If he would stop wagging his finger and listen occasionally, he might learn something and understand, which might help his 21 000 constituents in Brisbane Central. Interestingly enough, that number of constituents is similar to the number of constituents that I represent in Isis.

The qualifications for entry into tertiary institutions in this State are similar to the requirements in other States. The Queensland Tertiary Admissions Centre (QTAC) accepts the TE scores that are awarded to children who graduate from secondary schools. The children are selected for places in tertiary education on the TE scores they receive.

The number of places in tertiary education is the bone of contention. It is not the problem of the Queensland secondary school system nor of the Queensland Tertiary Admissions Centre that there are insufficient places in tertiary education in Queensland. That fault is fairly and squarely laid at the feet of the Federal Government.

A number of people are blaming the TE system for the fact that their children cannot gain a place in a tertiary institution. The State Government is alive to that criticism, which is wrong and misplaced. Yesterday my department launched an issues document that results from the work of a joint committee—I set it up last year—of the Board of Secondary School Studies and the Joint Advisory Committee on Tertiary Education. I hope that many honourable members will be able to obtain copies of that document and distribute them to their constituents, because I am interested to know what the people out there think can be done to change the existing system.

Mr Davis: Boring!

Mr POWELL: Of course the honourable member for Brisbane Central finds this boring. He finds anything to do with children and their education boring. Obviously, he does not have the capacity to grasp the problems faced by the people of Queensland.

The children of Queensland are faced with the problem that the State does not have enough places in tertiary education. A typical example is that of medicine. Because of the number of places available, the cut-off TE score is 990, which is the highest 1 per cent of secondary school graduates. As a result of that, many people who probably would make very good doctors, and who, at the same time, have the academic qualifications needed to become a doctor, are unable to undertake those studies.

The problem could be solved by tertiary institutions interviewing applicants. However, the size of the task is immense. Roughly 30 000 applicants apply for about 10 000 places. One can see the size of the task that would face tertiary institutions.

The issues paper that was distributed yesterday is an attempt to have the people of Queensland look sensibly at the problem so that the Government, through its procedures, can attempt to make it easier for students to follow a course of study that they find acceptable to themselves and which would, as a result, be more acceptable to both the tertiary and secondary school sectors.

Effect on Primary Industries of Federal Government Policies

Mr STEPHAN: In asking a question of the Minister for Primary Industries, I refer to the meddling, unfair taxes, high interest rates and protection of other industries by the Federal Government, which cost each Australian farmer $9,000 annually. I now ask: Has he had any success in his negotiations with the Federal Minister for Primary Industry (Mr Kerin) to gain recognition of the plight of the rural sector and its wish to have its products compete on an equal footing in the market-place?

Mr TURNER: I guess the simple answer would be, "No, I have had very little success." In common with all primary industries, I am concerned about the Federal Government's attitude. Australia is an exporting country and relies so much on its primary industries, which must compete against protected and heavily subsidised primary industries in other countries. Those international competitors on world markets have a distinct advantage over the primary producers of this country.

The simplistic answer from the Federal Government and Mr Kerin seems to be to remove all protection and all other forms of assistance from primary industries and to move towards import parity. I have said on numerous occasions that if the Federal Government wants to use that as a bench-mark to establish prices for domestic primary industry products, it should use it across the board and apply it to all industries, including secondary industries, and to the labour market. That is not palatable to the Australian Labor Party Federal Government.

The problems in primary industries are external and internal. The external problems relate to the common agricultural policy of the EEC and what is known as the USA Farm Bill.

Mr Hawke is making some effort to talk to the United States. However, he should be addressing himself to the internal problems that are devastating primary industries in Australia today. We should be looking at the problems created by Mr Keating, the

so-called world's greatest Treasurer, to see what he has done recently with the fuel tax. He has returned only half of the benefit to the consumer. Honourable members have witnessed the spectacle of the worst collapse of the Australian dollar in history; the highest national debt; interest rates of more than 20 per cent applying to primary industries and small businesses; the introduction of a capital gains tax; de facto death duties; the national superannuation scheme; the tax on fringe benefits, including employee housing; and the removal of about 40 other concessions from primary industries. It is deplorable that the Federal Government has moved against primary industries.

At the moment, primary industries in Australia are virtually on their knees. I am depressed but not surprised to see the way the Federal Government attacks primary industries and does not give them the recognition that they deserve for the role that they play in the overall prosperity of this country by their contribution to national export earnings.

Australia provides a great deal of foreign aid to other countries. In fact, it has recently doubled its contribution to the Philippines. Tomorrow, when I talk to the Federal Minister for Primary Industry (Mr Kerin), I hope that he doubles his contribution to the sugar industry. Actually, I hope that the Federal Government will do better than that. If it doubles its contribution, it will be contributing nothing, because twice nothing is nothing. I only hope that the Federal Government honours its promise that it made before the last election. Only then might the sugar industry get somewhere. The Federal Government is not interested in primary industries at a State or Federal level. The Deputy Prime Minister (Mr Bowen) told primary producers that they were of no——

Mr SPEAKER: Order! There is far too much conversation in the Chamber and in the gallery.

Mr TURNER: In 1983, the Deputy Prime Minister made his attitude clear when he said that primary industries should wake up to the fact that they are not required, that there is no need for primary industries in this country, and that the Labor Party could import wheat, sugar, citrus juices and so on. That was a despicable remark and was indicative of the level of assistance and support that can be expected from the Labor Party. Unfortunately, I must point out to the honourable member that Queensland is not getting very far; but the present Federal Government will not be in Canberra for very much longer.

Costs of Writs Served on Members

Mr PRICE: I ask the Minister for Industry, Small Business and Technology: As one of the Ministers responsible for writs being served on members of this Assembly, and bearing in mind that this matter is not sub judice, will he personally be responsible for any costs incurred as a result of his action, or has Cabinet decided that any costs that he and other Ministers may incur will be met out of the public purse?

Mr AHERN: The honourable members who have been impugning the integrity of the Queensland Government will have to face the consequences of their actions. When members go out of this Chamber and say that Government members as a whole are corrupt and have had their hands in the till, it is right and proper for the Government of the day to take action to preserve its integrity.

In other States in which the integrity of the Government as a whole is seriously and blatantly called into question, the Cabinet of the day accepts the cost of any action. The precedent has been set in New South Wales, and it is being followed by the present Commonwealth Government. Adequate precedent exists right across the nation.

Guide-lines in respect of this matter are currently being drawn up and will be published. However, I believe that when the comments of citizens—be they members of Parliament or otherwise—reflect seriously on the integrity of a Government as a whole, that Government is entitled to take appropriate action.

Rating of Federal Opposition Leader in Opinion Poll

Mr BOOTH: In directing a question to the Premier and Treasurer, I refer to the latest opinion poll results for the various leaders in Australia. I now ask: Would the Premier have any advice for Mr Howard that might assist him in improving his acceptance by the Australian public to a level approaching that of his own?

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: Personally, I have always got on very well with Mr Howard. Unfortunately, he is a member of a party that has an awful record. The Liberal Party has a record that is a mile long, if I could put it that way. The Federal Liberal Party has never been able to go in one direction for very long. It is much like the Queensland Liberal Party whose members vote for the revocation of a national park one day and vote against it the next day. Because of all their waffling and backing and filling, one never knows in which direction members of the Liberal Party will go. Recently, they were going to vote in favour of some Bills brought in by the Labor Party. The National Party will vote against those Bills.

I do not have a clue in which direction the Liberal Party is headed. Recently, when Mr Howard visited me, I said to him, "You have to stand up and be counted. You have had a very bad record over the years." I gave Mr Howard a list of a dozen things that the Liberal Party did and did not do when it was in office—how it performed and how it did not perform. I said to Mr Howard, "People have no confidence in your party because of its past and present record. You do not have a policy." At the time of the last Federal election I told the Liberal Party that it did not have a policy. I campaigned for the Liberal Party in every capital city. I had to make up my own policy because that party did not have one.

Today, the Liberal Party is heading nowhere. It is about time that it came up with a policy and stated its position on many issues. The Liberal Party cannot have two bob each way. It has to be consistent. With all the backing and filling by members of that party, it is no wonder that nobody wants anything to do with it.

Premier and Treasurer's Relationship with Sir Edward Lyons

Mr PREST: In directing a question to the Premier and Treasurer, I refer to the fact that, today, National Party back-benchers are urging him to sever his relationship with Sir Edward Lyons. I now ask: In the interests of good government, will the Premier accede to their request, or does he intend to continue to allow Lyons to direct him as to how this State should be run?

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: Of course, I do not have anything to do with the honourable member for Port Curtis. However, if it were suggested that I should dissociate myself from the honourable member, I could not get away from him quickly enough. That is exactly what the residents of Gladstone will do at the next election. They will get rid of the honourable member for Port Curtis.

Mr Prest: You're a joke, Joh.

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: The honourable member so easily falls into a trap, it is no wonder the residents of Gladstone want to get rid of him. The honourable member will have an opportunity to say——

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I point out to the honourable member for Port Curtis that he has asked a question, which is being answered. I ask the honourable member to listen to it.

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: The honourable member has fallen into a trap, but I will let him off lightly. The answer to his question is that the Gladstone electors will get rid of him at the next election.

Brisbane Forest Park; Requests for Land by Television Stations

Mr MENZEL: I ask the Minister for Lands, Forestry, Mapping and Surveying: Is it correct that all television stations in Brisbane situated on Mount Coot-tha have requested extra land from what is now part of Brisbane Forest Park? If that is correct,

and bearing in mind the stand taken against the proposal for the Lindeman Island national park revocation, I now ask: Are not those claims for more land from Brisbane Forest Park similar to the request made for land on Lindeman Island? Will the Government bear in mind the attitude of television stations towards national parks when it considers those requests?

Mr GLASSON: I welcome the question. Coincidentally, after question-time, I will introduce a Bill that will formalise a request made by three television stations situated on Mount Coot-tha—Channel 0, Channel 9 and Channel 7—to increase the area of land occupied by them on Mount Coot-tha. That will allow further development of those television stations, which will provide a service for the people of Queensland.

Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen: That is public land, is it?

Mr GLASSON: Yes.

Included in the land that will be excised from Brisbane Forest Park is a piece of land that is held in trust for recreational purposes by the Brisbane City Council. The other areas of land involved are freehold, and special legislation will have to be introduced to allow the Brisbane City Council to sell the land under freehold title to the television stations.

Honourable Members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! It is almost impossible to hear the Minister's reply.

Mr GLASSON: The approach for additional land, which is not unusual, is being made so that the three television stations will be able to provide for future development. It is worth while repeating that the request involves the provision of a service to the people of Queensland.

I point out that the Department of Lands and the Brisbane City Council have co-operated to bring this about. Let all honourable members be assured that it is as certain as the sun rising tommorrow morning that that will not be the last application for revocation of national parks, whether the land involved forms part of the Brisbane Forest Park or a State national park.

The legislation that I will introduce covers the revocation of no fewer than six parcels of land from State forest to provide land for Government instrumentalities, local authorities and electricity authorities, all of which have legitimate requirements. It is noticeable, however, that suddenly the issue of revocation has lost its heat; that published thoughts on the matter have changed.

Honourable Members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I consider the reply by the Minister to be very important, and I ask all honourable members to listen to it in silence.

Mr GLASSON: The proposal to sell the land is supported by the present Lord Mayor. It was supported by the former Lord Mayor also. The original negotiations took place between officers of the Land Administration Commission, officers of the Brisbane City Council, the then Lord Mayor (Alderman Harvey) and me. The present administration also supports the move.

The move is a logical one, although it is worth while noting that, when all the revocations to which I have referred take place, there will not be the same furore that occurred recently.

Project Development by East-West Airlines (Queensland) Pty Limited

Mr R. J. GIBBS: In directing a question to the Premier and Treasurer, I refer to the announcement made by him that the East-West Airlines company will be offered another development site that is better than the Lindeman Island site. I ask: Where is the new site? If it is better than Lindeman Island, why was it not offered to East-West

Airlines in the first place? Why is the Premier and Treasurer determined to continue giving special treatment to the company headed by Sir Edward Lyons by excluding all other tourist operators from tendering for the proposed new site?

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: Again, how simple can the honourable member be to run into a trap like that? Everybody knows that such areas are available along the coast. They have been advertised all round the world.

Mr R. J. Gibbs: Where are they?

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: The honourable member thinks that I am simple enough to tell him where they are.

Mr R. J. Gibbs: You are; you're quite mad.

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: The honourable member might think that I am simple, but I do not intend to tell him that. This is not the appropriate time to tell honourable members such as he where the land is.

I know how the honourable member operates. He still does not want to get jobs for people. It is quite obvious that he and his colleagues are all completely and utterly dedicated to destroying every job opportunity that they can. They have demonstrated that again and again. We will soon see the utter hypocrisy of members opposite. I bet that they will not vote against the revocation of land for the television people. I bet that they will turn a somersault, like a man on a flying trapeze. We will see how they perform. We will watch those hypocrites turn a somersault—one thing today; another thing tomorrow. It is no wonder that members of the ALP have always sat on the Opposition benches, and that is where they will stay. That is all the information I intend to give the honourable member—it is as simple as that.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will ask his second question.

Tabling of Expenses of Chairman of Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation

Mr R. J. GIBBS: I ask the Minister for Tourism, National Parks, Sport and The Arts: Will he lay on the table of the House a detailed account of all travel, including flights, and expenses incurred by the chairman of the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation (Sir Frank Moore) for the financial years 1980, 1981, 1982, 1983, 1984, 1985, and to date in 1986?

Mr McKECHNIE: Does the honourable member think that I would have that information with me? I ask him to place the question on notice.

Mr R. J. Gibbs: No, I asked——

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The Minister has asked the honourable member to put the question on notice.

Mr R. J. GIBBS: I will put the question on notice. All the Minister had to say was whether he would table the information.

Changes to Fishing Regulations

Mr RANDELL: I preface a question to the Minister for Primary Industries by stating that I understand that major changes have been made to regulations controlling the number of undersized fish and crabs allowed to be caught. I ask: Can the Minister give the House an outline of those changes? Is he aware of concern about the current decline in mud crab numbers? Has his department carried out research into the cause of the decline? Can he give an assurance that the research will continue?

Mr TURNER: I thank the honourable member for his question, because it gives me an opportunity to indicate that research relative to fishing resources throughout

Queensland is constantly being carried out. Several days ago, in answer to a question, I did indicate what the department is doing relative to a breeding program for restocking dams and streams.

The honourable member mentioned the recent changes to regulations relative to the number of undersized fish that a person may have in his catch. I believe that the change that has been made will be welcomed by all responsible people. The regulations did allow people to have six undersized fish of any species in their catch. They have now been changed to allow people to have a total of six undersized fish of any particular species, and I believe that that is quite reasonable. The change has been well accepted by the industry.

A program of limiting the entry of people into the fishing industry has been effected by a freeze on new licences. That has been done in an effort to preserve the resource for future generations and ensure that there is a fishing industry in the future. The honourable member would be well aware, as would all other members, of closures that have been implemented in different areas of the State to allow prawns and barramundi to breed up.

The honourable member mentioned mud crabs specifically. Their decline has caused concern, and research is being conducted in that respect. The taking of jennies and undersized male crabs is prohibited. Prosecutions for offences in that regard occur all the time in an attempt to stamp out the practice. Certainly, the department is concerned about the fishing industry and is doing all that is necessary in the field of research.

It should be understood that there may be a multitude of reasons for a reduction in numbers. My officers are monitoring the situation.

I assure the honourable member that I take on board his concern about crabs. Similar concern has been expressed about fishing in Moreton Bay. Numerous meetings have been held to try to determine whether the problem is caused by professional fishermen, amateur fishermen, development or pollution.

My department is certainly aware of the problem, and research will continue to ensure that a viable industry will remain for the benefit of future generations.

Depositing of Government Funds with Building Societies

Mr MACKENROTH: In directing a question to the Premier and Treasurer, I refer to the practice of the South Australian and Western Australian Governments of depositing Government funds with building societies, and those funds then being used to subsidise the interest rates of building society home loans. I point out to him that the scheme in Western Australia benefits approximately 50 000 families who otherwise would be faced with impossibly high home loan interest rates. I now ask: In the light of the fact that Queensland's allocation to housing of $145m is almost half of Western Australia's allocation of $258m, will he urgently follow Western Australia's example and make arrangements for the Government to deposit with building societies funds that could then be used to hold down interest rates for building society borrowers?

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: It is interesting that the honourable member should be game to talk about the problems associated with housing, high interest rates, the chaos in the community generally related to all types of building, and many other facets of activity that have been affected adversely by Labor's policies. Labor has turned the economy of the nation completely upside down. It has destroyed completely the confidence of business and the community generally. It has created the enormously high interest rates that confront the nation today. I am surprised that the honourable member has the hide and audacity to suggest that there is any solution to the problems. There is no simple solution other than to get rid of the honourable member's colleagues in Canberra and put into power someone who is prepared to do something about the problems by changing the system and throwing out of the door all the heap of rubbish that the people in Canberra have generated and piled up in 101 different ways since coming to power.

Let us get somebody who will throw out Labor, because that is the real solution. However, the honourable member will not acknowledge that.

Commonwealth Schools Commission

Mr ALISON: In directing a question to the Minister for Education, I point out that in 1983-84 the Commonwealth Schools Commission spent in excess of $6.6m on salaries and administrative expenses. As the commission merely duplicates the State education departments, that is a wastage of almost $7m of public funds. I now ask: Is the Minister for Education aware of the running costs of the Schools Commission for the 1984-85 financial year, and, if so, does he feel that these costs represent tax-payers' money being well spent?

Mr POWELL: I thank the honourable member for his question. I understand that the cost of running the Schools Commission in 1984-85—and its annual report is due to be printed in May 1986—will be in the vicinity of $9m.

The honourable member was completely correct in suggesting that the Schools Commission does nothing more than duplicate the work of the State education departments. Such duplication occurs in a number of instances. The latest episode, with which I want to acquaint the House, is quite incredible.

The Schools Commission had the temerity to offer to develop a policy for my department and for the education departments in other States. It then proposed to tell them how to implement it. In my opinion, no Education Department in any State of Australia will accept such dictation from Canberra.

The Schools Commission has really had much of its work taken away from it by the Federal Department of Education. It should be borne in mind that, as well as the Schools Commission, there is the Federal Department of Education. If the $9m cost of running the Schools Commission in 1984-85 had been used to provide tertiary places, an additional 1 500 tertiary places would have been available in tertiary institutions throughout Queensland.

The Schools Commission, in my view and in the view of the Queensland Government, is totally superfluous. It recommends what are called tied grants to the States. It tells a State that a certain amount of money is available provided that the State Government also contributes for the particular purpose. The purpose may not be one that is supported by the State Government; it may not be something that that Government finds important. But, to get the funds, the Government has to embark upon that program.

Some programs in which the Schools Commission has been involved are important and have been good—for example, pre-school education. Suddenly, without warning to the Queensland Government or to the Queensland Treasury, the Schools Commission and the Federal Government withdrew from pre-school education. On the eve of the presentation of its Budget last year, the Queensland Government had to find an extra $6.6m to make up the funds that the Federal Government had withdrawn. That is typical of the Federal Government and of the way in which it handles its finances. It commences programs, withdraws from them and leaves a whole bunch of people in the country dangling. The Federal Government commences programs that it is not prepared to continue and is unable to finish.

The Schools Commission should be disbanded. It does not perform one positive task on behalf of education in Australia. The $9m that it cost in 1984-1985 could have been far better spent on providing tertiary places.

Queensland Government Power Generation Investment in Turkey

Mr YEWDALE: In directing a question to the Minister for Works and Housing, I refer to the Premier and Treasurer's recent public statement, which confirmed that the Government would expend about $75m in Turkey for a power station generating approximately 1 400 MW. I ask: As thousands of Queenslanders are crying out for accommodation, does the Minister concur with the decision to expend that amount

overseas? Is he prepared to ask the Premier and Treasurer to reverse the decision about Turkey and allow similar funds to be utilised for the construction of 1 500 homes in Queensland?

Mr WHARTON: I am delighted to answer the honourable member's question. I will not be asking the Premier and Treasurer to retract his statement, because what is proposed will be good for Queensland and for jobs in this State. What has the Labor Party done about housing and employment? High interest rates, the abolition of income-gearing and the introduction of a capital gains tax have affected the housing figures for Queensland. That has happened because of the Federal Government's mishandling of the affairs of the nation. Last week, I took up with the Federal Minister the proposition that the Federal Government should increase the first home owners grant to encourage the building industry, reduce interest rates and put some value back into the dollar. The Federal Minister and Federal Cabinet have put those matters off again. They will not do any of those things.

During all this time, the member for Rockhampton North has been silent. Now he wants to know what the Queensland Government is doing in Turkey. The Government is doing something for the building industry and the people in this State. The ALP is doing nothing.

Private Accommodation Bonds

Mr YEWDALE: In directing a second question to the Minister for Works and Housing, I refer to the present requirement that prospective tenants have to pay the first $100 of a bond in private sector accommodation. I ask: When was that requirement imposed? Is it intended to continue that imposition on families who are desperately seeking accommodation?

Mr WHARTON: The requirement was introduced some little time ago, and it will continue, for the simple reason that people are coming from other States, getting accommodation and then ducking off and leaving the real estate agent and the owner of the premises sitting there without any money. That is not what the policy is all about. The Government is trying to get people into accommodation. It is trying to provide people with temporary accommodation.

Mr Yewdale: The most needy cannot pay it.

Mr WHARTON: These people are not the needy ones. They are the ones who come to Queensland, hop into a house and pay no money. They do not deserve any help. Under this policy, the Government is looking after the most needy people.

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

CITY OF BRISBANE TOWN PLANNING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

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

"That leave be given to bring in a Bill to amend the City of Brisbane Town Planning Act 1964-1985 in certain particulars."

Motion agreed to.

First Reading

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

Second Reading

Hon. C. A. WHARTON (Burnett—Leader of the House) (12.32 p.m.): I move—

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

This is a relatively minor measure designed primarily to facilitate properly the public exhibition by the Brisbane City Council of the proposed new town plan for the

city of Brisbane. At this stage, it is expected that the new town plan will be placed on public exhibition on 7 July 1986.

There are two major principles contained in the Bill. Firstly, the existing law provides that a new town plan, when prepared by the council, must be placed on public exhibition at the city hall, or another place approved by the Minister within 1 km of the city hall at which public business of the council is conducted.

It is not convenient for the new town plan to be displayed at the city hall, and the council desires to place the plan on exhibition in the recently renovated old School of Arts building in Ann Street. Under the current law, it is not permitted to do this, as the old School of Arts building is not an office of the council at which public business is conducted. It seems reasonable that the new plan be available for public exhibition at the site nominated by the council, and the Bill provides accordingly.

The existing law also provides that, when a new town plan is placed on public exhibition, there shall also be exhibited copies of the existing plan and a set of documents and matters identifying the differences between the existing plan and the proposed new plan.

There is also a requirement for the council to display a deal of other information in relation to the proposed new plan and, given the fact that a person is aware of the provisions of the existing town plan relating to his land, it is a relatively simple matter for him to establish the differences that may apply under the new plan.

In these circumstances, it is considered to be unnecessary to require the council to produce a comparative statement as between the current and the proposed new plan. This would, by its very nature, be a voluminous document and would cost a considerable amount of money to produce.

The opportunity has also been taken, following the recent approval of amendments to the City of Brisbane Act to provide for the restructuring of the council administration and the delegation of powers by the council, to clarify certain of the decision-making processes in relation to town-planning under the City of Brisbane Town Planning Act.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate, on motion of Mr Shaw, adjourned.

LAND (MT. COOT-THA TELEVISION STATIONS) SALES BILL

Hon. W. H. GLASSON (Gregory—Minister for Lands, Forestry, Mapping and Surveying), by leave, without notice: I move—

> "That leave be given to bring in a Bill to provide for the disposal by the Crown and the Brisbane City Council of certain lands at Mt. Coot-tha and for related purposes."

Motion agreed to.

First Reading

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

Second Reading

Hon. W. H. GLASSON (Gregory—Minister for Lands, Forestry, Mapping and Surveying) (12.35 p.m.): I move—

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

The studios and broadcasting facilities used by the three Brisbane commercial TV channels are located on freehold land on Mount Coot-tha. Each of the relevant companies needs to carry out urgent extensions to its facility on Mount Coot-tha so as to continue to provide an adequate television service to the residents of Brisbane and south-east Queensland. The stations cannot carry out those extensions unless and until additional

land is made available for the purpose. Consequently, an approach was made to the Brisbane City Council and the Crown to purchase land adjoining the television facilities.

Part of the land required by Channel 9 is in reserve for public park (R.476), being the land contained in certificate of title volume No. 3581, folio 51, held by the council as trustee upon trust as a site for a public park. The valuation of the trust land has been assessed at $39.54 a square metre. Other parts of the land required by all three channels are freehold land owned by the Brisbane City Council, which the council desires to sell to the channels at an equitable price calculated in accordance with the value of the land.

All of the subject areas are within the Brisbane Forest Park area and, before any sale can be consummated, will require to be excised therefrom. The proposal envisages that—

an area of 2.152 ha of council-owned freehold be sold by the council for inclusion in TVQ-O's freehold portion 1100;

an area of 6 986 square metres be excised from the trust land and included in QTQ-9's freehold portion 995 at a purchase price of $39.54 a square metre payable to the Crown and that two council-owned freehold parcels, containing 1 298 square metres and 5 905 square metres respectively, be sold by the council also for inclusion in portion 995; and

an area of 2 ha of council-owned freehold be sold by the council for inclusion in BTQ-7's freehold portion 824.

The purpose of the Bill is to—

(a) Excise an area of 6 986 square metres from trust land and to free and discharge it from the trust to enable sale. This is a relatively small area of the total of 608 ha of the land contained in the trust deed.

(b) Excise all the areas from Brisbane Forest Park. To the park authority's knowledge, no specific development proposals are envisaged for the areas. Again, the area is a relatively small part of the total of about 25 000 ha of the Brisbane Forest Park.

(c) Permit Brisbane City Council to sell its freehold land by private contract, which it is presently prevented from doing by section 19 of the Local Government Act.

(d) Deem the proposed use—television station purposes—to be a permitted use under the town plan or, alternatively, to have the subject areas rezoned.

Owing to changes in technology, especially in satellite and overseas communications, over recent years the television industry has expanded beyond the expectations of the people involved in the industry. Much of the available space has been used to accommodate instruments and satellite receiving dishes. It is envisaged that the lands now proposed for addition to the television stations will accommodate expansions in the foreseeable future.

As I indicated earlier, it is essential for the continued provision of adequate television services to make available the additional land required for the proposed expansion, and the purpose of the Bill is to facilitate that.

The following is a brief explanation of the effects of the Bill.

Clause 1 sets out the short title to the Act.

Clause 2 contains the definitions necessary for the purposes of the Act.

Clause 3, subsclause (1), makes provision for registration of the relevant plans, which are set out in the first, second and third schedules. It provides that the plans for registration must be substantially in the form reproduced in those schedules. Subclause (2) provides that the Brisbane City Council shall be deemed to have complied with all the requirements of the City of Brisbane Act, the City of Brisbane Town Planning Act and the town plan in relation to the subdivision and sale of the subject land.

Clause 4 excludes the provisions of section 32 of the Brisbane Forest Park Act and section 19 (4) and (5) of the Local Government Act. The former precludes sale of the land whilst it remains part of Brisbane Forest Park. The latter precludes a local authority from entering into a private contract for sale of land.

Clause 5 provides for the Brisbane City Council to surrender the 6 986 square metres of trust land and for the Governor in Council to grant Channel 9 an estate in fee simple, freed and discharged of all trusts, upon payment for the lands at $39.54 a square metre and upon payment of other fees.

Clause 6 excludes the subject parcels of land from Brisbane Forest Park upon—

(a) registration of transfer of the land owned by the council; and

(b) the issue of the deed of grant in respect of the area excised from the trust land.

Clause 7 ensures that the land be used for television station purposes only. It further provides that the City of Brisbane Town Planning Act and the town plan shall apply as if the land were included in the town plan in a special uses zone in respect of which the purpose indicated on the relevant scheme maps is "television station purposes".

Clause 8 complements clause 7 by providing that the council can reacquire the land in the event that it ceases to be used for television station purposes. Upon resolution by the council in those circumstances the land may be reacquired for park, recreation ground or road purposes. The powers conferred upon the council by this proposed section is to be read and construed as being an addition to and not in derogation of the powers conferred on the council as a constructing authority under the Acquisition of Land Act.

The first, second and third schedules contain plans of survey of the subject land.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate, on motion of Mr Mackenroth, adjourned.

REVOCATION OF STATE FOREST AREAS

Hon. W. H. GLASSON (Gregory—Minister for Lands, Forestry, Mapping and Surveying) (12.43 p.m.): I move—

"(1) That this House agrees that the proposal by the Governor in Council to revoke the setting apart and declaration as State Forest under the Forestry Act of:—

(a) All that piece or part of State Forest 682, parish of Vernon described as Area 'A' as shown on plan FTY 1297 prepared by the Department of Mapping and Surveying and deposited in the Office of the Conservator of Forests and containing an area of 21.727 hectares—and,

(b) All that piece or part of State Forest 788, parish of Conondale described as Area 'A' as shown on plan FTY 1318 prepared by the Department of Mapping and Surveying and deposited in the Office of the Conservator of Forests and containing an area of 10.41 hectares—and,

(c) All that piece or part of State Forest 611, parishes of Beerwah, Canning and Toorbul described as portion 924, parish of Beerwah as shown on plan Cg. 3105 deposited in the Office of the Department of Mapping and Surveying and containing an area of 0.162 of a hectare—and,

(d) All that piece or part of State Forest 235, parishes of Bingeyrang, Boondandilla, Calingunee, Merinda, Morennan, Mundagai, Uranilla and Waggaba described as portion 12, parish of Boondandilla as shown on plan Dy. 1073 deposited in the Office of the Department of Mapping and Surveying and containing an area of 1 198 hectares—and,

(e) All that piece or part of State Forest 898, parishes of Kinagin, Littabella, Monduran and Tottenham described as lot 209, parish of Tottenham as shown on plan Fd. 1054 deposited in the Office of the Department of

Mapping and Surveying and containing an area of 0.324 of a hectare—and,

(f) All that piece or part of State Forest 71, parish of Sonoma described as Area 'A' as shown on plan FTY 1209 prepared by the Department of Mapping and Surveying and deposited in the Office of the Conservator of Forests and containing and area of about 1.0332 hectares,

be carried out.

(2) That Mr Speaker convey a copy of this Resolution to the Minister for submission to His Excellency the Governor in Council."

These proposals make provision for the excision of land from State forests near Maryborough, Kenilworth, Beerburrum, Dalby, Watalgan and Collinsville.

At this juncture I point out that all six proposals have been considered carefully by the Conservator of Forests and have his endorsement.

I turn now to the proposals before the House, the first of which involves the excision of an area of 21.727 ha from State Forest 682, parish of Vernon.

To service the growing population of the small coastal resort of Toogoom, which is situated approximately 30 km from the city of Maryborough, the Hervey Bay City Council undertook an investigation to locate a parcel of land in close proximity to the resort for the siting of a sewage treatment plant and refuse tip.

The site most favoured for that purpose is located in the most northern section of the State forest and is well served by dedicated road access. It carried a limited quantity of merchantable hardwood timbers, together with a small quantity of roundwood. That timber stand has since been logged on a clean-out basis. Its value for timber production was not considered significant, and its loss from the forest estate would not have any detrimental effect on the established sawmills drawing Crown log timber supplies from this region.

For a number of years, the area has been leased for grazing purposes. Owing to the council's interest in the area, the permittee voluntarily surrendered his grazing rights to the area. Following its excision from the State forest, it is proposed to have that area set apart as a reserve for local government purposes under the control of the Hervey Bay City Council.

The next proposal provides for the excision of a small parcel of land from State Forest 788, parish of Conondale, which is located in close proximity to the township of Kenilworth.

During the 1940's a road was constructed through adjoining freehold to a sawmilling complex sited adjacent to the Kenilworth-Maleny road for the purpose of hauling timber from State Forest 788 to the mill site. Maintenance of that road, known locally as Grigors Road, ceased on the closing of the mill.

In the late 1970's, when a decision was taken to recommence logging in the Booloumba Creek catchment and surrounds, that road was reopened by the department after it secured the consent of the owner at that time.

Use of that access route compared with alternative routes for timber extraction purposes was considered most desirable because of higher stumpage returns to the Crown. Furthermore, that road construction has significant value to the department for management and protection of the upper Booloumba Creek catchment.

To avoid any constraints that may be placed on the department in regard to use of the road, negotiations were opened with the present owners with a view to having the constructed road dedicated. This road traverses subdivision 2 of portion 185V, subdivision 17 of portion 1128 and subdivision 25 of portions 2 and 944, parish of Conondale.

The proprietors are prepared to surrender to the Crown, for road purposes, the affected area in subdivision 2 of portion 185V, which totals about 3.2 ha, in return for

a section of adjoining State forest, 10.41 ha in area. For the purposes of an exchange in terms of the provisions of the Land Act, these parcels of land are deemed to be of equal value.

No compensation is payable for that section required from subdivision 17 of portion 1128, in view of the existence, on the title to the subject land, of a 25-acre road reservation. No claim for compensation was made in respect of the small section required from subdivision 25 of portions 2 and 944 for road purposes.

The area sought from the State forest carries some hardwood forest, which will be logged prior to completion of the exchange action. Excision will have no detrimental effect on the management of the balance of the reservation.

The third proposal deals with the proposed excision from State Forest 611, parishes of Beerwah, Canning and Toorbul, of an area of 1 620 square metres (1 rood 24 perches) described as portion 924, parish of Beerwah.

The subject portion, which lies within the township of Beerburrum, is completely severed from the main body of the State forest by a section of the old Bruce Highway and north coast railway line.

This small parcel of land, which contains a bore, was acquired by the Department of Forestry in 1969 for provision of water. The bore produced good-quality water which was reticulated to the Beerburrum forest station to provide most of its water requirements. Prior to its acquisition, the department had to pay a nominal fee for the drawing of water from this source.

Approximately six years after acquisition, the Landsborough Shire Council provided a reticulated water supply to the forest station. As a result, the bore is surplus to the department's requirements.

Recently, approaches have been made by some local residents to purchase portion 924, parish of Beerwah. Its excision from the State forest will have no detrimental effect on the management of the balance of the reserve, and will enable the Land Administration Commission to deal further with this land.

The fourth proposal seeks the excision from State Forest 235, parishes of Bingeyrang, Boondandilla, Calingunee, Merinda, Morennan, Mundagai, Uranilla and Waggaba of an area of 1 198 ha, now designated as portion 12, parish of Boondandilla.

This portion is situated on the north-western boundary of the State forest and presently comprises part of a special lease being utilised for grazing purposes.

Following excision, it is proposed to offer the present lessee a priority special lease over the area in terms of the Land Act, with a view to conversion to freehold tenure at some future date.

In the main, Portion 12 carries stands of brigalow and belah. The area has previously been logged of all merchantable timber. Overall, it is considered that its best future use is for agricultural development. The lessee has agreed to meet all costs in the matter, including survey.

The fifth proposal deals with the proposed excision from State Forest 898, parishes of Kinagin, Littabella, Monduran and Tottenham, of an area of about 0.324 ha.

This area, situated at Watalgan, is sought by Queensland Railways as a reserve for railway purposes under the control of the Commissioner for Railways as trustee.

The site, which is severed from the main body of the State forest by an old fire-break, carries no commercial timber and is presently being utilised by Queensland Railways as a sleeper dump.

Following excision, the subject area will continue to be used for this purpose. Management of the area will not pass from Crown control.

The final proposal provides for the exclusion from State Forest 71, parish of Sonoma, of an area of about 1.0332 ha.

The subject land is required by Queensland Railways in connection with the reconstruction of a railway bridge over Devlin Creek near Collinsville.

Once excised from the State forest, the small section required for actual reconstruction purposes will vest in the Commissioner for Railways. The balance will be opened as road to provide continuity of access following realignment of the constructed route in the vicinity of the bridge site.

The proposed excision area contains some merchantable stems of poor quality.

Once again, the area will not pass from Crown control.

I strongly support all of these proposals, and commend them for the approval of the House.

Mr MACKENROTH (Chatsworth) (12.55 p.m.): The Opposition will not oppose the motion for revocation before the House although, at question-time, the Minister for Lands, Forestry, Mapping and Surveying challenged us to oppose it in line with our opposition to the Lindeman Island proposal. The Minister referred to legislation that he intended to introduce and to the revocation of six parcels of State forest. He said that, if the Opposition was opposed to the Lindeman Island proposal, it should also be opposed to the revocation of that State forest land.

Fortunately, the Opposition does not work that way. Opposition members have looked at this proposal in a sensible manner. I thank the Minister for allowing his departmental officers to talk to me and outline what the revocation proposals for each of those six parcels was all about. I was provided with maps so that, when this matter was debated today, Opposition members would at least have prior knowledge of the areas proposed to be revoked and the reasons for such revocation.

The Minister's action has allowed Opposition members to make a decision on each parcel of land. However, I was disappointed with his attitude during question-time when he tried to draw the longbow and say, "Well, if you are going to oppose revocation of national parks, you should also oppose all other revocations." The Opposition will not do that. I listened to the Minister's argument, and the arguments put forward to me by officers of the Lands Department.

I accept the explanations that they have given to me relative to each of the sites, and the Opposition will not be opposing the motion.

Looking at each parcel individually—the first is a small portion of land in the small coastal resort of Toogoom, which is near Hervey Bay. It will be used for a sewage treatment plant and refuse tip, and there is no opposition to that. As I said, it is a small portion of land that will be used by the Hervey Bay City Council, so it will not in fact be removed from public ownership.

The second part of the motion relates to a swap of land. The Forestry Department needs the land in question to gain access to a forestry area by its trucks and equipment. Some members might like to discuss whether in fact those areas should be logged; however, it is forestry and is there to be logged. In that event, trucks must have access to it to enable the Forestry Department to manage the area better. That being the case, I can see no reason why the Opposition should not support the proposal.

Mr Comben: You have not forgotten about the gastric breeding frog, have you?

Mr MACKENROTH: The resident conservationist in the Labor Party has filled me in with information on the gastric breeding frog in the area into which the road is to go. I suggested to him that if the Forestry Department constructs a road, perhaps people might be able to get into the area and find that frog, because I understand that it has not been seen for the past four years. If people have access to the area they might be able to discover whether those frogs still exist.

Sitting suspended from 1 to 2.15 p.m.

Mr MACKENROTH: Before the luncheon recess, I was explaining to the people of Queensland why it was a good idea to have the road. I will not take that any further.

The third area of land to be revoked is in the Landsborough shire. The Lands Department has a bore on that land that it no longer needs. Members of the Opposition are not opposed to the Lands Department's selling that block, but I should like the Minister to assure us in his reply that the block will be auctioned. He told us that some local residents are interested in that block. I assume from his statement that more than one person is involved.

The fourth proposal deals with the largest piece of land, which contains 1 198 ha. At first glance, one could be concerned about such a large area being revoked. However, the Minister and his departmental officers have assured me that the block was cleared of merchantable timber many years ago, and that since 1947 it has been leased to people for pastoral purposes. As that has been going on for 38 or 39 years, the Opposition sees no reason why the land should be retained by the Forestry Department.

The fifth and sixth proposals deal with the transfer of land from the Forestry Department to the Railway Department. That land will remain in the ownership of the State Government. The Opposition has no objection to the proposals.

I have outlined the reasons why the Opposition supports the proposals in this instance. As I said at the beginning of my speech, Opposition members will always consider on their merits proposals advanced by the Minister. In no way can I see why the Minister should draw the longbow and say that because Opposition members opposed the Lindeman Island proposal, they would also be opposed to the proposal now before the House.

Mr Glasson interjected.

Mr MACKENROTH: The Minister said that. He tried to draw a parallel when asked about the legislation concerning the Brisbane Forest Park, which, no doubt, will come before honourable members next week, relative to the three television stations. Opposition members will examine that legislation and judge it on its merits, in the same way as they dealt with the revocation of the Lindeman Island national park. Forestry land and the Brisbane Forest Park are certainly not national parks. They are in a completely different category.

Mr COMBEN (Windsor) (2.18 p.m.): As the Opposition spokesman pointed out, members of the Labor Party will not be opposing the revocation of the six areas under consideration. Four of the proposals are quite straight forward. The first relates to a sewerage treatment plant and land required for it. The next relates to an area of .162 ha in the Beerburrum State Forest on which a bore is situated. The third proposal relates to an area of .324 ha that is already used by the Railway Department as a general purpose and sleeper-dump area. The last proposal relates to just over 1 ha that is being used by the Queensland Railway Department in reconstructing a railway bridge over Devlin Creek.

I have no intention of quibbling about the revocation of those areas, but I do wish to discuss in further detail the other two areas that we are revoking this afternoon. When I say, "We are revoking", I have in mind that Opposition members know the numbers in the House. Although they can oppose some things in principle, they know that, eventually, the Government has the numbers. When the House is debating projects such as this one, it probably is better for the members of the Opposition to simply raise their objections to certain principles and let the Government go ahead, rather than waste the time of the House on divisions.

The first area that I deal with is that area of 10.41 ha that it is proposed to exclude from State Forest 788, parish of Conondale. The Government is exchanging 10.41 ha for 3.2 ha of road that already exists. It seems to me to be strange to swap a fairly substantial piece of land for a much smaller one merely on the basis, as the Minister

put it, that no constraints will be placed on the department's use of the road. Parliament has been told that the road has been there for 40-odd years. The Minister did not mention anything about difficulties. I would be interested to learn whether there are any legal difficulties or whether the department is not being given access. Certainly most land-holders would be happy to have a road that runs through their properties maintained at Government expense. It seems odd that the Government is swapping an area of land that is three times as large as the area of the road.

That land is near an environmentally sensitive area. It is less than 2 km away from the Conondale National Park. Of course, over a number of years, there has been a great deal of controversy about that national park, which contains an area of less than 2 000 ha. As has already been heard, that national park contains the gastric breeding frog, which has not been seen for four years. One would think that the Government would be trying to preserve all the land that it could for national park purposes or for properly managed forestry. I really do not see the rationale behind exchanging an area of land of 10.41 ha for a road containing an area of 3.2 ha.

The area contains the plumed frogmouth, the red goshawk, which is Australia's rarest bird of prey, the powerful owl, which is now found in only certain limited areas of the rain forest, and the sooty owl. Those animals and birds should be protected by this Government. It is necessary to preserve their habitat. One would think that it would have been far better for the Government to pay for that area of road, if it has to be acquired——

Mr McPhie: What about the mopoke?

Mr COMBEN: The member for Toowoomba North is again showing his ignorance. He has asked me whether we are looking after the mopoke. It is found throughout Australia. It is the second most common night bird in Australia. I do not think that any serious conservationist would ever take any notice of the member for Toowoomba North.

People are concerned about the red goshawk, which is a very rare bird. They are also concerned about the habitat that is found in that area. They cannot see why it should not be preserved in its rightful state, and not just given to the local land-holder so that a little extra area is removed from the Government's control. Again it is the tyranny of the small decisions. Little excisions are made here and there. One day, perhaps in a century's time, people will wake up and find that nothing is left in that area.

Logging is taking place in the Booloumba Creek area, to which this road is giving access. That area is sought by many people in the conservation movement as an extention of the Conondale National Park. It contains only 2.7 per cent of the whole Conondale Range forestry area. It is a fairly small area. It is a sensitive area. There is a need to preserve it; yet the Government seems quite content to say, "No, we need it for logging. We will go in there. We will destroy it. We will be giving away small areas of it at any time, anyway."

Earlier, it was interesting to hear the Minister talking about the development of five areas for camping and recreational purposes. One could compare this area with the Lamington National Park, which is behind the Gold Coast. About 700 000 visitors a year travel to the hinterland of the Gold Coast to enjoy the rain forest and parks. It is only right that a similar sort of development should take place on the Sunshine Coast, yet very little attempt seems to have been made to establish an adequate national park system in that area.

The Minister's camping grounds in the forestry areas are to be commended from a recreational point of view; but, with the sorts of endangered creatures in the Conondales, any land that can be given over for national park purposes should be given over. The Labor Party would support any such moves. For the time being, it seems that excisions in the Conondales will continue to be made. An area of 10 ha is being swapped for 3 ha of land. The land will be degraded again and the habitat lost. That is deplored by the Opposition. In future, the Opposition hopes that the Minister might more properly

manage the forest estate. The Minister ought to be managing the forest estate under his control.

I would like to turn to the area of 1 198 ha proposed to be excluded from State Forest 235 on the Darling Downs. The area is presently held under special lease tenure and it carries stands of brigalow and belah and has been previously logged for merchantable timber. Looking at the Queensland estate simply from the point of view of forestry, it would be reasonable to say that all the merchantable timber has gone and that agricultural development would serve the area best in future.

What the Minister did not say this morning in his speech, or in his explanatory memorandum that was tabled in this House, is who decided that this was the best future for the area and what criteria were used. The Land Administration Commission had some sort of input. The Opposition believes that an area of this size containing stands of brigalow and belah would have important conservation value.

Brigalow is supposedly widespread in the brigalow belt, which stretches south from Emerald and across to Rockhampton. Once a very substantial area, it was subdivided into 4 000-acre blocks in the mid-1960s and early 1970s as a land development scheme after brigalow was permitted to be cleared. Today, very little brigalow is left in any quantities, and no brigalow is to be found in any decent-sized national park in Queensland.

National parks are few and far between on the Darling Downs and the parks there generally tend to be very small environmental parks, so an area of 1 200 ha would have been a good addition to the national park estate. It would not have cost the State Government any money. To hand it over now for private agriculture, even though it has been leased for some time, would only make the rural situation in Queensland worse because of the overproduction of wheat and cattle. This area could have been used for tourist purposes on the Darling Downs, but it is not to be used in that way.

Brigalow is one of the most threatened species in Queensland. The Opposition believes that the area should be put to one side rather than handed over to private enterprise.

The Opposition supports in general the excisions that are proposed today but, had the decision been in our hands, certainly the area near the Conondales and on the Darling Downs would have been handled differently. The Opposition would have looked at all the competing land uses to which those areas could have been put. The Opposition would have stood up for conservation principles for the future of Queensland and put the areas to different uses.

Mr INNES (Sherwood) (2.28 p.m.): The Liberal Party supports these proposals, as indeed it has supported the majority of recommendations for revocation that the Minister has put before the House in recent times and other dispositions of Crown land, including the adjustment of national park boundaries.

This morning, it was regrettable to witness the almost habitual misrepresentations, untruths and distortions of logic with regard to the right of members to adopt different attitudes to different matters.

If Cabinet's decision is merely to be rubber-stamped, no purpose would be served in having the Land Act and the National Parks and Wildlife Act, which require the approval of this House before revocations can be made.

Because those Acts provide control over the disposition of Crown lands, the previous administrations that placed that obligation in the Acts showed great wisdom. The executive has to justify the proposition it puts before the House so that secret deals cannot be made and so that, if mistakes are being made, time is available to expose them. If everything is open and above board and in the public interest, the approval of the whole House will be given, or should be expected. It is totally wrong to compare the attitude that one takes to one set of proposals with one's attitude to another set of proposals. If that were not the case, there would be no point in debating these things; the Government could rubber-stamp the lot.

The motion before the House deals with both substantial portions and minor portions of land. On many occasions, the Liberal Party has supported revocations from and additions to the Crown estate, including important tracts of land, such as national parks. The same Minister is responsible for the overall supervision of the Brisbane Forest Park. As was said during question-time this morning, there will be some parcels of land which it is desirable or justifiable to alter and there will be other parcels of land for which there is no justification for alteration. Each issue has to be considered on its merits.

It was clearly a very wise decision of a previous administration to place, in the Land Act and the National Parks and Wildlife Act, an obligation to lay such revocations on the table of the House for a fixed period so that people could, firstly, learn about what was going on and, secondly, have an input into the ultimate decision on the disposition of the land.

The Liberal Party has no hesitation in supporting the six proposals to alter the Crown estate in the way that the Minister has put them before the House. The Liberal Party had great objection to the proposal in relation to Lindeman Island. For somebody to compare the gutting of an entire and large island national park with modifications of this type or with a piece of brigalow land is illogical, absurd and stupid. For people to suggest that there is a clear parallel is deceitful. On the merits of what the Minister has put before the House, the Liberal Party has no objection at all to the revocations.

Mr CAMPBELL (Bundaberg) (2.32 p.m.): In supporting the Minister's action over these lands, I should raise three points about what happens to Crown land that is either kept for forestry or lost to forestry. Once these lands are declared for forestry, the House should be told what will happen to them.

My first point deals with the supply of cabinet timbers, which has been given a very low priority by the Forestry Department. More money should be expended on the provision of cabinet timbers. Secondly, I question the actions of the Forestry Department in putting its money into softwood plantations. I believe that the department is putting an excessive amount of money—money that we as Queenslanders cannot afford—into softwood plantations. My third point deals with the economics and management of forestry areas, with particular attention focused on how much they are costing tax-payers.

As it is very important, I wish to quote as follows from what the Minister said in this House on 15 October last year—

> "Most rain forest timbers are specialised cabinet timbers that are highly prized and in great demand. The actual volume used is limited by availability, not demand. There is no reason to suppose that this situation will change."

Therefore, I believe that the Minister concurs that there is a need for more cabinet timbers. I also know that Queensland has no significant plantations of prime cabinet timber species. Effectively, all supplies are drawn from native forests.

As a policy issue, I would like the department to examine the possibility of raising in Queensland plantations of fine cabinet timbers. I know that such timbers are not easy to grow in plantations and that many management problems are encountered. It is now 1986 and all the easy questions have been answered. Although specific problems dealing with management and control of plantations exist, it is time for research to be directed to growing plantations of Queensland's fine cabinet timbers so that the market for them could be tapped.

At present, New Zealand is taking the lead. Fine Australian timbers, including thousands of eucalypts, are grown there. Because of that, Queensland will lose its position in the timber market. Some timbers are found only in Queensland, including the beautiful silky oak, red cedar, Queensland maple, black bean, alpine ash, walnut and also the special yellowwood, from which a great deal of the fine furniture in this Chamber was made. Botanically, it is known as Flindersia Zanthoxyla. Queensland has hardly any of that timber left. I do not think that the Forestry Department is doing anything to meet the future demand for such fine timbers. It is important to examine the problem to

determine what action should be taken. The volume of fine cabinet timbers and miscellaneous cabinet woods provided by Queensland forestry areas is decreasing. According to the annual report of the Department of Forestry, in 1984-85, 25 434 cubic metres gross measure of prime cabinet woods and 36 239 cubic metres gross measure of miscellaneous cabinet woods were taken out of Queensland.

Mr Comben: We would abolish all of that; it's rain forest timber.

Mr CAMPBELL: That could happen. I am saying that rain forest timber should be grown.

The volume of prime cabinet woods removed from Crown lands in 1984-85, 25 434 cubic metres, is the smallest volume removed since 29 516 cubic metres was taken in 1981-82, five years ago. The figures for miscellaneous cabinet woods dropped from 52 291 cubic metres in 1981-82 to 36 239 in 1984-85. In other words, there is now less of a scarce resource that honourable members know is in demand. Even the Minister said that Queensland is unable to meet the demand for it. It is time that the Forestry Department took positive action to ensure that Queensland can meet not only local demand but also export demand. Many countries would like to be able to obtain Queensland's natural cabinet timbers for use in the manufacture of fine furniture.

Time and time again the Opposition has alleged that there is an over-supply of plantation softwoods in southern Queensland. Millions of dollars are being put into those plantations. That money is coming out of the pockets not only of honourable members but also of pensioners, family men and the unemployed. Those persons must put their hands into their pockets to pay for investments that are not in the best interests of the people of Queensland.

During the Estimates debate statements were made about the over-supply of plantation softwoods. The Minister said, "The honourable member will go to the chip-heap if he is not careful." It has been said that the Opposition has been somewhat cynical about the matter. On 15 October 1985, referring to the proposal to construct a pulp-mill, the Minister said—

> "... despite the honourable member's cynicism regarding pulpmill projects, the Government is still receiving firm inquiries regarding the utilisation of available pulpwood. Only today, discussions were held in that regard."

Is it not marvellous? It is now March 1986, and not only are there no firm proposals but also there are no proposals at all! It is just a whitewash, and it has been going on for years.

Since 1968, Ministers for Forestry have promised a pulp-mill in south-east Queensland. In 1968, a pulp-mill was to be built at Woodlands. After putting it off for a decade, the company contracted to build that mill opted out and sold the project to CSR. CSR did not take it any further.

APM was going to harvest the Crown's pulp crop as well as its own Caboolture crop at a mill to be built at Bribie Island. It has come and gone. As these pulp-mills have come and gone, the softwood plantations, whose thinnings would be used by a pulp-mill, keep on growing.

Mr De Lacy: They're going to announce another one this year, because it's an election year.

Mr CAMPBELL: As the honourable member for Cairns says, as it is an election year the Government will probably announce the building of another pulp-mill. The last pulp-mill proposed was to be built somewhere between Gympie and Maryborough. The next one will probably be a bit further north, because the Government will probably be looking at the electorate of Bundaberg.

Mr Prest: The National Party Government is known for its phantom projects.

Mr CAMPBELL: This Government is well known for its phantom projects. I believe that the honourable member for Lytton (Mr Burns) has done quite well.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Row): Order! The honourable member for Port Curtis may not interject from other than his usual place.

Mr CAMPBELL: The latest consortium was to be headed by Ekono Oy, which was to build its mill at Owanyilla, but it has fallen through yet again.

It is about time the Government considered its policies in relation to softwood plantations because, in reality, the Queensland environment is not the most efficient in which to grow softwoods. It is known that softwood species can be grown better in Victoria and New Zealand. Queensland should concentrate on what it can do best, that is, cabinet timbers. I hope that the Minister will give consideration to what I am saying.

I turn to the total cost of forestry in Queensland. It is very important because, as is evidenced by last year's Budget papers, the Forestry Department has one of the largest loan expenditures of any department. As at 30 June 1985, loan expenditure by the Department of Forestry was $281m. It is time that Queensland got a return for that $281m. It is important that the Government ensure that that debt can be repaid. Even at an interest rate of 14 or 15 per cent, millions of dollars will have to be repaid.

At present, the Government is not getting the return from forestry that it ought to. It is not getting a sufficient return to repay that $281m. It seems that the loans that are taken out on behalf of the people of Queensland are going up at the rate of more than $20m a year. The fact is that the Government is not getting a return of at least that sum of money. As time goes on, the forestry debt increases.

The Government has to change its policy and consider growing different species. The species that the Government must consider should be wanted not only by Queensland but also by the world, that is, fine cabinet timbers.

I hope the Minister takes my comments on board and that he changes the basic policy of the Forestry Department so that more money is put into native timbers, timbers that are known to be in demand, timbers that can be sold and timbers for which there will be a market in the future. In that way, the forestry industry would be efficient and profitable in the future.

Mr De LACY (Cairns) (2.44 p.m.): I take this opportunity to mention the rain forest resources in the north, and particularly the future of the milling industry.

Towards the end of last year, in this Chamber, I asked the Minister for Lands, Forestry, Mapping and Surveying (Mr Glasson) a question about a report called *Rainforest Conservation in Australia.* For the information of honourable members, I point out that last year a good deal of work was carried out by a working party consisting of officers of the Department of Forestry, representatives of conservation groups and officers of the Federal Department of Home Affairs and Environment. That working party laboured long and hard to compile the report. In Cairns, a conference was held so that representatives from different and disparate groups could come together. I thought that the conference was an excellent idea, because previously many of the people from these disparate groups had not spoken together; on the contrary, often the groups were at odds with each other publicly; so it was good to see them seeking common ground.

The report entitled *Rainforest Conservation in Australia* was published, and a copy was sent to the Minister for Lands, Forestry, Mapping and Surveying. The Minister considered that the key recommendation in the report was one calling for the Federal Government to provide assistance to the States for acquiring, planning and managing rain forest reserves. He acknowledged also that co-operation with the States and the Northern Territory was the most effective way for the Commonwealth to promote rain forest conservation.

The working party recommended a range of practical measures that Governments could undertake that would ensure the long-term protection of Australia's natural rain forest resource. The question I asked the Minister in the House was—

> "Will the Minister give an undertaking to co-operate fully with the Federal Government to implement the recommendations of the report . . ."

Although it was a question without notice, I could not understand the Minister's reacting very unkindly to it—and I still cannot. The question was asked in good faith, and the Minister replied—

> "This is another attempt by the Opposition to wreck the jobs of people in this State. The forestry management reports compiled by the Forestry Department of Queensland are recognised nationwide and by the Minister for the Environment, who spoke with me in my office in this building last week."

I cannot understand how the Minister could interpret a reasonable question about whether or not the Department of Forestry would co-operate with the Federal Government in implementing recommendations of a report that was compiled with the benefit of a good deal of input by officers of the Minister's department as an attempt to wreck the jobs of forestry workers in Queensland. Now that the Minister has had time to consider the question and to recognise the good faith in which it was asked, I ask him once again to respond. Will he co-operate in implementing the recommendations of that particular report?

The other matter that I raise is one that received some attention in the *Rainforest Conservation in Australia* report. The run-down in timber resources in north Queensland concerns me. That is nothing new; I know that officers of the department are aware of it, and I am sure that anyone involved in the timber industry would be as aware of it as I am. This year, 1986, will be the crunch year, because I understand that the annual quota will be reduced from something of the order of 130 000 cubic metres to 80 000 cubic metres.

The report predicts also that the number of timber-mills will be rationalised and will be reduced from 17 to 12. That will mean that the number of people directly employed in the industry will be reduced from 960 to 590.

I now wish to ask a question about rationalisation or reduction in the number of mills. Will that be carried out by a process of attrition? In other words, will market forces be allowed to operate and will timber-mills disappear as they go broke, or is some planning in train to amalgamate or rationalise in a reasonable way?

As the Minister is aware, in absolute terms the loss of 400 jobs is not very important, although it is important to the people involved. My colleague the member for Mourilyan (Mr Eaton) would support me when I say that the timber workers are great people. Most of them have been involved in the industry all their lives—it is the only vocation that they know—and we are concerned for their future. I ask the Minister to explain how those mills are to be rationalised and what plans are in place to take up the slack caused by the cut in quotas in north Queensland.

I suggest that a couple of things could be done. One would be to absorb the surplus work-force in reforestation programs. The people of far north Queensland have known that the crunch-time would come. In fact, I read a report prepared in 1949 that predicted that the sustainable yield for north Queensland rain forests would be in the vicinity of 75 000 to 80 000 cubic metres per annum. Now, 40 years later, what planning has been done to take account of that prediction?

A report prepared by the Minister's department in 1981 stated that on the use factor of timbers in north Queensland a plantation estate of about 21 000 ha would be required. Nothing like that exists. In the whole of far north Queensland, only a couple of thousand hectares exist. Approximately 600 ha a year are being planted. At that rate, north Queensland will never get close to having a plantation estate of sufficient magnitude to supply its timber needs. So I ask the Minister to instruct his department—I hope it is already planning along these lines—to increase the number of plantings.

Many thousands of hectares of farmland on the Atherton Tableland that previously was very productive is now largely degraded. In addition, at this stage no good economic use has been found for it. Much of it is being sold off for use as hobby farms. I suspect that one day society will rue the day that prime agricultural land was given away for hobby farms, because the process cannot be reversed. I suggest that the department should therefore look at acquiring some of that land for conversion into plantation estates to supply the timber needs of north Queensland.

In the past, I have written to the Minister regarding the possibility of importing through the port of Cairns timber from Papua New Guinea. He might be able to give me the latest information on that proposal. A great deal of preliminary work was done. However, there was some hold-up about a declaration by the Federal Customs Department allowing the importation of logs from the Sepik River district of Papua New Guinea. Although such timber imports might assist Queensland to preserve its dwindling rain forest resources, they might not do much good for Papua New Guinea's. It may assist in keeping employed those people currently involved in the timber-milling industry in north Queensland.

I wish to raise another point that I know has been drawn to the Minister's attention. I do not believe that the aftermath of cyclone Winifred in north Queensland has received the attention it deserves. Members have heard a lot, and those of us who live in north Queensland know a lot about the human tragedy caused by the cyclone. The plight of the cassowaries received some press coverage. As members would know, they live in the rain forests.

However, at this stage it is not the cassowaries for whom I am going in to bat but the rain forests themselves, because I believe that they could be on the verge of an unprecedented disaster. I have discussed this problem with the member for Mourilyan. I have flown over the rain forests and noticed that they are brown. They have been opened up and the canopy has been destroyed.

As members would know, usually rain forests are not threatened by fire. The whole of the rain forest area in the belt from Babinda to Tully containing thousands of hectares, a sufficient proportion of which comes under the Minister's control, is susceptible to fire. If that forest, in its present condition, were to catch fire, it could burn in a way in which rain forests in Australia have not burnt before. I am concerned that if the fire should get out of control, the rain forest conservation program in Queensland could be set back hundreds of years. Indeed, the forest could be totally destroyed and would have to be regenerated virtually from scratch, which would be a 500-year process.

Mr Comben: Surely that is a good argument why large areas, rather than tiny remnants, of forest should be preserved for years.

Mr De LACY: I have always believed that if rain forests are to be preserved, they must contain large areas. Small blocks are not sustainable in themselves.

Cyclone Winifred created a new element when it devastated the rain forests. I have no doubt that, without major outbreaks, the rain forests will regenerate remarkably quickly. However, there is so much debris in them that they could be destroyed almost completely by fire.

I am sure that I do not have to remind the Minister of these matters, but it would be remiss of me, as a member of Parliament from far north Queensland who is concerned about the remaining rain forest resources, not to do so. I ask the Minister to ask his department to determine what measures can be taken to ensure that the area does not become the scene of a holocaust.

Hon. W. H. GLASSON (Gregory—Minister for Lands, Forestry, Mapping and Surveying) (2.57 p.m.), in reply: I thank honourable members for their contributions on the proposals relative to the revocation of six pieces of land from forestry areas of Queensland. I was very pleased to note that all honourable members accepted that,

inevitably, with the progression of time, instrumentalities representing various sections of the community will need additional land for various purposes.

The Opposition spokesman implied that I more or less dared members of the Opposition to challenge the proposals. That is far from the truth. That was never my intention. The honourable member is aware of the co-operation that he has received, and always will receive, from my officers and from me. Indeed, he acknowledged that he received co-operation relative to any revocation proposal or legislation coming before the House.

The member for Windsor questioned the wisdom of dedicating a road used by the Forestry Department as a haul road and by forestry officers travelling to and from work. He said that it would be reasonable to assume that most people would be only too pleased to have a road through their property. That comment clearly indicates that he has had very few dealings with people on the land, although in many instances his comment would be appropriate.

It is quite obvious from the history of the parcel of land in question that the present owner has accepted that the road passes through his property and has imposed no constraints on the use of the road for the hauling of timber or on its use by officers going to and from work. However, tomorrow, if ownership of that parcel were to change, the new owner might have a different view. Therefore, it is only logical to move at this time to dedicate the road. If any new owner of that parcel of land decided that the road would not traverse his property, he could forbid people to travel on his property and could be very reluctant to co-operate in having the road dedicated.

The honourable member referred to the exchange of 10 ha of land for 3 ha of land. Under the Land Act, the land has to be of an equivalent value. It just happened that the area of 10 ha had a lesser value per hectare than the area of 3 ha.

The member for Windsor referred to the ruination of the Conondale Range area. That was a completely dishonest statement. Similar statements are always made by the conservationists.

Mr Comben interjected.

Mr GLASSON: The honourable member did say that. He said that the forests would be destroyed. That is what the conservationists, the Animal Liberation people and some of the other lobbies round the ridges have said. They have said that, if the rain forests of north Queensland were not placed on the World Heritage List before 31 December, or in 12 months, they would be ruined. That is a completely deceitful, dishonest statement. No people manage rain forests better than the professional forestry officers.

On the front page of today's *Courier-Mail* is a photograph of the spokesmen for the conservation group popping champagne corks and saying that the next campaign would ensure a cessation in harvesting the rain forests of north Queensland. Of course that would be supported by the member for Windsor.

The move to extend the Booloumba Creek area into the national park was designed to do nothing more than cause the cessation in the harvesting of timber in the Conondale Range area. That would result in the closure of sawmills and the loss of employment in the timber industry. The member for Windsor shakes his head. He is not concerned about those people. He cannot have it both ways. He is not being honest with himself or with the people of Queensland.

As he has done on many occasions, the member for Bundaberg (Mr Campbell) criticised the Forestry Department and its management of, firstly, the native forests and, secondly, the plantations. He said that the Forestry Department is growing plantation timbers that it cannot sell. I give him credit and say that he probably meant that the department cannot sell the thinnings in the market-place for use in the way that was originally intended. The best way to use the thinnings would be to turn them into wood-pulp in a pulp and paper mill. Over many years, that has been the long-term objective

of the Forestry Department. The real reason for growing plantation timber is to produce saw logs. The thinnings are just a by-product.

The honourable member referred also to cabinet timbers. He rattled off a list of prime cabinet timbers in Queensland. Each and every one of those species is grown in the rain forests, and the honourable member and all of his friends want to stop harvesting in those rain forests. They do not want any further harvesting of those precious timbers. That is completely negative thinking. If the rain forests were not there, those timbers would not be available to the people of Queensland.

The honourable member then referred to the growing of cabinet timbers. He referred to yellowwood, which is a very slow grower. I reiterate what the Forestry Department has endeavoured to do. The rain forest timbers can be seen on the fringe of the Atherton Tableland. They were planted after World War I. It was the greatest disaster ever. Those timbers grow in the rain forest environment. Efforts have been made to establish those implantation areas, and the result was disastrous.

The honourable member for Bundaberg (Mr Campbell) spoke very critically about the efforts of the department and the Government to encourage a pulp-mill in any area of Queensland where it would be a viable proposition to use the thinnings of the plantation estates of the department, but every endeavour by APM, when it has endeavoured to establish a pulp-mill, has been inhibited. There was a great furore from the conservationists and environmentalists who opposed it. The mill probably would have been built now in south-east Queensland if the proposal had been accepted, but the environment movement opposed it and won the day.

Mr Comben: Oh, come on!

Mr GLASSON: That is exactly what happened. If the honourable member for Windsor does not believe me, he should go away and do his homework properly.

There was another expression of interest from Ekono Oy, and negotiations took place over a long period. A trial shipment, consisting of a selection of average quality timber, was sent from Queensland to Finland. The timber was tested in the laboratory and paper was sent back to Queensland and used by every major newspaper company in Queensland and also in south-east Asia to determine the quality of the paper. Regrettably, at that time, there was a surplus on the world market—indeed, there still is—and the major users of paper told Ekono Oy that they would buy the best quality paper at the best price on the world market. That is why Ekono Oy could not attract a partner to invest in that project.

In reply to the sarcastic comment made by the honourable member for Port Curtis (Mr Prest) that there will probably be one in Cairns, I point out that interest has already been shown in the resources in the Mary Valley area—the Tuan/Toolara forest area—to utilise those thinnings. Six proposals have been submitted already and more will be submitted before the closing date. The department is continually endeavouring to obtain maximum utilisation of the resources of the forests of Queensland.

I refer to comments made by the honourable member for Cairns (Mr De Lacy) in a question in the House when I said this was another effort to destroy jobs. The very remarks from the honourable member for Bundaberg (Mr Campbell) on which I commented came from the honourable member for Cairns in this Chamber in a previous debate, in which he spoke about setting aside the rain forest and claimed that the department was growing more trees than it could sell. The honourable member did nothing but ridicule the efforts of the department to create jobs. Now, in this debate, he is saying that the department should be growing more trees. *Hansard* shows that the honourable member said that the department was growing trees that it could not sell.

Mr De Lacy: In south Queensland, I said.

Mr GLASSON: That is no doubt the statement he made.

Following the disaster of cyclone Winifred, what happened in the forests in north Queensland? The rain forests and plantations in north Queensland suffered drastically from cyclone Winifred. Conservationists, environmentalists and wildlife protection people made efforts to stop logging in north Queensland. Cyclone Winifred did more damage in 10 hours than would be caused in 100 years of harvesting the rain forests of north Queensland. That applies not only to the rain forests but also to the plantations and reserves in north Queensland where the Forestry Department endeavoured to salvage the timber that is now on the ground or has been destroyed or split in half. The destruction that took place had to be seen to be believed. As he has flown over the area, the member for Mourilyan would know that.

The honourable member asked what efforts have been taken by officers of the Forestry Department to salvage that timber. My answer is that the officers from Ingham and Atherton have made every possible endeavour to do so. When I was in north Queensland with David Howard of the ABC, I was given the opportunity of appealing to people to be aware of the disaster that was waiting to happen. I told the people of north Queensland that, if an irresponsible person dropped a lighted match or cigarette in that forest area, the damage caused by cyclone Winifred would look like a fairy-tale. That will be appreciated by anybody who has realistically assessed the forests in that area which, at the moment, could be described only as a powder-keg. If that area is ignited, Lord help the future of the rain forests of north Queensland.

If somewhere down the track those areas had been made national parks, the same endeavours of responsible and caring people would not have been available to protect those forests. That has not been so under the protection of the Forestry Department. It is no use Opposition members shaking their heads; they are the cold, hard facts.

Mr Comben: You are off the track, Bill.

Mr GLASSON: The member for Windsor would have Fraser Island, the Conondale Ranges and the Windsor Tableland declared as national parks.

I have not yet responded to the question asked by the member for Cairns (Mr De Lacy) relative to the Forestry Department of Queensland co-operating with the Federal Minister responsible for the environment on a report that was written following a joint inspection of the forests of north Queensland. That was a joint inspection by all bodies with a vested interest in forests—environmentalists, the Federal forestry authorities, the Queensland Forestry Department and the Lands Department. The report was written by Mr Cohen's department in Queensland and was sent to the State Government for comment.

The Premier wrote to the Prime Minister advising that the State Government required more time to assess that report in total. A report from the Queensland Forestry Department clearly indicates that in many areas it is only too happy to co-operate; but, in certain other areas, most certainly the State Government has no intention of co-operating with the Federal authorities. So the answer to the honourable member is that in some instances the State Government will be more than happy to co-operate with the Federal authorities, but the report cannot be accepted in total.

Motion (Mr Glasson) agreed to.

MINERS' HOMESTEAD LEASES ACT AND MINING TITLES FREEHOLDING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading—Resumption of Debate

Debate resumed from 12 March (see p. 4109) on Mr Glasson's motion—

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

Mr STEPHAN (Gympie) (3.13 p.m.): I have pleasure in joining the debate on the Bill which, in effect, transfers responsibility from the Mines Department to the Lands

Department. I believe that the Lands Department should have that responsibility. With its interest in and influence over land usage, there is no doubt that the Lands Department is the proper place for control over lands covered by the Bill.

I take this opportunity to point out a couple of the problems that I have found with miners' homestead perpetual leases, miners' homestead leases and residence areas in the Gympie area which, as honourable members know, is situated on an old mining-field. That field was worked over 100 years ago. In many instances the area was settled under miners' homestead perpetual leases, miners' homestead leases and residence areas. Over the last 30 or 40 years there has been quite a checkered history of involvement of owners of land on that mining-field.

At that stage, and even now, Labor did not want very much to do with the freeholding of land. In the '30s, '40s and '50s, a provision was written into the Act that the leases continued in perpetuity, as the name implies. For some areas, that has posed a problem for a long time. For many years, people have wanted to freehold land. However, they could not do so without transferring special leases and entering into a freeholding arrangement, which was a prolonged and expensive exercise. It was not until the '70s that successful moves were initiated to freehold land.

At that stage, three distinct tenures existed. Some properties had been freeholded. The miner's homestead lease was a fully paid-up lease and the miner's homestead perpetual lease was a perpetual lease. Many of those leases were owned by pensioners or people who had come from other areas. They did not realise the problems with perpetual leases, such as a lease fee having to be paid each year. I have had difficulty explaining to those people the difference between a miner's homestead lease and a miner's homestead perpetual lease. I have had greater difficulty explaining to them the increase in values placed on perpetual leases following the recent valuations. I can understand their concern about the 800 per cent increase in valuations. If it had been valued at $30, $40 or $50, a sudden increase to $200 would certainly be a disadvantage to the people concerned, particularly if they are pensioners. The alternative is to freehold the land. I have difficulty convincing pensioners that, in the long term, if they want to leave their land to their children or keep it for themselves for another 20 years—if they live that long—it will be in their best long-term interests to enter into a freeholding arrangement.

Mr Price: They can freehold now, can't they?

Mr STEPHAN: I am not arguing that. I have pointed out that, at present, in many instances it is more expensive to freehold and to go through the required procedure.

Mr Price: They pay only 51 per cent.

Mr STEPHAN: They pay only 51 per cent. I am sure that they will pay only 51 per cent of the 1980 valuation. I am thankful for that. I am passing on the suggestions that I have received from persons, mainly pensioners, who own land adjacent to freehold land and a miner's homestead lease.

Mr Price: If the Lands Department gets hold of them, the valuations will sky-rocket.

Mr STEPHAN: That is another matter that must be considered. I hope that the valuations will not sky-rocket. Under the administration of the Mines Department, the valuations have sky-rocketed.

I do not know whether the honourable member for Mount Isa has encountered a similar situation, but I have found that blocks of land adjacent to each other could be a fully paid-up lease and a perpetual lease. When the leases were first taken up, a valuation was placed on the miner's homestead lease, which was divided into 30 equal payments. However, with the perpetual lease, only a nominal valuation was imposed. The perpetual lease goes on in perpetuity. The nominal valuation is being increased at present. I find it difficult to explain to land-owners that the value is increasing.

I appreciate the efforts of the former Minister in achieving the present freeholding procedure. Following a number of years of negotiations and discussions, a decision was made that the 1980 valuations of the Valuer-General's Department be frozen and that those valuations would be used for the purpose of freeholding. However, with the increase in valuations, some problems have arisen. I ask the Minister to take those matters on board when determining future valuations and when he has discussions in future with those land-owners.

The holders of those residence areas are in a minority at the moment. They are required to hold a miner's right in order to occupy the blocks of land.

I hope that the Minister looks after the land in the fashion that honourable members have come to expect from him.

As to valuations—I hope that the Minister bears in mind the problems of the many people who own fully paid-up leases adjacent to perpetual leases that still have to be paid for.

Mr CAMPBELL (Bundaberg) (3.21 p.m.): It is very important for honourable members to realise that, although the Bill is supposed to consolidate the Lands Act, in effect it will result in more red tape.

The holder of land in a mining area used to be able to change his lease by dealing with one department—the Mines Department. Two departments will now be involved—the Lands Department as well as the Mines Department. People wanting to transfer leases in mining areas will now have to deal not only with the Mines Department but also with the Lands Department. That will not help to reduce red tape in Queensland. Although the Bill is supposed to consolidate the Land Act, it will in fact cause more problems.

The Opposition believes that problems will arise, although perhaps not as much in the old areas described by the honourable member for Gympie (Mr Stephan). The honourable member for Gympie will find it very difficult to explain to pensioners and others in his electorate that, in many instances, because a different method of valuation will be used, the change-over to the Lands Department will result in their being charged higher rents. I feel sorry for the honourable member for Gympie. I would not like to have to tell my constituents that I supported an increase in rentals to be paid by pensioners in my electorate. It is very important that that be remembered.

I have spoken about this matter with the honourable member for Mount Isa (Mr Price). In active mining areas, problems could arise with the Mines Department. Firstly, the provision to provide a residential tenure in active mining areas will be lost. I refer to the gem-field and Herberton areas. Secondly, a loss of control of land tenures in major active mining towns such as Mount Isa will occur. Thirdly, there will be a loss of control of freeholding in mining areas and those mineralised areas of the State that could develop into mining areas in the future. The areas that I have mentioned will suffer the greatest problems as a result of control transferring from the Mines Department to the Lands Department.

On 1 July 1980 the Mining Titles Freeholding Act came into operation. Although the Government is consolidating legislation, one section of the Queensland community is still greatly disadvantaged in Queensland. No-one on the Government side is prepared to consider it. People who have Housing Commission perpetual lease land are being discriminated against, because they are paying thousands and thousands of dollars more than they would if the land were under the control of the Lands Department. It is about time that Government members were prepared to look after the ordinary people who live in the cities as well.

I turn now to examine freeholding under the Mining Titles Freeholding Act. Because the land had not been purchased from the Crown, before a miner's perpetual lease can be converted to freehold, payment of the unimproved value of the land is required. Apparently it was the intention of the Government that the Miners' Homestead Leases Act provide for the land to be leased in perpetuity. For use of the land, a yearly rental

was set at 3 per cent of the purchase price if taken up at auction, or 3 per cent of the capital value if taken up by the applicant. The rentals were very moderate, and that leads me to the point that I wish to make. Firstly, under the provisions of the Miners' Homestead Leases Act, rental is quite moderate but, by transferring the leases to the Lands Act, the rental will be increased. By virtue of the transfer, many of the people who are supposed to be represented by the honourable member for Gympie (Mr Stephan) will have to pay higher rents—and he is supposed to be trying to help them. In electorates such as Gympie, there will be a backlash of resentment against this proposal.

The second point I wish to make is that, because the State has never been paid a purchase price for the land and has merely received rent, the Mining Titles Freeholding Act provides for the determination of the unimproved value by the Mining Wardens Court. That value would be different from the valuations determined by the Department of Lands.

An applicant may elect to take a lease over the land for 30 years and would pay one-thirtieth of the value. The balance would be paid in equal instalments over a period of 30 years if the land is sold as freehold. In the alternative, if cash is paid for the land, the applicant would receive a substantial discount inasmuch as only 51.24 per cent of the determined unimproved value would be paid. Even if an applicant elected to take up a lease and decided to complete the purchase within three months of notification of the unimproved value, it is still the case that only 51.24 per cent of the value has to be paid.

That is how the anomaly between the provisions of the Miners' Homestead Leases Act or the Mining Titles Freeholding Act and the Land Act can arise. Under the provisions of the Land Act, the capital value of the leases drawn up under that Act will be determined for all time at a value that was assessed as at 30 December 1980. The rent period for such leases is limited to 30 years, whereas under the Miners' Homestead Leases Act, the capital value continues to be subject to redetermination every 10 years and rent is paid in perpetuity. Moreover, prior to freeholding, for a lease under the Miners' Homestead Leases Act, the unimproved capital value is determined on the current unimproved value at the time that application is made. In other words, to bring the Mining Titles Freeholding Act and the Miners' Homestead Leases Act into line with the Land Act, the unimproved capital value that would be applied to all future purposes, including the calculation of rent and freehold value, would be determined on the basis of the rental period that operated as at 31 December 1980.

It is important to contrast that arrangement with what is being done for needy families in Queensland. Needy families are being disadvantaged by the greedy attitude adopted by the Queensland Government when it allows the freehold sale of land under the State Housing (Freeholding of Land) Act on a basis that is different from freeholding under the Land Act. Needy people are being blatantly discriminated against because they will have to pay a great deal more than other people for comparable land becuase of the favourable provisions of the Land Act. Those who receive the benefits of low freeholding values and low rentals are foreign companies and non-residential land-holders, and they receive those benefits whilst ordinary people are being disadvantaged in purchasing property under the State Housing (Freeholding of Land) Act.

The discrimination occurs in two ways. Firstly, I will compare two blocks of land that are valued at $12,000 in a transaction to buy out a property. Under the provisions of the Land Act and a perpetual town lease, $5,707 will be paid, whereas, in a rural area, under the provisions of a perpetual lease selection, for a cash payment, the land can be made subject to freehold for $3,739. The discrimination that I have referred to becomes obvious when I point out that, under the provisions of the State Housing (Freeholding of Land) Act and a residential Housing Commission perpetual lease, people would pay $12,000, which is not subject to discount.

Different titles can apply to adjoining blocks of the same size. That is discrimination. If a miner's homestead perpetual lease worth $12,000 is freeholded, the cost is $6,148. I say again that everybody benefits except the poor, needy families living in urban areas

buying land from the Housing Commission. The Minister referred to a consolidation of the Land Act. If he were to do it properly, he would consolidate the lot and bring Housing Commission land under the Land Act to ensure that Housing Commission tenants received the same benefits as everybody else.

I turn now to what happens when a person wants to pay off a block of land over a period. A $12,000 block in an urban area can, under the Land Act, be paid off over 30 years. If the land is in a rural area, it can be paid off over 60 years. However, the poor family living in a Housing Commission house in Bundaberg, Inala or a similar area who wants to buy a block of land of the same value has to pay $19,608 over 10 years. Where is the fairness and justice in such a system? Families are being discriminated against simply because they can buy a house through the Housing Commission only.

That is not the only injustice suffered by needy families purchasing a block of land from the Housing Commission. Under the Land Act, all land values were frozen at 31 December 1980. Not so for Housing Commission land; its value increases year by year. The Government squeezes every dollar it can out of needy families, yet country people live under the very favourable system of land values being frozen. That helps people such as Sir Robert Sparkes who, because he lived at Cecil Plains, is now able to buy a $3.7m property——

Mr FitzGerald: You never change, do you?

Mr CAMPBELL: The Government introduced legislation that enabled him to have his leasehold land valued under the 1971 valuation. He was then able to freehold that land, and will own it for the rest of his life. Yet ordinary people have to pay the full value of their land—and that value will go up and up and up.

Mr Littleproud: He doesn't live at Cecil Plains.

Mr CAMPBELL: Cecil Plains was one of the areas that was used to keep the valuations down.

Mr FitzGerald: You said he lived there. He doesn't live anywhere near Cecil Plains.

Mr CAMPBELL: It is still very important that areas such as that should be mentioned. People paid $3,000 for land valued at $12,000. What would happen if needy families in Bundaberg received the same benefit and were able to pay only $3,000 for land worth $12,000?

Mr FitzGerald interjected.

Mr CAMPBELL: It hurts the honourable member when he is exposed as discriminating against Queensland pensioners and not caring about needy people. All he is concerned about are the big, hungry land-owners. It happens again and again.

I want to know why foreign companies can freehold land so cheaply and yet people who have lived in Queensland all their lives cannot gain the same benefits. This Government is prepared to treat needy city people differently from country people. I do not want to take anything away from country people; all I want is the removal of blatant discrimination so that people purchasing land from the Housing Commission are treated in exactly the same way as people purchasing land under the Land Act. I hope that the Minister consults the Minister for Works and Housing (Mr Wharton) with a view to having all Queenslanders treated equally and receiving the same benefits.

A number of problems could occur when the Land Act is being consolidated, particularly relative to those areas where active mining still occurs. Problems could arise when the department loses control of areas that are freeholded. Many difficulties could be associated with those areas if they are wanted in the future for mining purposes.

Hon. W. D. LICKISS (Mount Coot-tha) (3.36 p.m.): It has been very interesting to listen to the debate. It seems that some honourable members have read much more into the Bill than I can see in it. I see it as streamlining, under the expertise of the Lands Department, the method of handling land dealings that were formerly handled by the Mines Department. That, to me, is the extent of the legislation.

It is very interesting to note the way in which land-handling in the State has progressed. When Queensland was a colony, all lands were Crown lands held under the

realm of the colony. Later they were held under the realm of the State of Queensland. When the land came into use, certain rights had to be alienated from the Crown for specific purposes. The Crown land lease system developed and, in certain circumstances, deeds of grant in fee simple were issued.

Over the years, as the requirements for land and the more intensive use of capital to develop land increased, it became necessary to vary land tenure to give greater or lesser security of tenure, depending on the capital investment required, to vary the term over which the land was to be alienated or to vary the purpose for which it could be used.

In parallel with the use of the Crown estate for grazing, agriculture and settlement purposes was the development of mining industries that became established where the minerals were found. A number of mineral discoveries were made over the face of Queensland. They required special administration. Therefore, under the Mining Act, a method of land-handling was set up and the necessary tenements were pegged. The miners' rights, which were the powerful weapon of the day, gave people the right to peg land for mining and ancillary purposes, such as residential areas, garden areas and business areas.

The Crown estate was permanent. The mining areas, as declared, were permanent only as long as the mineral could be located and the necessity remained to maintain the mining areas. The mining areas, as gazetted, were therefore varied from time to time. Because of cancellation, some of the non-mining tenures were located outside the existing mining areas. Some confusion arose on how mining areas of long tenure were to be maintained, registered and controlled by the Director of Mines.

In my view, the purpose of this legislation is sound. The developments in the Lands Department over the years have provided expertise in dealing with Crown land. They provided expertise in many fields of land usage. Over the years, the register of Crown leases has been set up. These non-mining leases fit very nicely into the system. I believe this measure to be a system of streamlining administration. It will be advantageous to all concerned.

An honourable member envisaged difficulties relative to arranging tenure on gazetted mining areas or reserves in the future. In fact, after the passage of this legislation, the present system will continue. No difficulties will be experienced. Instead of seeing a reference to the Director-General, Department of Mines, one will see a reference to the Chief Commissioner of Lands, Land Administration Commission. I cannot see arising the difficulties that the honourable member mentioned.

Without delaying the House, I indicate that the Liberal Party supports the legislation. It believes that the introduction of the legislation is a progressive step forward. I would like to see more mining tenures taken over and registered in a central registry of Crown leases. In other States—for example, in South Australia—the registrar of titles also registers Crown leases. They all come under the registration-of-title system. I do not see any problem, ultimately, in working towards that end in this State. I think that in time the Titles Office and the Crown lease registers will be amalgamated so that people dealing with the various tenures and interests in land will be able to go to the one office. It is well known that once a deed of grant in fee simple is issued, any subsequent dealings by way of subdivision are transferred to, and the dealings are handled by, the Titles Office.

I repeat that this is a step in the right direction. I compliment the Minister for introducing the legislation. The Liberal Party supports it.

Mr PRICE (Mount Isa) (3.41 p.m.): At the beginning, I admit that I am becoming more and more confused and starting to feel that perhaps I do not know enough yet about the change-over. Certainly, after I have listened to the member for Gympie (Mr Stephan) and the member for Mount Coot-tha (Mr Lickiss), that view has been reinforced. Goodness knows what the public servants will make of this when the orders pass through.

Mr Baker will need more than two years to build himself into a sensible administrative force.

It seems to me that there are two sides to the argument. The contribution of the member for Mount Coot-tha seemed to be an over-simplification. He said that it was just a streamlining of the administration. I can see confusion arising not only for public servants but also for members of the public in their dealings with the Mines Department and the Lands Department. I share the sentiments of the honourable member for Bundaberg (Mr Campbell) in replying to the speech of the honourable member for Gympie. I cannot understand the attitude that the member for Gympie adopts.

I can envisage all sorts of problems arising, I would like, if I can, to put both sides of the argument and, eventually, to refer to some of the anomalies, particularly in my own region, that are already appearing and are hurting people with miners' homestead perpetual leases and non-competitive leases (NCLs).

The position is similar to that which occurred in 1980-1981, when there were high valuations of $20,000 in cities such as Townsville. Three per cent of that amount, $600, was added to rates of about $600, putting the cost beyond the bounds of reasonableness.

The whole matter is historic and boils down to a contest between the Lands Department and the Mines Department as to which department gets the revenue. The history of miners' homestead tenure has been roughly traversed, and certainly I am not here to instruct the Minister or his advisers on that history.

To my mind, the Bill does not go far enough. It is only selectively taking one form of tenure from the Mines Department and giving it to the Land Administration Commission. It is not touching the other forms of tenure, and, really, there are dozens of other forms of tenure in the Mines Department. On the other hand, it seems so simple to leave a perfectly efficient system of running mineral fields—and I live on one—and to repeal inactive mineral fields such as Gympie, Warwick and Herberton. It is reasonable to assume that regions in which mining is not the principal activity could fall under the control of the Lands Department. My initial reaction is to suggest that mining-fields be repealed and that freehold title be granted readily. If necessary, once the mining-field is repealed, amendments could simply be made to the Mining Titles Freeholding Act to ensure that freeholding is on the same basis as under the Land Act.

There are four or five facets of the legislation that must be addressed. As the honourable member for Mount Coot-tha (Mr Lickiss) pointed out, when minerals were found in various regions of Queensland from the turn of the century onwards, the Mines Department enacted a very sensible method of administering land tenure in those mineral-fields, the guiding principle being that mineral-fields are finite and that, at the end of the life of a field, all of the land will eventually return to the Crown. So MHPLs were created to meet the need, and they became a very efficient form of land tenure. In that case, in an active field such as Mount Isa, I question exactly what will happen at the end of the life of the Cloncurry/Mount Isa mineral-field after this legislative change.

Mr Lickiss: Sometimes the tenure extends well beyond the life of the field.

Mr PRICE: Yes; but the honourable member for Mount Coot-tha cannot deny that a mineral-field is finite, and that is the basis upon which MHPLs were created. No matter how long beyond the life of the field it will stretch, people will leave despite an endeavour being made to get other industry into the region to prolong that life. However, for the purposes of this argument, MHPLs were created on that basis.

With decentralisation, as was agreed this morning, the Mining Act, the Miners' Homestead Leases Act and the Mining Titles Freeholding Act are all controlled on a regional basis. The local warden is the registrar of titles and dealings under those Acts, and the Wardens Court provides an open and public forum for dissent from any decision. In sand-mining and uranium-mining regions, that occurs frequently. In such cases, the public, through the warden, has ready access to information and to all the plans of that

mineral-field. All the dealings and all the titles can be searched locally rather than in Brisbane.

The mineral-field at Mount Isa is 2 000 km by road from Brisbane, so there will be all sorts of problems in searching not only in Mount Isa or Cloncurry, where at the moment there is a land commissioner, but also in Brisbane.

Mr Glasson: All records stay with the warden.

Mr PRICE: The warden will be classified as the land commissioner and left there? What will happen to the land commissioner in Cloncurry? Will he be shifted? Will there be two? That will be good.

The Mining Act, the Land Act and the Real Property Act are all fairly complex pieces of legislation that require expert knowledge for even simple actions such as transfers, additions and amalgamations, whereas the Miners' Homestead Leases Act is easily understood and ordinary citizens can readily effect their own transactions without recourse to expert and expensive advice. In fact, I think it could be the model upon which other legislation controlling State land tenures should be based.

The third facet is mining-fields. Unless the Mining Act itself is to be brought under the Land Act, it is difficult to see any benefit in the proposal within an active mining-field. The Mining Act provides for the granting of several forms of tenure and for the administration of some tenures no longer granted. The other tenures about which we are speaking that are controlled by the Mines Department cover claims, mining leases, authorities to prospect (ATPs), special mining leases, market garden areas, business areas, residence areas, dredging leases, licences over alien land, proclaimed areas for various purposes, and so on. Over each mining-field, the Mines Department maintains master plans showing the current status of all such tenures and all tenures under the Miners' Homestead Leases Act and, when necessary, tenures under the Land Act and the Real Property Act inasmuch as they affect mining tenures.

As I pointed out earlier, it must be remembered that all mines have a finite and limited duration. Consequently, tenures are continually changing, with land being transferred, reverting to the Crown or changing its use status. A stark example of that is an exercise done in Mount Isa a couple of years ago which showed that the turnover of population in that city was 10 per cent every three months. Can honourable members imagine the transfer of titles of land in that city alone?

Unless all the tenures under the Mining Act are brought under the Land Act, I consider that delays will be exacerbated and extreme, as the Land Administration Commission will have to determine the status of surrounding mining tenures from the Mines Department before approving of a new homestead. The Mining Act further enforces that, of course, by requiring the approval of the Minister before the granting of any lease.

The Miners' Homestead Leases Act also grants miners a priority use of the land, with compensation only for capital improvements, whereas the determination of compensation over other Crown land subject to a mining lease application or a mining claim application is awkward, with agreement to be reached between the lessee and the applicant before the mining tenement is granted.

The Minister is no doubt aware of the problems that occurred on the coal-fields, particularly in New South Wales. A miner, whether a small gouger or a major operator, can apply for his mining leases and for a homestead adjacent or nearby, thereby allowing the simultaneous development of his mine and his residence. Mary Kathleen was a good example of that. It was under the tenure of miner's homestead perpetual lease. In one of the suburbs of Mount Isa, Mount Isa Mines took up a mining lease for housing purposes and then, with houses constructed on the allotments, sold them to its employees as MHPLs. Such actions are currently administered by one department and are rather straightforward, but the Bill before the House will require negotiation with two departments.

The Mines Department has participated in such development by designing and constructing roads and selling at auction developed MHPLs to facilitate housing requirements in mining-fields. Because of something that occurred recently in Cloncurry, I had certain discussions with the department. Before the edict was issued by Cabinet, money had been put aside in the Budget for the surveying of land in Cloncurry for just such a sale of land. Fortunately, Mr Baker was able to reassure me that that money would be spent before the Lands Department took over.

The danger was that the money might go back into the Government's coffers simply because the Lands Department would not have allocated that money for the surveying of that land. What will happen in Mount Isa when the matter is taken out of the control of the Mount Isa City Council? With such developments, the Mines Department is fully aware that, when the mining is over, the land will revert to the Crown, so it sets a reserve price that covers the cost of the development without any component for the value of land.

A couple of years ago, a development of that nature was commenced in Collinsville by the Mines Department. The development was completed by the Land Administration Commission (LAC). The Mines Department had intended charging about $7,000 per allotment. However, the reserves set by the LAC were about $12,000, because it includes a high value for the land component. That will pose another problem for a local authority that wants to subdivide land. It is not like the miner's homestead perpetual leases. A local authority will have to look at that additional value, because the Land Administration Commission will not outlay money on subdivision unless it receives a return on its money. To do that, a certain amount must be added to the price of the land when it is sold, so the reserve price is so much higher.

My advice is that the agreement Acts also come into contention. Although I am unsure of the exact situation, I believe that certain of the agreement Acts—for example, the agreement with Comalco at Weipa—provide for the granting of miners' homestead titles over residential development. Again, two departments will be involved with future dealings under that legislation.

At the moment, under the miners' homestead leases, any person may place a datum post and apply for a homestead, although, within designated auction areas, he will require the Minister's approval for his application to proceed. Assuming that the miners' homestead perpetual leases will be replaced by perpetual town, suburban or country leases, as far as I can ascertain no provision exists under the Land Act for a person to make application for land other than through the auction system.

That leads me to the question that I have been trying to ask in this Chamber for the last month. It is addressed to the Mines Department. If the Minister can see fit, perhaps he might address the question and give me an answer today. On 7 September 1985, the Minister, by proclamation, set apart the whole of the Cloncurry/Mount Isa mining-fields for auction purposes under the Miners' Homestead Leases Act, thereby depriving persons of their 100-year-old right to take up land in mining-fields for residential purposes. Did that proclamation comply with the provisions of section 16 of the Miners' Homestead Leases Act? Would the Minister table the report and the recommendations of the mining warden submitted prior to that proclamation? When will those restrictions be lifted?

Mr Glasson: You want that today?

Mr PRICE: If I cannot have a reply today, I shall hand the question to the Minister.

Another problem arises with the Mount Isa City Council. As an alderman on the Mount Isa City Council, I would say that, very frequently, the council receives requests for additional land. Very often, the MHPLs in Mount Isa either back onto open space, onto creeks or onto areas of land that are bush that become untidy. People, in their enthusiasm, look after the land behind their block or they ask for permission from the council to add the land onto their blocks. The Land Act contains no direct provision for an addition to a perpetual lease, although it can be effected by application and

negotiation. The Miners' Homestead Leases Act provides for such action. So, under MHPLs, it can be done. However, of course, the Land Act contains no provision for that.

I raise the anomaly of non-competitive leases (NCLs) and the problems being faced by house-holders in one area of Mount Isa. Previously, I spoke about Mount Isa Mines subdividing a mineral lease, putting houses on it and selling it back again as MHPLs. Years ago, Mount Isa Mines made arrangements with the Lands Department—the Land Administration Commission ended up with it—about the payment that the Lands Department required Mount Isa Mines to make. However, like the others on MHPLs, the residents—the people who went into the houses on NCLs—were required to pay 3 per cent of the unimproved value. That 3 per cent was reasonable. As a matter of fact, until recently, it was $52.50 per year, which was nominal. However, the non-competitive leases agreement contains a prohibition on freeholding. Those people cannot freehold their land.

Every 10 years, the rental is reassessed, and valuations are made. As the Minister comes from Longreach, he ought to know that the MHPL rentals are fairly nominal, and the criteria given to the warden to place valuations on mining leases are fairly liberal. Really, they do not pin him down to anything. In my general experience, the valuation of the mining warden is about half that of the Valuer-General. A method of valuation used by the warden was the use of the unimproved capital value. That valuation is carried out every seven years for a local council. Current valuations are those of the Valuer-General at present. For some the 10 years is up. The 3 per cent will relate to much higher valuations, and the $52.50 has now become $285 per annum.

The rates charged in Mount Isa are among the highest in Queensland. Mount Isa residents are paying upwards of $750 per annum for rates. If $285 is added, they are paying over $1,000 per annum on NCLs. Mount Isa residents are streets ahead of anybody else. They are paying $1,000 per annum for rates, because the valuations are just too high on NCLs.

I equate that with what happened in 1981 when valuations were frozen. I ask the Minister to consider non-competitive leases and perhaps give the holders of those leases the opportunity to freehold that land or delete from the agreement the provision that stops the holders of non-competitive leases from freeholding their land.

These people are starting to hurt because they are having to pay retrospectively. The Mines Department has up to three years to value all these leases. The department has taken two years to do it. In 1985, those people paid $52.50. In 1986, they pay $285. However, they must also meet the difference between the $52.50 and the $285 from last year. So, everybody is being hit with bills of more than $500. It is occurring spasmodically, and the complaints are being received one at a time. However, they will continue. It is only happening in the isolated cases of non-competitive leases, so I ask the Minister to address that problem and see what he can do.

I have previously mentioned that Mount Isa will require a land commissioner and staff in addition to the existing mining warden's establishment. A mining warden's office has been set up in Mount Isa, but the land commissioner's office is in Cloncurry. I am informed by the land commissioner at Cloncurry that he is not sure of the result of this legislation and fears a deluge of paper-work. If the Minister is indicating that the land commissioner will remain at Cloncurry and that the mining warden will act as a land commissioner in Mount Isa, he may have a short-term solution to the problem. The drawback is that the co-ordination between the Department of Lands and the Department of Mines may be a problem in terms of time estimates. I assume that the Minister envisages that, at some time in the future, a land commissioner will be located at either one place or the other.

Searches of records are a problem in Mount Isa, and I would like the Minister to inform the House whether Department of Lands records will be located in Mount Isa or whether they will remain in Cloncurry. The Minister is indicating that the situation

will remain as it is for the present, so I will leave the matter at that. I understand that plans will also be retained at Mount Isa and will not be sent to Brisbane.

To my mind, to determine any consequences that might flow to mining operations, the new provisions relating to grants of land should be referred to the Department of Mines. Obviously, that would cause a delay. The Minister indicates to me that that will not happen, either.

I am concerned that doubts will arise about security of tenure and that legal action over freehold transactions will ensue. I suspect that the original suggestions about this legislation were made by lawyers who wanted the Government to consolidate land tenure dealings throughout Queensland. To my mind, the Government is hiding behind the law and, instead of having regard to the requirements of users of land tenures, has attempted to appease lawyers and simplify things for legal practitioners. The end result will be that costs associated with property transactions will increase. I can understand why the legislation would receive the support of lawyers because everybody will be slipping into the office of the local solicitor to find out what the provisions mean.

In conclusion, I reiterate the statement I made at the outset by suggesting that many of the existing problems could be solved by repealing legislation in respect of mining fields that are now defunct, such as those in the Gympie area.

That would reduce much of the confusion that is associated with this legislation. In principle, what should be strived for is a reduction in the variety of tenures granted in Queensland and the administration of all tenures by one authority only. That proposal obviously warrants an in-depth study before any action is taken or legislation is promulgated.

I am not presently able to argue the clauses because none of the provisions contained in the amendments have anything to do with the problems that I perceive are associated with tenures. I feel that transferring the provisions of the Miners' Homestead Leases Act to the Mining Titles Freeholding Act is ill conceived and represents only a short-term solution. I believe that the Government should establish a commission with a view to rationalising tenures because, at present, tenures are being administered by almost every Government department. It is therefore not surprising that one section of the Government is unaware of what other sections are doing. I draw the attention of the Minister to the problems that I have outlined and the question that I have asked, and ask him to turn his mind to those matters in his reply.

Hon. W. H. GLASSON (Gregory—Minister for Lands, Forestry, Mapping and Surveying) (4.8 p.m.), in reply: I thank all honourable members for their contributions to the debate. The legislation presently before the House has generated a deal of concern. It appears to me that everyone is afraid of the unknown. The legislation merely provides for transferring the authority for administration of MHPLs from the Chief Lands Commissioner to the Director-General of the Department of Mines.

It is little wonder that the honourable member for Mount Isa (Mr Price) concluded by saying that the clauses do not address problems inherent in legislation relating to tenures. Basically, he was concerned about what will happen. However, I took very keen notice of many of the points he made, and I will be only too happy to respond to them. The honourable member was particularly concerned that, in the city of Mount Isa, the Land Administration Commission had taken land from the Mines Department for development as residential areas.

The Opposition spokesman expressed similar concerns. Regrettably, he was labouring under the false apprehension that, because this legislation will change the authority for administration from one department to another, there will automatically be drastic changes in everybody's values and that, overnight, rents pertaining to MHPLs and many other tenures referred to by members from both sides of the House will escalate.

I would like to clarify that all the Bill does is transfer the administration of miners' homesteads, residence areas, business areas and market garden areas from the Department

of Mines to the Land Administration Commission. It does not in any way touch or affect mining leases, authorities to prospect or mining claims. It does not change or affect in any way the present administration of the Miners' Homestead Leases Act or the Mining Titles Freeholding Act. It only transfers the administration from one department to another.

The status quo in respect of miners' homesteads, residence areas, business areas and market garden areas will continue. There will be no change in the approach to values or the administration of rents. Rents will continue to be determined by the wardens, or on appeal to the warden's court. Where the Valuer-General is presently involved in the determination of freeholding prices of those tenures, he will continue to be so involved.

I trust that I have satisfied the concerns of the Opposition spokesman. It is only the administration that is being changed; there are no changes in substance. However, when the legislation was being considered, certain minor anomalies were discovered which are being rectified.

It will still be possible to take up miners' homestead perpetual leases within the boundaries of the presently proclaimed mining-fields within the State. Mining leases and mining claims, which are granted under the Mining Act and are for the purpose of extraction of minerals or purposes associated with that type of operation, can be granted anywhere in the State. They are not related to, or restricted to, mining-fields.

I further understand that miners' homestead perpetual leases can only be granted over Crown land within the boundaries of a proclaimed mining-field. I understand that it is not possible for further residence areas, business areas or market garden areas to be granted anywhere within the State. I understand that the legislation that provided for the granting of such tenures was repealed quite a number of years ago and that there is merely a savings clause in the Mining Act protecting tenures of the types that were in existence when the legislation was repealed.

In relation to the concern of the member for Mourilyan—the legislation definitely does not aply to mining leases or mining claims. He mentioned the matter of grazing selections and occupation licences. I will consider the matters raised by him. As he is aware, compensation is payable by miners in certain instances. That is a matter for determination under the Mining Act and not the Acts that are being dealt with by this legislation.

The member for Mourilyan expressed concern about the future use of lands that are presently held as mining leases when those areas cease to be used for the extraction of minerals. I am unable to give him any assurance as to the use of such land in the future.

Each case—for example, whether land is within an existing title or within vacant Crown Land that was subject to such mining leases—will have to be considered on its merits, however, in certain instances, regard may clearly be had to the background tenure of the expired or terminated mining lease.

Comments were made by the member for Mourilyan about speculators profiteering from miners' homestead perpetual leases. He would be aware that each miner's homestead perpetual lease is subject to a condition requiring substantial improvements to be erected within 12 months of the grant of that lease. It has been the Government's policy since 1958 that transfers of miners' homestead perpetual leases should not be approved by the Minister until the improvement conditions have been complied with, unless exceptional or extenuating circumstances have forced the present holder to sell his lease. Also, the transferor and transferee are required to justify the purchase price of the lease. For instance, the purchase price should not greatly exceed the cost of obtaining and maintaining the lease, improvements erected thereon and a reasonable rate of interest on the moneys expended by the holder of the lease. That policy was formulated in an endeavour to curb speculation. That is exactly why it was introduced.

The honourable members for Gympie and Bundaberg spoke about the recent rise in rents. A reassessment of rents has taken place in that area. Rents are reviewed every 10 years. Many people are under the misconception that, at the moment of the transfer of authority, there will be a change in the methodology in determining the rent figure. The general idea seemed to be that, when the land comes under the umbrella of the Lands Department, a valuation will be invoked by the Lands Department valuers, and 3 per cent of that valuation will determine the new lease rental. I hope that I have explained that that is not so. The method of determining the rent will continue. It will be determined by the warden in the court house in the particular mining area and an appeal will lie to the Mining Wardens Court.

The honourable member for Mount Isa expressed concern about the records being kept at Cloncurry. They will remain in the offices in which they are presently located. Basically, there is to be no change. I have had problems in trying to convince a person living on a block of land in a town that, because he happens to be under a covenant relative to Housing Commission land, the value or the method of purchase for freeholding his land is completely different from those of his neighbour. I am prepared to consult with my colleague the Minister for Works and Housing to try to arrive at more realistic and comparable figures for the two tenures. No honourable member can substantiate why the valuations are so astronomically different. I appreciate the problem.

Obviously, the honourable member for Mount Coot-tha understands what the Bill is about. I thank him for his support.

Mr Davis: Good old surveyor Bill!

Mr GLASSON: The honourable member for Mount Coot-tha made a very responsible contribution, as did the honourable member for Mount Isa. Both honourable members indicated that they know what the legislation is about.

Basically, I have answered the queries raised by the honourable member for Mount Isa. He raised many relevant points, which I appreciate. The honourable member asked a question to which I can give the answer. The notification of 7 September 1985 was submitted by my colleague the Minister for Mines and Energy in an endeavour to stop application for a limited period until the transfer of administration of the Acts from the Minister for Mines and Energy to the Minister for Lands. As soon as the transfer is finalised, the notification of 7 September 1985 will be reviewed and possibly cancelled. Is that OK?

Mr Price: Yes.

Question—That the Bill be now read a second time (Mr Glasson's motion)—put; and the House divided—

AYES, 47		NOES, 30	
Ahern	Lester	Braddy	Warburton
Alison	Lickiss	Burns	Warner, A. M.
Austin	Lingard	Campbell	Yewdale
Bailey	Littleproud	Casey	
Bjelke-Petersen	McKechnie	D'Arcy	
Borbidge	McPhie	De Lacy	
Cahill	Menzel	Eaton	
Chapman	Miller	Fouras	
Clauson	Muntz	Gibbs, R. J.	
Cooper	Newton	Goss	
Elliott	Powell	Hamill	
FitzGerald	Randell	Kruger	
Gibbs, I. J.	Row	Mackenroth	
Glasson	Simpson	McElligott	
Gunn	Stephan	McLean	
Gygar	Stoneman	Milliner	
Harper	Tenni	Palaszczuk	
Harvey	Turner	Prest	
Henderson	Wharton	Price	
Innes	White	Scott	
Jennings		Shaw	
Katter		Smith	
Knox	*Tellers:*	Underwood	*Tellers:*
Lane	Kaus	Vaughan	Comben
Lee	Neal	Veivers	Davis

Resolved in the affirmative.

Committee

Mr Menzel (Mulgrave) in the chair; Hon. W. H. Glasson (Gregory—Minister for Lands, Forestry, Mapping and Surveying) in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1, as read, agreed to.

Clause 2—Commencement—

Mr GLASSON (4.26 p.m.): I move the following amendment—

"At page 2, omit all words comprising lines 7 to 9."

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 2, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 3—Parts of Act—

Mr GLASSON (4.27 p.m.): I move the following amendments—

"At page 2, line 11, omit the expression—

'3'

and substitute the expression—

'2' ";

"At page 2, line 13, omit the expression—

'4-12'

and substitute the expression—

'3-11' ";

"At page 2, line 15, omit the expression—

'13-16'

and substitute the expression—

'12-15'."

Amendments agreed to.

Clause 3, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 4 to 16, as read, agreed to.

Bill reported, with amendments.

Third Reading

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

STATISTICAL RETURNS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading—Resumption of Debate

Debate resumed from 27 February (see p. 3916) on Mr Lester's motion—

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

Mr McLEAN (Bulimba) (4.32 p.m.): This legislation was first introduced into the House in 1935 and, to my knowledge, has not been amended since. No-one could say that this amendment to the legislation is not overdue. Obviously quite a few years have passed since anyone has considered the legislation.

The legislation deals with the compilation and release of statistics in Queensland and will update the penalties. The Opposition has no dispute with the provisions of the Bill. It is obvious to the Opposition that any responsible Government must maintain an up-to-date record of events. Such records must be true and comprehensive.

Although I have no opposition to the Bill, I have some questions to ask the Minister—that is, when he arrives in the Chamber. I am aware that there is an agreement with the Federal Government on the collection of information. That is covered by the Commonwealth and State Statistical Agreement Act, the preliminary note to which states—

> "This Act ratifies an arrangement between the Commonwealth Government and the Queensland Government whereby an Integrated Statistical Service is constituted. The function of the Service is to collect and publish statistics and supply statistical information for Commonwealth and State purposes. The agreement forms a Schedule to the Act. It provides for the Commonwealth substantially to take over the facilities previously provided by the State for the collection, collation and publication of statistical information.
>
> . . .
>
> . . . authorizes the Governor-General to enter into arrangements with State Governors respecting the collection, publication, etc., of statistics."

Section 9 of that Act states—

> "Except where otherwise expressly provided, the Commonwealth will meet the full cost of the staff, equipment, printing, office accommodation and other things required for the Integrated Statistical Service."

Because no annual report is printed on statistics, it is difficult to obtain information in Queensland.

Clause 4 of the Statistical Returns Act has not been amended. It states—

> "Government Statistician may deliver forms for procuring information. For the purpose of collecting and publishing statistical information relating to—
>
> (a) Population; vital statistics;
>
> (b) Immigration and emigration;
>
> (c) Social statistics;
>
> (d) Factories and manufacturing industries;

(e) Wages;
(f) Employment and non-employment;
(g) Imports and exports;
(h) Shipping;
(i) Railways and tramways and transport generally;
(j) Banking, insurance, and finance;
(k) Land tenure and occupancy;
(l) Agricultural, pastoral, and kindred industries;
(m) Mining and mining industries (including quarries);
(n) Retail and distributive industries;
(o) Forestry;
(p) Fisheries;
(q) Local government;
(r) Water conservation and supply;
(s) Any other prescribed matters . . ."

I would like the Minister in his reply——

An Opposition Member: When he turns up.

Mr McLEAN: When the Minister arrives in the Chamber, I would like him to explain what happens with the Queensland section. From the limited amount of literature I have on the matter, it appears that costs are paid by the Federal Government.

I repeat that the Opposition does not oppose the legislation, which I hope in no way duplicates any present procedures between the State and Federal bodies. In fact, I trust that it will improve the efficiency of procedures.

Because of the absence of the Minister, I am placed in a difficult position. The Minister is probably aware that no annual report is provided on these matters. It is difficult to ascertain what is done and how far the State goes in compiling its figures.

Although the Opposition does not oppose the Bill, I would ask the Minister to clarify his plans for the future on any State-initiated extensions for the compilation of data.

Hon. C. A. WHARTON (Burnett—Leader of the House) (4.37 p.m.): I thank the honourable member for his contribution. In a few moments I shall give him some advice. The Minister is on his way.

An Opposition Member: He is indisposed.

Mr WHARTON: He is not.

I thank the Opposition for its support for the Bill. The honourable member for Bulimba will find an answer to his question in the annual report. I trust that the honourable member will be satisfied with that.

Mr COMBEN: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to speak to the Bill. The Minister has not replied.

Mr WHARTON: I have replied.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Row): Order! I will give the call to the honourable member for Windsor. However, I cannot understand why he left it so late.

Mr COMBEN (Windsor) (4.38 p.m.): The Bill that is being debated should take into consideration statistics of all types. In Queensland, it is always interesting to read statistics. The sort of statistics to be covered by the Bill should include the statistics that, today, Queensland has the highest jobless rate of any State in Australia. It is those

statistics to which honourable members should refer. The figures for February show that, in Queensland, 121 600 full-time or part-time workers, or 10.3 per cent of the Queensland work-force, were unemployed. One would expect any reasonable Government to be concerned about that and compile statistics on it. However, the Queensland Government does not care about the unemployed or the percentage of the work-force that is employed.

In January, 9.6 per cent of the State's work-force was without a job. In February, the rate of unemployment in other States compared very favourably with the rate of 10.3 per cent in Queensland. New South Wales had an unemployment rate of 9.4 per cent, which the New South Wales Government was greatly concerned about. That Government implemented job-creation policies and sought to find employment for the young people of that State. Victoria had unemployment of 7.4 per cent, which is still unacceptably high; but, when compared with the unemployment rate in Queensland, it is commendable. South Australia had an unemployment rate of 8.8 per cent and Western Australia had an unemployment rate of 8.7 per cent.

The other conservative State in this nation—Tasmania—had an unemployment rate of 9.7 per cent. In other words, the two conservative States, with conservative economics and conservative job-creation policies, have the highest unemployment in Australia—and it is said that the Queensland economy is on the mend!

The average unemployment rate for Australia was 8.9 per cent, with a total of 663 100 out of work. The Federal Government has created more than half a million new jobs in three years. It is well on its target for economic recovery. The present Federal Treasurer is one of the best Treasurers to be found anywhere in the world.

Members of the Opposition commend the compilation of meaningful statistics. Today, in Queensland, statistics should be compiled about motor vehicle registrations and bankruptcy. New motor vehicle registrations in Queensland are the lowest in Australia; bankruptcies are the highest in Australia.

Mr Vaughan: And increasing.

Mr COMBEN: As the honourable member for Nudgee says, they are increasing. It is a terrible state of affairs, and it is deplored by members of the Opposition.

Hon. C. A. WHARTON (Burnett—Leader of the House) (4.42 p.m.), in reply: I have thanked the honourable member for Bulimba (Mr McLean) for his contribution. Similarly, I thank the honourable member for Windsor (Mr Comben). I will refer to the remarks of the honourable member for Windsor shortly.

The demand for statistics by Governments, businessmen, economists, social workers and others has increased enormously in the past two decades. That has arisen largely because of the increasing complexity of our modern world, but also because of the role that Government has adopted in providing services to the people of Queensland. Those services range from the provision of health care, justice, housing, education—all aimed at protecting the welfare of Queenslanders—to the monitoring of measures aimed at achieving economic growth and development of the State.

To function efficiently, the Queensland Government must have available to it sound and accurate statistics that enable it to formulate appropriate policies. Statistics are important in helping to comprehend problems that must be dealt with and to put these problems in the proper perspective. The Government's statistical legislation must therefore be as up to date as possible to ensure that an appropriate level of information is available.

The honourable member for Windsor referred to the unemployment figures that were released this morning. I am pleased to be able to advise the House of some of the more important trends shown by those figures.

Queensland continues to have the highest employment growth in Australia. The State is generating jobs at a level 50 per cent above that of Australia as a whole. During the last 12 months, 54 800 jobs were created in Queensland, and during the same period

the unemployment rate dropped by 1 per cent, compared with a drop of only 0.4 per cent for Australia as a whole.

As I have said before, Queensland's unemployment rate is largely a result of the failure by the Federal Government to provide the same sort of protection and subsidies to this State's sugar industry that it provides to inefficient manufacturing industries in southern States. Even though Queensland's major industry, sugar, is suffering the results of neglect by the Federal Government, it needs to be remembered that the State as a whole is still producing new jobs at a much higher rate than the other States and the nation as a whole. In spite of the fact that the State is providing new jobs for people coming to Queensland from other States at a rate of 200 people every week, the number of people unemployed in Queensland is also falling faster than it is in other States.

To enable the statistical service to continue to function effectively in Queensland, it is necessary to ensure that information is provided where it is needed to make important decisions. However, it is also necessary to ensure that the confidentiality of information used to compile those statistics is protected and that legal sanctions exist against unauthorised disclosure of confidential statistical information.

The amendments to the Statistical Returns Act will update the Act and improve the statistical service within the Queensland Government.

Once again, I thank all members for their contribution to the debate and commend the Bill to the House.

Motion (Mr Lester) agreed to.

Committee

Mr Menzel (Mulgrave) in the chair; Hon. C. A. Wharton (Burnett—Leader of the House) and Hon. V. P. Lester (Peak Downs—Minister for Employment and Industrial Affairs) in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—Short title and citation—

Mr DAVIS (4.45 p.m.): I pose questions in the hope that the Minister in charge of the Bill may be able to offer some explanations. At the outset, let me say that I wonder why the Minister for Employment and Industrial Affairs (Mr Lester) is not in the House so that he can answer them.

I direct these pertinent questions to the Minister in charge of the Bill. Can he tell me why the unemployment rate in Queensland is still the highest of all States and Territories throughout the nation? As it is part of the role of the Government Statistician to collect data on this matter, I hope the Minister can answer that question so that it will be recorded in *Hansard* for posterity. Although it is a fact of life that the Minister responsible for the Bill is not in the Chamber, I am surprised, nevertheless.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr Menzel): Order! I rule the honourable member out of order. As I read clause 1, it provides for the short title and citation.

Mr Davis: Which clause would the Chair advise me to direct my remarks to?

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Order! Certainly not to clause 1. If the honourable member for Brisbane Central wishes to raise those matters, he should do so at a later stage.

Mr WHARTON: I have already provided the honourable member with an answer, which is contained in the Bill presently before the Committee.

Clause 1, as read, agreed to.

Clause 2—Amendment of s. 3A; Government Statistician—

Mr DAVIS (4.47 p.m.): Because this clause deals specifically with the role of the Government Statistician, I reiterate my previous remarks. I inform the Committee that Opposition members decided that the legislation presently being considered was not

what one would term politically motivated. The legislation relates purely to the collection and analysis of numerical data, and any decent parliamentarian would regard the subject-matter as apolitical. It is a pity that, in the absence of the Minister for Employment and Industrial Affairs (Mr Lester), the Minister in charge of the Bill introduced the legislation by making comments of a political nature.

It is only fair that today's *Hansard* should record that the number of unemployed in Queensland is the highest of any State or Territory in Australia. It was stated in a newspaper article today that in Queensland in February, 9.6 per cent of the population was unemployed——

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member for Brisbane Central will resume his seat. I explained earlier that I can see no relevance in the honourable member's remarks to the subject-matter of the clause presently under discussion.

Although I have not read the Bill in detail, as I read clause 2, it does not relate to what the honourable member has spoken about. I hope that the honourable member is not attempting to make a mockery of the proceedings. If he were, I would be forced to warn him. However, because I know the honourable member is a responsible parliamentarian, I am sure that he will not continue with his remarks. In any event, I ask the honourable member not to continue with his discussion of clause 2.

Mr DAVIS: I certainly would not be one who argues with the Chair, and I abide by your ruling, Mr Menzel.

With the indulgence of the Committee, I mention that the Minister has entered the Chamber. Perhaps he would be able to inform the Committee why Queensland has the highest rate of unemployment of any State or Territory in Australia.

Mr LESTER: Could the honourable member repeat his question? I cannot do two things at once.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Order! I feel that the honourable member for Brisbane Central was out of order. There may be another clause under which he can again ask the question. However, because I feel that he was out of order, and to save the time of the Committee, I will now put the question on clause 2.

Clause 2, as read, agreed to.

Clause 3—Repeal of and new s. 5—

Sir WILLIAM KNOX (4.50 p.m.): Originally the collection of data by the Government Statistician was a State Government responsibility. In 1942, or perhaps even later than that, the Commonwealth Government began to collect data, and the State office became a branch of the Commonwealth statistician's office. A nation-wide committee looks at the desirability of the various returns that are made to the Government Statistician.

This clause deals with a refusal or failure to furnish information. The furnishing of information has always been a very vexed question in the community, and particularly in the small-business community. There is a requirement that everybody fill in forms for the Government Statistician, and that, of course, is at census-time, which is again this year.

However, there are times when only certain people are required to fill in forms, and usually they are categorised into different industries for different reasons. Some are required monthly, some annually and some biannually, but all regularly.

The filling in of some forms creates real problems for business—the ones done as special one-offs or sampling. They have caused problems for the smaller businesses in the community simply because of the enormous number they are required to fill out for all Government departments, but particularly for Government Statisticians. It may be all right for a business of reasonable size that is able to carry out all its clerical work in an office in which clerks can keep an eye on such things and see that they are attended to on time and contain the correct information. I am sure that people on the land who

have to fill in forms and return them to the Government Statistician have a similar problem if they do not have clerical assistance to keep an eye on the forms and see that they are returned in time.

I have always thought that this practice is an imposition on the citizen, particularly when he may be charged with failing to return information that is used not to decide whether he is a good person or a bad person, or whether to tax or not tax him, but to judge the economy of a particular industry, the range of employment in that industry or the type of goods that that industry is producing. It seems to me that that is an area at which the national committee that looks at the forms that are sent out and the different inquiries that are made should look a little more closely.

It is my experience that people in my electorate who complain that they are being imposed upon do so because they did not ask to have themselves placed in categories and be obliged to make returns, particularly those that are done on a sampling basis, yet an enormous onus is placed on them if they do not complete the return, and complete it correctly.

When this matter is raised with people in the community who claim to use the information, they are somewhat stunned to learn how it is collected. The chambers of commerce, the United Graziers Association and other bodies do not realise that the only way to collect reliable information comparable with that of earlier years, in similar circumstances, is by making people subject to a penalty if they do not supply the correct information on time. I do not know how many people have been charged with failure to attend to these matters properly.

Mr Fouras: None.

Sir WILLIAM KNOX: I suspect that that might be so.

I have not been told how many have been charged. Perhaps the Minister has information on the subject.

This is an area in which bureaucracy can be reduced considerably by looking closely at the number of forms and inquiries sent out to people in the community seeking sometimes regular information. On other occasions, ad hoc inquiries are made. I believe that an element of compulsion in the system is necessary, and I guess that compulsion should be supported by penalty. However, if people do not pay the penalty, they run the risk of serving a gaol sentence. That seems to be a heavy imposition. Perhaps the effect of the imposition could be minimised by ensuring that the questionnaires sent out are really necessary rather than by reducing the penalties.

Mr LESTER: I thank the honourable member for Nundah for his interest. I know that he has always been interested in the statistical area. The penalties for failing to provide information have remained unchanged since 1935. To reflect current values, clause 3 increases the penalties for failing to provide information. I might add that the penalties proposed are exactly the same as those provided under the Federal statistical legislation.

Also, I call on every member to ensure that everything possible is done to get people to fill in their 1986 census forms properly, because that is one way in which the Commonwealth is able to determine how much money it will give back to the States and that is very important.

The complaints made by the honourable member for Nundah relate to the Australian Bureau of Statistics. For years, no-one has been prosecuted by the Queensland Government Statistician. The points made are well noted. I will bear them in mind. If the honourable member wants to discuss them at any time, I shall be happy to oblige.

Clause 3, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 4 to 9, as read, agreed to.

Bill reported, without amendment.

Third Reading

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

INDUSTRY AND COMMERCE TRAINING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading—Resumption of Debate

Debate resumed from 27 February (see p. 3918) on Mr Lester's motion—

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

Mr McLEAN (Bulimba) (5 p.m.): The Industry and Commerce Training Act was proclaimed in September 1979. It replaced the Apprenticeship Act, allowed for the amendment and consolidation of the law relating to apprentices and provided for the training of other persons. The Bill deals with the very existence of the youth of the State and, for that reason, no corners should be cut. It is an important piece of legislation.

Young people are our most important resource, and I do not think that there would be any argument in this House about that. Meeting the needs of youth is not simply the task of one arm of government. In fact, it is an obligation that rests on all sections of the community. All elements of Australian society have a role to play. They include employers, unions, educationists and community service organisations, as well as young people themselves. Of course, governments at all levels have a role to play.

Contributions are needed in many areas to assist in developing new educational and training opportunities to suit today's circumstances. It goes without saying that this is a complicated area and that the answers are not easy. The Minister, in his second-reading speech, said—

> "When I introduced amendments to the Industry and Commerce Training Act on 27 November 1985 to facilitate the introduction of traineeships in Queensland, those amendments were part of a larger package of amendments to the Act that I was having prepared."

I wonder whether those amendments will be the last. On that occasion, 30 amendments were introduced, and, on this occasion, we are considering 42 amendments. The Minister went on to say—

> "The Bill will further improve the operation of the industry and commerce training legislation in Queensland . . ."

That might be so. Although the Opposition will not oppose the Bill, it will advance some arguments and ask some questions.

The Minister concluded his speech by saying—

> "The Government is committed to the promotion of employment and training opportunites in Queensland and is whole-heartedly behind the traineeship program, which was the core of the Government's submission to the Committee of Inquiry into Labour Market Programs."

I sincerely hope that that last statement means that we will see some co-operation between the State and Federal Governments. Later in my speech, I shall compare the efforts that have been made by some of the State Governments and the Federal Government to deal with the matter that we are discussing today.

The Bill covers an extremely important and worrying area of Government responsibility—youth employment or, I suppose, youth unemployment.

Mr Hamill: There is a lot of that here.

Mr McLEAN: Yes. The latest unemployment figures were mentioned in the previous debate, but probably they would fit more easily into this debate. An article in today's *Telegraph* headed "Queensland jobless rate still highest" reads—

> "Queensland remains the state with the highest unemployment rate, according to Bureau of Statistics figures released today.

Figures for February show that 121,600 full-time and part-time workers, or 10.3 percent of the Queensland workforce, were unemployed.

In January, 9.6 percent of the state's work-force were without jobs.

February rates of unemployment in other states: New South Wales, 9.4 percent; Victoria 7.4; South Australia, 8.8; West Australia, 8.7; Tasmania, 9.7."

Once again, Queensland's unemployment figure, which is above 10 per cent, has increased the national average, which is 8.9 per cent. That is a good example of what is happening in this State.

The debate today is about youth unemployment. I do not think such a debate can be held without referring to the alarming increase in unemployment in Queensland. In Queensland, in December 1981, 13 500 people in the 15-19 years age bracket were out of work; in December 1982, 19 700; in December 1983, 23 600; in December 1984, 25 600; and in December 1985, 26 200. They are startling and quite unbelievable figures. As has been said many times in this House, Queensland is dragging the chain badly. In Australia, last year, more than 2.6 million young people were between 15 and 24 years of age and close to 60 per cent or 1.5 million of them were employed. Of them, 400 000 were also participating in some form of education. About 520 000 other young people not in the labour force were pursuing full-time education. The great majority were making good progress and moving from childhood through adolescence to independent adulthood, but too many of them were unemployed. I will refer to that later in my speech.

At June 1985, about 135 000 young men and 95 000 young women, or 9 per cent of all young people, were officially recorded as being unemployed and seeking full-time work. This represented about 15 per cent of young people in the labour force. On average they were spending from 30 to 50 weeks out of work. Another 40 000 young people were unemployed and looking for part-time employment.

In the past decade, there have been important structural changes in the economy, in the labour market and in society at large, which implies that, even if the most optimistic predictions for economic growth are fulfilled, the labour market will not rapidly return to the low levels of employment experienced in the 1960s and early 1970s.

Anyone who puts any thought at all into this type of legislation and its consequences will realise the serious problems that face the youth of Australia. It is important that there is co-operation between Governments at all levels and, of course, the community at large. Unemployment is a staggering problem and has to be addressed by the avenues I have mentioned.

When the Bill came before the House in December 1985, the Opposition, similarly to today, while not opposing the Bill, said that there were certain areas that were of concern. The same situation exists today with these amendments. Although the Opposition will not be opposing the Bill, many queries will be raised by other members as the debate proceeds.

The Opposition endorses the Federal Government's overall proposals in regard to traineeships. Many of the amendments are changes to fit in with an overall scheme. The Opposition does not disagree with that. I, personally, am disappointed that the overall traineeship scheme has not progressed more speedily Australia-wide. More could have been done and more should be done to implement the scheme if it is to reach its full potential. Full criticism for that cannot be levelled at the Queensland Government, but I criticise the fact that that area has not progressed more quickly than it has.

One major concern I have is the attitude of the Queensland Government in regard to co-operation with the Federal Government. This is one area in which petty politics should be bypassed.

Mr Lester: We have tried to co-operate. Tomorrow the Government will sign the traineeship program. I think the Federal Minister will tell you that I have been pretty co-operative.

Mr McLEAN: If that is so, I will accept the Minister's statement. Because this Government has an obvious obstructionist policy against honest attempts by the Federal Government to progress in the area of job creation, I am speaking generally.

Over recent days Queensland has seen a blatant, politically motivated attack on sensible industrial relations.

Mr FitzGerald: Give us examples.

Mr McLEAN: There are hundreds of examples, as the honourable member knows. Every point that is raised by the Commonwealth Government, whether it be right or wrong, is criticised by the Premier or by other spokesmen from the Government side of the House.

The Government's unnecessary, provocative attack on industrial relations, which could cost jobs, not create them, is the latest politically motivated action that has been seen in the last couple of weeks. The Government's attacks can only cause more instability, when exactly the opposite is needed.

The time has long passed when the State can afford the luxury of playing politics with the lives of our young people. The time has passed when we can sit back and watch the State Government's outdated, fanatical obsession cause heart-break and problems to the workers of the State.

In his second-reading speech, the Minister said that the Government was committed to the promotion of employment and training opportunities in Queensland and is wholeheartedly behind the traineeship program. I admit that the Minister has said that he will sign the agreement tomorrow. That is good news. I sincerely hope that the Minister's speech will reflect the Government's actions. In the future I will be watching with interest the Government's attitudes and actions and comparing them with its claim of co-operation with the Federal Government in all aspects of this legislation.

The Federal Government has genuinely attacked the problem and is continuing to do so; but the problem is very difficult and is not easily solved by a Government of any colour. I shall outline some of the job-creation policies of the Federal Government. A comparison between the various States is also worth while. The Federal Government has a number of schemes that are aimed at employment and training programs. I refer to a couple of them and point out exactly what they are about. The first is the Participation and Equity Program which, with a TAFE component, has the objective of encouraging young people above school-leaving age to participate in useful, fulfilling education and training activities, while at the same time reducing inequalities in the competition for available jobs. That scheme, which was introduced in 1984, had funding and expenditure for 1984-85 of $35m.

The second scheme is the Transition Allowance, which has the objective of assisting longer term unemployed young people by encouraging them to undertake full-time vocational-oriented courses approved by the department. That scheme, which was introduced in 1980, had funding and expenditure for 1984-85 of $126,870,000.

The Special Youth Training Program is aimed at assisting long-term unemployed young people who are unable to compete effectively in the labour market. In 1984-85, it had funding and expenditure of $108.9m.

The Adult Wage Subsidy Scheme is designed to provide a period of stable employment for long-term unemployed job-seekers. The scheme was introduced in 1983 and had funding and expenditure for 1984-85 of $40.9m.

The Special Assistance Program has as its objective the reduction of wastage among apprentices who are retrenched or threatened with retrenchment owing to economic problems experienced by their employers. The estimated expenditure for 1984-85 was $4.57m.

The objective of the Labour Adjustment Training Arrangements was to improve, through the provision of vocationally orientated training, the employment prospect of

workers affected by large-scale redundancies. The expenditure budgeted for 1984-85 was $16.1m.

The object of the Skills-in-Demand Program was to assist industry to overcome skill shortages while helping unemployed persons to obtain stable employment. The budgeted expenditure for that scheme in 1984-85 was $3m.

The General Training Assistance Scheme was designed to assist industry to meet its requirements for skilled labour. In 1984-85, the allocation for that scheme was $7,355,000.

The objective of the Experimental Training Projects Scheme was to improve the employment prospects of longer-term unemployed young people, particularly those who were most disadvantaged through the development of innovative, flexible, small-scale training arrangements in response to local labour market needs. In 1984-85, $1.89m was to be expended on that scheme.

All honourable members have heard about the Community Employment Program and have been involved with it in some way. Its objective is to improve the employment prospects of those persons who are most disadvantaged in the labour market by creating additional short-term employment opportunities. In 1984-85, $410m was allocated to that program. A total of 52 324 jobs were approved and recommended in 1983-84.

The objective of the Relocation Assistance Scheme is to assist in the relocation of unemployed persons and of persons who have received notification of redundancy and are unable to secure continuing employment. Funding and expenditure on that scheme during 1984-85 was $4.9m.

Expenditure on the Fares Assistance Scheme during the same period was $480,000.

The Community Youth Support Scheme had the objective of encouraging local communities to assist unemployed youth to become more self-reliant during periods of unemployment and to develop their capacity for obtaining and retaining employment. In 1984-85, expenditure was estimated at $26.3m. That scheme served about 70 000 participants during 1983-84.

The Volunteer Youth Program had the objective of assisting unemployed young people, through their participation in voluntary community service activities, to maintain and develop their capacity to obtain and retain employment. Expenditure on that scheme in 1984-85 was estimated at $530,000. In the previous year, 2 600 persons were assisted by that scheme.

The Community Youth Special Projects Program had the objective of promoting the provision of full-time structured community-based training opportunities for unemployed young persons most disadvantaged in the labour market. The funding allocated for the Community Youth Special Projects Program in 1984-85 was $3,231,000.

I have referred to all those schemes because, often in this Chamber, it is said that the Federal Government is not attacking the unemployment problem. It is important for the Opposition to record the facts in *Hansard* and to record what is being done by the Federal Government to solve the problem.

The New Enterprise Incentive Scheme has the objective of overcoming the distinctive effect that the loss of unemployment benefits has on those unemployed people with the capacity to establish a small enterprise by providing income support during the initial establishment phase. The allocation for that scheme in 1984-85 was $1.5m.

The objective of the Labour Force Program for Special Needs Job Seekers was to assist into stable employment those individuals who are specially disadvantaged compared with the majority of unemployed persons registered with the Commonwealth Employment Service. The allocation for that scheme was $2.6m.

The 1984-85 budget for the Labour Force Program for the Disabled was $10.1m.

The 1984-85 expenditure on the Public Sector Training scheme was $26,702,000.

Expenditure on On-the-Job Standard Subsidy (Private Sector) was $3,332,000.

Although there are many schemes with which I will not deal, it is important to compare the efforts of the States. Opposition members hear much Queensland Government criticism of the Federal Government in that regard. I will consider the efforts of the Queensland Government in comparison with the efforts of the other State Governments. I invite Government members to listen to the figures that I will produce.

The New South Wales Government has given employment and training programs a very high priority. That State has quite a number of programs. It has programs such as the Work Experience and Orientation Youth Employment Scheme, Job Skill Training—a number of schemes under that heading—Specific Job Creation and Job Generation, and Personal Support and Development Schemes for Unemployed. That Government's expenditure on those schemes is $34m.

Victoria has not quite matched the effort of New South Wales, but it has still made a considerable effort. That State also has programs such as Work Experience and Orientation, Job Skills Training, Specific Job Creation and Job Generation, and Personal Support and Development Schemes for Unemployed.

I think that Queensland rates a mention. This State has the Work Experience and Orientation Program and the other programs of the other States. However, it is worth going through the Queensland programs in detail. In 1983-84, $408,611 was expended under the Pay-roll Tax Rebate Scheme for First Year Apprentices. A total of 350 employers applied for assistance under that scheme in respect of 2 927 apprentices. No information was available on the performance of the program, so it is not known how it performed.

I turn to the Pay-roll Tax Rebates for Apprentices Employed Under a Group Apprenticeship Scheme. The objective of that scheme is to encourage and assist the employment of apprentices in group apprenticeship schemes. In 1983-84, $8,906,200 was expended under that scheme. One organisation only, that is, the Metal Trades Industry Association, received assistance. Surely the scheme could be broadened. In regard to program performance, it is considered that the support mechanisms for group apprenticeship schemes have been central in the development of such schemes in Queensland. The Opposition hopes that the scheme will be broadened.

The objective of the State Government Off-the-Job Training Schools Program is to provide a means whereby out-of-trade apprentices, in the period of their unemployment, can undertake useful and meaningful work experience. No information is available on the funding and expenditure under that program. No precise information is available on the numbers served. The Government says that it is doing all that it can and it takes great pains to publicise its schemes, yet, in regard to the State Government Off-the-Job Training Schools Program, no information is available on funding and expenditure and no precise information is available on numbers served.

I turn to the financial support for Group Apprenticeship Schemes Program. The objective of that program is to maximise the number of persons employed under group apprenticeship schemes. The figures for the funding and expenditure of that program for 1983-84 are not available, and the numbers served under that program are not available. Once again, no-one has a clue what is going on, yet all these schemes have received a great deal of publicity.

The objective of the Self Employment Venture Scheme is to provide financial advice to unemployed individuals or groups that have developed a proposal to establish a commercial enterprise. The numbers served are not available as yet. The performance of the program is not available as yet.

The objective of the Local Employment Development Scheme is to promote awareness in local business and community groups of the employment situation in the local area. The funding and expenditure for that scheme has been budgeted as part of the special allocation of $400,000 during the 1984-85 year for youth employment initiatives. Once again, the numbers served are not available as yet.

It is now March 1986. I have been referring to a document in which all the other States have outlined the details of their programs. Queensland has five programs for

which no figures are available. No figures have been provided. The document simply states that they are not yet available.

The Innovative Employment and Training Program is designed to assist business and community groups in improving the employment readiness of long-term unemployed people. The numbers of unemployed who have been served are not yet available; neither is the assessment on program performance.

I point out that that document contains a comprehensive assessment and has been circulated throughout Australia. It clearly states that Queensland has implemented only half the number of training schemes that operate presently in New South Wales, yet the Minister for Employment and Industrial Affairs (Mr Lester) is not even able to provide an indication to the public of how effective the Queensland training schemes are. Something must be wrong somewhere, and it could be that the Government is not being honest about its so-called efforts to create employment for young people.

In December, the Minister said in the House that the Government aimed at the creation of 1 256 traineeships in 1986. It is now March and, although the Minister will not sign the agreement with the Federal Government until tomorrow, he should nevertheless be able to indicate the progress that has been made so far. I ask the Minister to inform the House of the target figures for the spread throughout selected industries of the 1 256 traineeships.

How many of the traineeships will be established in the tourism industry, the building industry, the manufacturing industry, rural industry and the public service? I ask the Minister to give details of the plans that have been made and an indication of the stage that has been reached in implementing those plans. I also ask for an indication of the nature of talks that have been held with employer groups and trade unions in the designated industries. What plans have been made for traineeships in the public service sector? What is the nature of discussions that have been held, and what has been the result?

I reiterate that it is already March and that the Minister should be able to give an indication of the progress that has been made by the Government in association with the various other interested bodies. Although the Minister will not be signing the agreement with the Federal Government until tomorrow, the Government's plans should have proceeded some distance down the track at this stage. Perhaps that is so. In any event, I will be interested to hear the Minister's reply.

If the Government is honest in its endeavours to resolve the unemployment problem, I believe that the traineeships and creation of job opportunities should be given top priority. The Government should do much more.

Last week, I read with interest an article in *The Courier-Mail* that cited unemployment figures released by the Australian Bureau of Statistics. In that article, the Minister is reported as being relatively happy with the figures. Unfortunately, I am not happy with the figures; neither are other members of the Opposition. The figures are alarming, and I was astonished to read that the Minister was relatively happy with them. To my mind, they are figures that no-one could be happy about.

When the rate of unemployment is brought to my attention, it is not difficult for me to appreciate the problems faced by young people. The position is even worse when it is realised that so many young people are unemployed. I can understand the heart-break, the desperation and the frustration that they must feel. I remember how difficult life was when I was their age, although I was fortunate enough to be able to obtain employment in any field I cared to select. Because I sympathise with young unemployed people, I certainly will not play politics on the efforts undertaken by the Government to improve employment opportunities.

However, the worrying factors remain. I hark back to the disproportionate burden of unemployment that is carried by the 15 to 19-year-old age group. It is imperative that the three levels of Government take whatever action is necessary to attack that

problem. Petty politics should be cast aside in favour of adopting a united and sincere approach.

The Opposition raises no significant objection to the amendments. I realise that it is a complicated field of legislation. It is not surprising to me that the legislation has been brought back to the House after such a short time.

The Opposition sees no problem with that——

Mr Lester interjected.

Mr McLEAN: I realise that. If there is to be an improvement in that area, the Opposition most certainly agrees with it. The Bill that came before the House in December contained 32 clauses. Today's bill contains 42. If those amendments are aimed at helping Queensland's young people to be trained and to obtain jobs, the Opposition has no beef with them.

I have spoken to members of the commission. There appears to be no opposition from that quarter. The Opposition will be asking for an explanation of the contents of a few clauses. Other members of the Opposition will outline those matters.

The legislation was debated at length in December, and I shall not repeat what was said then. Many members who did not take part in the debate on that occasion should have the opportunity to join this debate.

Although traineeships are a step in the right direction, they are not the complete answer to youth unemployment. Long-term planning is vital. Unfortunately, that is the area in which this Government falls down. The problems confronting youth today are quite complex and will probably become more complex as time goes on, particularly with computerisation, mechanisation and many other modern work practices being introduced. If job creation is to be successful, new areas of work must be found and new approaches adopted. New ideas must be tried. None of that is being done to the extent necessary in Queensland, which has no industrial base and no plans for such a base in the near future. The Government's rural and mining mentality has been quite successful and has carried the State through a boom period. However, it is not adequate for the future.

Unfortunately, the Premier has proposed one hare-brained scheme after another. To date, none has proved to be of any substance. The State was to be made the financial capital of Australia. Claims were made about oil-seed industries, steam-car industries, coal-to-oil industries, mini-steel-mills and cancer clinics. To date, there has been no result. I should probably add that many of the Premier's strange friends ended up in gaol.

Other Opposition members will cover a number of areas of concern during the second-reading debate and raise other points during the Committee stage.

Mr HENDERSON (Mount Gravatt) (5.32 p.m.): I am very pleased to support the Minister in his introduction of a Bill to amend the Industry and Commerce Training Act. The legislation was introduced in 1979 to provide a more efficient means of administering apprenticeship and other forms of structured training in industry in Queensland.

Business people have made various representations to the Minister relative to the training of apprentices, and it is pleasing to note that the Government is keeping such an important piece of legislation under continual review. In recent years, somewhat of a diversification of Queensland industry has occurred, with particular attention being focused on the service sector.

Two amendments that will further improve the effectiveness of training in industry and commerce relate, firstly, to approvals for technical college training and, secondly, to pre-apprenticeship and pre-vocational training programs for young people.

The amendments to section 74 of the Act, proposed by clause 24 of the Bill, will ensure that the Minister is able to react promptly when he is satisfied that the block release training arrangements for apprentices should be varied.

I know that in the vast majority of instances the Minister appreciates the advice given to him by the Industry and Commerce Training Commission. During 1985, the Minister initiated a review of block release training arrangements. Officers of his department undertook that comprehensive review. The review included a wide survey of industry and commerce, apprentices themselves, employee representatives and teachers in the technical and further education colleges. As could be expected from such a major review, there was a diversity of views about the changes that should be made to the existing block release training arrangements.

The Minister has informed me that he has received the report of the investigation, which highlighted the differing needs between various industry categories. He has now sought further specific recommendations from each of the relevant industry and commerce advisory committees established for that purpose under the legislation. The committees have representatives from both employers and employees, and I feel sure that full consideration will be given to all implications associated with the block release training of apprentices when the committees make their recommendations to the Minister.

The Queensland Government was the first State Government to move into the provision of block release training for apprentices on a large scale, and most States are now seeing the merits in this form of training and moving towards the Queensland model.

It has meant an additional cost to the Government in many instances, but the Government has felt that the move has been worth while.

The quality of training of our young people is some evidence of the success of the block release training system and, at the recent Work Skill Olympics in Osaka, Japan, of the four Queenslanders who represented Australia in their skill categories, three won medals—one gold, one silver and one bronze. The fourth contestant was just beaten for a bronze medal.

Queensland was further successful in the apprenticeship field in 1985, taking out the Apprentice of the Year Award in the competition held among the States and Territories each year. That was the final culmination of close success in being runner-up on two previous occasions in recent years in the Apprentice of the Year Award.

I mention our achievements to improve the skill competence of our young people to emphasise not only the intensive training provided by the respective employers of those young people but also the fine technical training provided in our colleges of TAFE. It is important, therefore, that the Minister have a discretion to vary technical training arrangements. The amendment proposed in this regard will contribute to the further improvement of this already enlightening legislation.

The other matter to which I particularly wish to address myself is the amendment to section 99 of the Act contained in clause 33 of the Bill. The introduction of the pre-vocational form of training of young people was also pioneered by the Queensland Government in the late 1970s. This form of work preparation of our young people has now been taken up by a number of other States. The aim of pre-vocational and pre-apprenticeship training is to provide young people with experience in vocational skills prior to their obtaining employment in an apprenticeship field.

Pre-apprenticeship training is directed solely at the one trade, whereas pre-vocational training gives a person a variety of exposures in trade areas.

With the extensive network of colleges of TAFE throughout Queensland, young Queenslanders throughout the State are able to obtain the benefit of this important aspect of pre-vocational training.

In the pre-vocational training programs, young people undertake an initial period of training in many trades that are somewhat related. As the training progresses throughout

the year, however, the training becomes more specific until a small group of related trades is concentrated upon. The young person who completes his training in his chosen field is then entitled to a reduction in the term of his apprenticeship, and his employer is not required to send him for his first year of technical training.

Under the present arrangement, various industry and commerce advisory committees determine that period of the apprenticeship at which the reduction in time from the period of pre-vocational training should apply.

The proposed arrangement will not alter in any way the fact that the reduction should apply, but it will allow the Industry and Commerce Training Commission to ensure that consistency applies across all trade categories as to the amount of credit and the stage at which that credit should apply.

I have much pleasure in supporting the Bill, because I know that many young people have enjoyed the opportunity to undertake both pre-apprenticeship and pre-vocational training. I commend to employers the programs themselves and the trainees who complete the programs. Employers seeking young people with some level of experience should visit the TAFE college in their local area and acquaint themselves with the pre-apprenticeship and pre-vocational training programs.

Mr HAMILL (Ipswich) (5.39 p.m.): The Opposition spokesman has indicated that we support the development of traineeships. Today is not the only day on which we have stated our support. Last year, we supported amendments to the Act. Opposition members see the development of traineeships as an integral part of the development of employment opportunities for young people. Opposition members believe in giving young people a future to which they can look forward. We see apprenticeships as an opportunity to deal with the need for the development of skills and training in the community whilst, at the same time, giving young Australians and young Queenslanders an opportunity to develop skills that will enable them to participate fully in the labour market.

Of course, as other members have said, the problems of youth unemployment are very much with us today. The new statistics from the Australian Bureau of Statistics, which were released today, underline that problem. Over the last month, youth unemployment in Queensland increased, whereas the figure for Australia as a whole decreased. In other words, Queensland is out of phase with the movement across Australia in the level of youth unemployment among the 15 to 19-year-olds looking for full-time work. Queensland has 24.6 per cent of the unemployed in that age group which, as I say, is ahead of the Australian average of 24.1 per cent.

We cannot close our eyes to the total problem of youth unemployment in our State. In February 1986, unemployment in Queensland stood at 10.3 per cent of the labour force, compared with an Australian average of 8.9 per cent.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Row): Order! There is too much audible conversation in the Chamber.

Mr HAMILL: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker.

Queensland has not only a higher rate of youth unemployment than the Australian average but also the highest rate of unemployment of any State in Australia. Last month, Queensland had the highest rate of unemployment of any mainland State in Australia. It has now succeeded in overhauling Tasmania.

One can only be staggered by the reported comments of the Minister for Employment and Industrial Affairs. One wonders whether his title is apt; maybe he should be known as the Minister for Unemployment. He said that, on last month's statistics, he was relatively happy with developments in the area of youth unemployment. I draw the Minister's attention to this matter because I believe that his relative happiness with developments in youth unemployment in this State really defies any sort of logical or rational explanation. Although, last month, there had been a drop in the number of people aged between 15 and 19 years looking for full-time and part-time employment, Queensland still had more than its fair share of young unemployed. In that month,

Queensland's unemployment figure accounted for 17.2 per cent of all the unemployed people in Australia aged between 15 and 19 years, yet, according to the demographic statistics, Queensland's 15 to 19-year age group constitutes only 16.4 per cent of the total number of 15 to 19-year-olds in Australia. Therefore, Queensland's teenage unemployed are more heavily represented in the Australian figures.

In the 20 to 24-year age group—another group in which there is a serious unemployment problem—Queensland's unemployment figure accounted for 17.6 per cent of all unemployed Australians aged between 20 and 24 years, yet only 16.2 per cent of the people in that age group in Australia live in Queensland. Queensland is more heavily represented in both of those key youth age brackets of unemployment statistics. That is why I say that the Minister's statement that he was relatively happy with that situation defies comprehension. Certainly, if I were the Minister for Employment, I would not be as happy presiding over such an indictment of my Government's policies on youth employment.

Mr FitzGerald: Willis should resign.

Mr HAMILL: The member for Lockyer interjects that Willis should resign. It is interesting that he should say that. Youth unemployment across Australia is falling, yet Queensland's unemployment rate is out of phase because it is increasing. While most of the other States in Australia are wilfully and effectively combating youth unemployment, this Minister, whom the member for Lockyer supports, is presiding over an increased number of unemployed youths. The member for Lockyer stands condemned for that support. He shows no caring and no feeling for the plight of those young Queenslanders, some of whom happen to live in his electorate.

I shall look at some of the other typical attitudes adopted by some of the conservatives in this State and the sorts of programs that they have put forward to combat the tragedy of youth unemployment.

Last year, a former Minister for Employment and Industrial Affairs in this State, Sir William Knox, came forward with a revolutionary suggestion. He said, "Why don't we cut youth wages? That will assist us in combating youth unemployment." Such a policy, although it may appeal to the conservatives who know nothing of wage justice, would result in young people being exploited in the labour market. Many employers would give 18-year-olds the dump when they reached that age; they would employ young people. In other words, 18-year-olds would be cast away like dirty rags once the employer had satisfied his desire for that cheap labour.

On the other side of the coin, older workers would be displaced from employment if such a proposal were pursued. In other words, all the conservatives are arguing is that unemployment in the community should be redistributed. That is a proposition that the Opposition finds totally repugnant and totally unacceptable. For that reason, the four State Labor Governments have been pursuing vigorously programs aimed at training, educating and providing employment for young people.

Mr Booth: What about CEP?

Mr HAMILL: The old dairy farmer is displaying his ignorance. My apology; the honourable member for Warwick (Mr Booth) is displaying his ignorance in relation to this matter. He is talking about the Community Employment Program. If he wants to hand back any CEP money that was spent in his electorate to alleviate unemployment, let him tell the people of Warwick that he wants to hand the money and the jobs back. I believe that the honourable member for Warwick would be quite thankful for the money that was spent in his electorate under the CEP program. If he is not thankful, he is clearly out of step with the Queensland Government, which was quite happy to attach its name to any CEP money that was spent in Queensland.

The Hawke Government, under its Priority One scheme, has been assiduous in trying to promote Australian traineeships. Government members should recognise that the legislation being debated this afternoon is a product of that initiative. Under that

scheme, Queensland is supposed to develop 1 250 trainees this year. There has been some delay in achieving that goal. I welcome the Minister's statement this afternoon that documents will be signed tomorrow so that there will be a start on this worthy project.

Mr Newton: We've been at it all the time.

Mr HAMILL: The honourable member for Caboolture (Mr Newton) said that the Government has been at it all the time. The honourable member for Caboolture is only indicating his lack of knowledge about employment-initiative programs, if he says that the Government has been at it all the time. What it has been at all the time is sitting on its hands and doing very little for the young unemployed of this State. Other State Governments have put in place their own traineeship schemes quite separate and apart from the Commonwealth initiative.

Last year, in Western Australia, before the Australian traineeship system was being devised to be brought into place, 500 young unemployed Western Australians between 16 and 17 years of age were engaged in traineeships by the Western Australian Labor Government. In 1986, an additional 2 000 young people were being brought into training programs by the Western Australian Government.

In Victoria, 1 250 traineeships in the work/study positions engaged with the public sector are already in place, and the Victorian Government is pursuing the course of providing additional traineeships through its Youth Guarantee Directorate.

The South Australian Labor Government has in place a three-year program to establish 6 500 traineeships.

Those figures show clearly that Queensland is lagging behind in employment initiatives for traineeships. It is lagging behind because it is relying on the Commonwealth Government's program to be the panacea for youth unemployment in this State.

Although co-operation by the State Government with the Australian traineeship system is welcome, the State Government should be doing more. Queensland does not compare favourably with other States in relation to employment schemes, particularly those directed to the needs of the young unemployed.

The New South Wales Youth Employment Scheme focuses quite clearly and unequivocally upon the needs of the under-25-year-olds. Out of a total program of $40m this year, $24m will be committed to that scheme. In Victoria, the Youth Guarantee Directorate, which is overseeing the development of traineeships in that State, is taking $11.4m from a total program budget worth $27m.

In South Australia, this year, the employment programs alone excluding a number of other major undertakings in areas such as health and recreation for young people, are worth $4.5m. In Western Australia, $7.7m has been earmarked for youth employment schemes alone, and that excludes the imaginative Westrek program that is being admininstered in that State.

Only Tasmania and Queensland have employment schemes that are not tailored to the specific needs of the young unemployed. The unemployment statistics by age groups for November last year—unemployment among young people has increased since then—show that, in Queensland, 18.7 per cent of 15 to 19-year-olds and 10.4 per cent of 20 to 24-year-olds were unemployed. Those people were seeking full-time and part-time employment. As I said, in both Queensland and Tasmania, there were no age-specific unemployment programs.

Queensland has some programs in the Employment Initiatives Unit operating under the aegis of the Minister for Employment and Industrial Affairs. This year, those programs have $1.49m committed to them. In addition to that, $485,000 is earmarked for implementation of the recommendations of the task force on employment. However, they are not specific tc the needs of the young unemployed, who constitute such a very large proportion of the unemployed in this State. If we be generous and if we be more than fair to this Government, we can say that that is, in all, about $2m that could be

focused upon the needs of the young unemployed. That is $2m out of a total employment program package of about $3.8m.

I will put that into perspective. If one assumes that that Employment Initiatives Unit was directed solely to providing employment programs to meet the needs of the teenage unemployed—the 15 to 19-year-olds—what sort of commitment is it? For this State Government, that commitment amounts to spending the price of a local telephone call each day for each Queensland teenager looking for work. What a lousy, pitiful contribution that is. Little wonder that the young unemployed believe—and rightly so—that this Government, led by aged people, is totally out of touch with their needs and aspirations.

Earlier, the member for Maryborough (Mr Alison) interjected that people were coming to Queensland. He should realise that I have given the reason why young Queenslanders are leaving this State. Over the last 12 months, young Queenslanders between the ages of 15 and 25 years left this State. In fact, it was a net loss to this State of 50 young people a week. Those young people deserted this State because they knew damned well that this Government does not care about their employment needs and aspirations.

Mr FitzGerald: Those figures are incorrect. They were proven to you to be incorrect.

Mr HAMILL: I challenged the Minister on that. His answer to that challenge was such that he acknowledged the accuracy of those figures. The Minister said that, over the year, Queensland had a net increase of 10 000 people by interstate migration. That is a figure I do not disagree with. However, the reality is that young Queenslanders are leaving and elderly people are arriving. Queensland is losing its youth to interstate employment opportunities and it is picking up people who are not adding to the labour force in this State. The State is gaining people who are retired, those who are coming to Queensland to live out their retirement years. They are not making a positive contribution, therefore, to the labour force of this State.

As part of its overall commitment to youth, the Labor Party is committed to traineeships. I believe that Queensland can do more than it has done to date. Queensland has great natural resources, but it is offering its youth a lousy present and a dismal future, which is trapping young people into a secondary labour market.

The labour market is characterised by low wages and job insecurity, often caused by part-time employment. An enormous explosion has taken place in part-time employment at the expense of full-time employment for young people. The labour market is characterised by a lack of a career path and a lack of opportunity for young people to work their way up through employment. The labour market is characterised also by a low demand for skills. Because of its inaction on youth unemployment in this State, the Queensland Government is perpetuating that environment through its lack of commitment to education.

The Opposition readily accepts any training initiatives. Those initiatives flow from Federal Government initiatives. Despite the National Party Government's policy of bringing education expenditure in this State up to the level of the six States, Queensland lags dismally behind. That shows in the State's high schools, in the overcrowding of schools, the lack of resources in schools and the low retention rate of young people in schools. The Government has failed to address those issues in a constructive manner.

Because of the constant neglect of the employment and training needs of young people in Queensland, the State finds itself in a parlous position. Those particularly neglected are the young adults—the 20 to 24-year-olds. The training and apprenticeships schemes are directed primarily at the needs of the 15 to 19-year-olds. What is there for the 20 to 24-year-olds? Precious little! At a time when those young people are endeavouring to establish themselves and when they are taking on more financial responsibilities and commitments, their future looks particularly dismal because of the absence of any constructive program to alleviate the oppressive levels of unemployment afflicting that age group.

The Opposition welcomes the legislation because it does something for the younger age group—the 15 to 19-year-olds. It indicates a degree of co-operation in the establishment of traineeships, which is welcomed by the Opposition. One could well ask: Apart from the accreditation and the supervision of the traineeship system, which, after all, would be the responsibility of the State authorities, what is the State Government doing in terms of its commitment in dollars and cents to the future of young people in this State? It is not doing very much, other than producing little glossy brochures that carry prominently the photograph of the Minister for Employment and Industrial Affairs (Mr Lester), seemingly to give the impression that it is as a result of that Minister's initiative that the traineeships are being provided and that, somehow, it is a State Government initiative. The truth is that the traineeships are an initiative of the Commonwealth, which is providing the real financial backing for the program.

I would like to make one final point in relation to this matter. The Opposition recognises that traineeships cannot be developed without strong industry support. Both the union movement and the employers have difficult roles to play in their development. For that reason, the Opposition welcomes the agreement into which the Government will enter tomorrow.

The Opposition welcomes also the agreement reached on 14 February this year between the Queensland Confederation of Industry and the Trades and Labour Council of Queensland on the Australian traineeship system. That is an example of co-operative industrial relations, something that is anathema to this Government, which seeks every opportunity to bring about industrial confrontation, seemingly for no purpose other than to achieve some perceived political advantage. I hope that the Government recognises the value of the agreement between the TLC and the Confederation of Industry. The agreement goes to the very heart of the future employment of young people. If the Government supports such an agreement, I trust that that indicates that the Government is learning for itself a more responsible attitude to industrial relations as a whole. Its irresponsibility in industrial relations has done inordinate damage to employment opportunities for young people and old people in Queensland.

Sitting suspended from 6 to 7.15 p.m.

Mr ALISON (Maryborough) (7.15 p.m.): I am very pleased to speak in the debate. I will make a couple of comments about the speech of the previous speaker, the honourable member for Ipswich (Mr Hamill). If one were sitting in the gallery, listening to it, unaware of which political party he is a member, one would not take long to arrive at the conclusion that he could not be a member of any party other than the socialist Labor Party.

Mr Vaughan: That's because he talks sense.

Mr ALISON: That is not right. It is because the old hand-out mentality comes through loud and clear; the old socialist philosophy that if a problem exists in the community, a handful of tax-payers' money will remedy it. That is the philosophy of the Federal Labor Government in dealing with problems facing Aborigines and the unemployment problem. It simply does not work.

A far more efficient and effective method of helping people to help themselves, and helping people to find employment, is the very different philosphy of the National Party, which is to create the right atmosphere, the right incentives and the right climate in which the private sector can flourish to develop and create permanent jobs, not the Claytons jobs that the Federal Government is creating at present throughout Australia.

Approximately 80 000 Claytons jobs are included in the employment statistics that Mr Hawke bandies about as evidence of the jobs that he alleges his Government has created. Those are 80 000 tax-payer funded jobs, for periods of two months, one month and so on. They are not real jobs at all. That is the Hawke Government's approach to the unemployment problem.

The honourable member for Ipswich appears to be very adept at statistics, until one takes the time to check them out. The honourable member delivers statistics with a flourish. However, if one takes the time to check them out—as I have occasionally—more often than not, one finds that the statistics are distorted and that the honourable member is telling straight-out untruths. One would have to give the honourable member for Ipswich eight out of 10 for delivery and four out of 10 for presenting the facts.

In dealing with the Bill, I address my remarks to the fine work that the Minister is undertaking through the promotion and recognition of outstanding training given to apprentices and trainees by employers and to the way in which opportunities have been taken up by those apprentices and trainees.

Each year, the Industry and Commerce Training Commission, with the support of the Government, through the Minister, mounts a major promotional exercise. That promotion draws attention to the importance of receiving and providing adequate and appropriate training and is directed at apprentices, trainees, their employers, the teachers who provide the training in technical colleges and the parents and families of the apprentices and trainees. The promotional activities culminate in what is called "Training for Industry Month" in August each year. Two major highlights of that month's activities are the various employment and careers markets that are undertaken right throughout the State and the presentation of major awards at the awards function held by the commission.

Firstly, I draw the attention of honourable members to the employment and careers markets. In August each year in Brisbane a major employment and careers market is held at which about 30 000 young people are able to attend, during school hours, with their teachers and, during the evening, with their parents. That gives students the opportunity of obtaining first-hand assistance in selecting an appropriate career after they leave school and in making a more informed choice in the selection of a career. Those who support this activity of the commission by exhibiting put a tremendous effort into the careers market, with live demonstrations by trade workers being a major drawcard for the students. However, the careers market is not confined to Brisbane. Smaller careers markets are run at the major centres throughout the State during Training for Industry Month and other appropriate occasions.

The annual awards function is conducted by the Industry and Commerce Training Commission. Presentations of awards are made to outstanding apprentices and trainees and their employers, as well as individual employers who are leading providers of training in an industry.

The commission also runs a State-wide craftsmanship competition which, last year, attracted more than 200 entries. This competition allows young people to develop the practical side of their skill training and the creation of a unique article appropriate to their craft.

The bringing together of these outstanding achievements in the various facets of the Minister's portfolio is quite an auspicious occasion. It provides the opportunity for the Government to give due recognition to outstanding achievers in the employment field.

The involvement of youth in employment opportunities is further emphasised by the apprenticeship intake levels for the year of 1985. They were running slightly below, but were nevertheless very close to, the levels for the previous 12 months.

It is true that, in Queensland, the unemployment rate for young people increased during January to 24.5 per cent, but this is reflective of a seasonal adjustment. The national average in fact has risen to 25.5 per cent and is a clear percentage point worse than the average in Queensland whereas, at the end of December, the national average was only 0.6 per cent worse than the average in Queensland.

The industry and commerce training legislation has a specific focus on preparing people for full-time work. Under the employment initiatives program run by the Minister's department, 2 899 individuals have been able to undertake training programs that better

fit them to obtain employment. Grants are being made available under the innovative employment and training program scheme for training programs of this nature. Furthermore, 86 individual businesses have been established, employing 135 persons, as a result of funding under the self-employment venture scheme.

It is important that any legislation affecting the employment and training opportunities of people in the State, particularly young people, should be kept under continual review by the Government. It is necessary that legislation of this nature be the most appropriate in today's circumstances.

It was in fact quite a revolutionary move when the Queensland Government introduced the Industry and Commerce Training Act in 1979. All the other States of Australia have either moved to the implementation of similar legislation or are in the process of doing so.

The field of employment and training is also subject to change, and the continual evaluation of the legislation will ensure that the Government keeps abreast of changed situations. The progressive analysis of legislation of this nature has been, I am sure, one of the factors that have helped Queensland maintain its more than proportional representation of new jobs established.

Queensland has only 16.1 per cent of Australia's population but, of the 252 000 new jobs created in Australia in the calendar year 1985, 70 300 were established in Queensland. This represents 28 per cent of the total jobs created, which compares more than favourably with Queensland's 16.1 per cent of the population.

At the end of December 1985, the Queensland youth unemployment rate was 21.5 per cent whereas the national average was 22.1 per cent.

The Minister's department has enabled a bridging-the-gap program to be established in the centre of Brisbane. Through this program, 299 young persons have been placed in employment. Many have been placed in jobs that would not otherwise have been established. Another important matter considered under the legislation is the pre-employment training programs undertaken in the various colleges of technical and further education throughout the State, which are the direct responsibility of the Minister for Education (Mr Powell).

During 1986, 2 570 places were provided in pre-apprenticeship and pre-vocational programs in a variety of centres and across the wide spectrum of industry. These programs ensure that young people are given appropriate work preparation to fit them to undertake apprenticeships and other vocational employment opportunities. In a joint program between the Commonwealth Government and the State Government, a further 392 places were made available for similar programs.

It is my pleasure to offer my full support for the Bill.

Mr VAUGHAN (Nudgee) (7.23 p.m.): As other members have indicated, the Industry and Commerce Training Act was introduced in 1979. Tonight, honourable members are debating amendments to that Act. As most honourable members would be aware, that Act replaced the Apprenticeship Act, and many of the provisions of the Act that is being amended were lifted from the Apprenticeship Act.

An apprentice executive, group apprenticeship committees and local advisory committees were set up under the previous legislation. Tonight I wish to comment about those aspects because I am a little concerned about some of the provisions of the Bill. I ask the Minister to comment on the points that I raise. I will also be raising a number of other points during the Committee stage.

In his second-reading speech, the Minister referred to additional representation on the Industry and Commerce Training Commission. Page 21 of the 1984-85 annual report of the Department of Employment and Industrial Affairs refers to the Division of Employment Planning and Training and the Industry and Commerce Training Commission. According to my calculations, the commission at present is comprised of 14 people: The Commissioner for Training, who is chairman, the Director, Division of Technical and

Further Education, six employers' representatives and six employees' representatives. The Bill increases the membership from 14 to 18. Quangos have been discussed at great length. The Government has even published documents about them. I just wonder why it is so necessary to increase the membership of the commission by four.

The Bill increases the number of employees' representatives from six to seven and the number of employers' representatives from six to seven. It also adds a person who will represent the Minister for Education. Regard must be had to the fact that the Department of Education is already in effect represented by the Director, Division of Technical and Further Education. Because of amendments to this Act last year, I can understand why a representative from the Federal Department of Employment and Industrial Relations is being added, but I wonder why the Government wants 18 members on the Industry and Commerce Training Commission. The annual report stated that the commission met on 15 occasions in 1984-85. I would like the Minister to comment on the points I am making. I will be listening carefully to his reply and, if he does not provide the answers I require, I will be taking him to task during the Committee stage. I might be doing that, anyway.

Another point has attracted my attention. Although on the one hand the membership of the commission is being increased from 14 to 18, the legislation reduces the number required for a quorum at the meetings of the commission. Why in the name of heaven would the membership be increased from 14 to 18 at the same time as the number necessary to make up a quorum is reduced from eight to six? The Bill states that a quorum will be the chairman and five members of the commission. It is one thing to increase the membership of the commission; but, if that is necessary, surely there is no justification for reducing the quorum from eight to six. If the Minister considers that it is necessary to have only six people present to make a decision—after all, the commission is supposed to advise the Minister, about which I will comment later—he ought to explain the reduction in the number required for a quorum.

The Minister referred also to increased representation on the industry and commerce advisory committees. I think I should place on record the structure of the industry and commerce training scheme. Below the Industry and Commerce Training Commission are the industry and commerce training advisory committees. The report indicates that the 17 industry and commerce training advisory committees held 188 meetings in 1984-85, which is about 11 meetings a committee.

The industry and commerce training advisory committees comprise a deputy commissioner, who is the chairman, and a member who is the director of the Division of Technical and Further Education. The employers and employees have equal representation, with the number to be determined by the Minister.

The legislation provides for such other members as the Minister determines. It is incumbent on the Minister to indicate what he has in mind about adding members to the committees. If the Minister introduces legislation to this Chamber, he should explain what he has in mind rather than make this brief statement—

> "There are instances, however, in which additional representation is appropriate. The Bill will provide for an appropriate amendment to the legislation to provide for this additional membership."

It may be appropriate to have additional representation, but it is not good enough for the tax-payers of this State to have the Minister simply say that there are instances in which additional representation is required. Let the Minister include in *Hansard* what he has in mind, so that people who want to find out why things are being done can do so by reading the *Hansard* record. All too often, Ministers come into the Chamber and say that this or that will be done, without justifying why it is to be done. I want the Minister to cite cases in which it is considered that additional representatives should be added to the industry and commerce training advisory committees.

In the old apprenticeship days, I was on one of the apprenticeship group committees for over 10 years. Indeed, I was on several of the committees. I know their background,

how they worked and how balanced they were. I can only say to the Minister, "Give us instances when you think additional representation will be required." I have no ulterior motive in saying that; I want only to understand exactly what the Minister has in mind.

The third tier in the structure is the regional advisory committees. According to the report, 17 of them are established throughout the State. They held 138 meetings in 1984-85, or about eight meetings a committee. The chairman of the regional advisory committee is a public servant in the area, the ex officio member is the principal of the local technical and further education college, and there are not less than four representatives of employers and employees, that is, two from each side. Again, the Bill provides for the Minister to add members to the committees as he determines. I must say to the Minister once more, "Be more explicit. You pride yourself on keeping the House informed and being up-to-date with your portfolio. You should spell it out for us so that people outside this Chamber, as well as members, will be able to inform themselves on how the industry and commerce training scheme is operated."

One provision in the Bill gives more direct input, as the Minsiter said in his speech, to regional advisory committees. Historically, the regional advisory committees, as they are now called, make recommendations to the industry and commerce training advisory committees, which then flow through to the Industry and Commerce Training Commission, which, I suppose, advises the Minister.

I do not disagree with the proposals in the Bill. However, I have reservations about the additional powers that are to be given to the regional advisory committees. It is all right for the Minister to say, as he did in his second-reading speech, that he is further improving the decision-making processes of those committees. I am a little surprised to hear the Government talking about extending decision-making processes, because that is something for which the Government has not been renowned. I am a little concerned at the extent to which the Government is going to give more authority, powers or decision-making processes to regional advisory committees, having regard to their structure and the way in which they actually operate in practice.

For instance, under the Bill, the regional advisory committees will be given more power in the allotment of apprentices. They will be able to determine the allotment of apprentices in their areas. Instead of making a recommendation to the industry and commerce advisory committees, they will be able to make the decision.

In addition, the regional advisory committees will be given the power to extend or reduce the term of an apprenticeship. People may say that that is fair enough, but it is placing much more responsibility on the regional advisory committees and, having regard to their nature and the way in which they operate, I wonder whether that is advisable.

Regional advisory committees also will be given the responsibility or added power to assess an employer's entitlement to an apprentice. At present, they make recommendations to the State advisory committees. In the future, regional advisory committees will be able to make that assessment themselves. They will be able to impose penalties on apprentices and cancel the indentures of apprentices.

As I say, I have reservations about extending these powers to the regional advisory committees. It remains to be seen how the scheme operates. If it operates successfully in practice, that will be all right.

I would like the Minister to explain the rationale behind this proposal. It is all right for him to say that he is extending the decision-making process. At present, there is a decision-making process. The regional advisory committees make recommendations to the industry and commerce advisory committees, which then make recommendations to the Industry and Commerce Training Commission. The commission is supposed to advise the Minister. That is the present position. Under this Bill, some of those advisory responsibilities will be taken from the commission.

In his second-reading speech, the Minister mentioned the introduction of a variety of pre-apprenticeship and pre-vocational courses. I see a contradiction here, because the Minister went on to say—

> "Where a graduate from such a course subsequently obtains an apprenticeship, the determination of the periods of reduction and the stage at which the reduction is granted during the apprenticeship is vested with the various industry and commerce advisory committees."

I ask honourable members to note that.

Then he said—and this is the contradiction—

> "This has resulted in a variety of arrangements being applied, though all have the effect of providing for a reduction in the apprenticeship period."

The point I am making is that, if the Minister is to break down the present system by giving all of those responsibilities to the 17 regional advisory committees throughout the State, he will certainly have a variety of arrangements. He will not get a great deal of consistency in what happens throughout the State and in the decision-making that takes place in the State. If the Minister has not already done so, I ask him to reconsider what he is doing. He is creating the very thing to which he referred in his speech. He is creating a variety of arrangements.

The present system has been tried and proven over many years and the Minister could be making a serious mistake. I understand that he has good reasons for wanting the regional advisory committees to make those decisions; he wants to give them more power. However, the responsibilities that the Minister is giving them may in the long term react against the real intention of the provisions of this legislation.

On page 3 of his speech, the Minister referred to a standard of proficiency being introduced in individual trades. He prefaced his remarks by referring to the current system, under which an apprentice who obtains a pass of 75 per cent or more is given a reduction in duration of his apprenticeship. The Minister went on to say—

> "The Government has accepted the commission's recommendation that amendments should be made to the Act to provide for the commission to set a standard of proficiency in individual trades."

I would like the Minister to explain the rationale behind that statement. Personally, I am not in favour of reducing the period of the apprenticeship because an examination result exceeded 75 per cent. The old system, under which he received additional remuneration, was better. That may not have been acceptable to the employer. However, the duration of the apprenticeship is already short enough, having been reduced over the years. In a number of trades, corners have been cut in training apprentices. I am of the old school that believes it is advisable for the apprentice to serve the full four-year apprenticeship.

Because the Minister intends to accept the commission's recommendation to set a standard of proficiency in individual trades, I would like the Minister to say what trades are being considered and the rationale behind the recommendation so that the method of operation will be recorded.

On page 2 of his second-reading speech, the Minister referred to the position when an employer is unable to provide work for an apprentice. I agree with the thoughts behind the legislation, but I recommend that the indenture should not be cancelled when the employer has difficult times and cannot provide employment to his apprentice or apprentices. Under the present provisions of the legislation, if the apprentice cannot be transferred, there is no other alternative than to cancel the indenture. The Minister mentioned that the apprentice would be stood down. It would be more appropriate to suspend the indenture. The Minister said that many apprentices and their parents do not like the term "cancellation", which gives the impression that the apprentice has done something bad and has had his indenture cancelled and his training terminated. It would be far more appropriate, rather than to refer to the apprentice being stood down, to refer to the indenture being suspended so that it can be readily brought back

into operation if the apprentice is re-employed by his old employer or, subsequently, he is able to find new employment.

I now comment on the additional powers that have been given to the Minister by this legislation. Previously, I referred to the report on the activities of the Division of Employment Planning and Training. That report and the Act state that the main function of the Industry and Commerce Training Commission is to advise the Minister. After all, the Minister cannot be expected to be up to date on all things. He must rely on information and advice from the commission. That is only logical. Section 74 of the Act deals with attendance at classes and submission for examinations. Presently, the Act provides that the Minister should act on the recommendation of the commission after its consultation with the appropriate industry and commerce advisory committee. The Bill repeals that provision, so I want to know who is to advise the Minister. That applies not only to this part of the legislation but also throughout the Bill.

If the Minister is not to rely on the recommendations of the commission, who is to advise him? Who is to supply him with the information? Is the Minister to be so competent that he can do it off the top of his head? What is the position? I have reservations about amending the provisions of the legislation to provide for more direct decision-making, which I assume is decision-making by the Minister. In the past, I have known Ministers to commit blunders. It is only right that the Minister should take advice from the structure that he has set up to handle this legislation. That structure should make sure that the legislation operates for the good of the people who are to be covered by it. Therefore, the structure that has been set up should be adhered to, and the Minister should take advice from those who have been appointed by legislation to advise him. That is the extent of the comments I wish to make at this stage.

Mr LITTLEPROUD (Condamine) (7.46 p.m.): I welcome the chance to speak to the Bill. At this stage of the debate, it is not necessary for me to go through many of the matters that have already been canvassed by other contributors to the debate.

Mr Davis: Because you wouldn't be able to understand it. What would you know about apprenticeships?

Mr LITTLEPROUD: I ask the member for Brisbane Central not to be his usual inane self. I have not even started my contribution and the honourable member has interjected. He should not show his ignorance. Ever since I entered this place, I have seen a striking resemblance between that Muppet character Oscar, who lives in the garbage, and the member for Brisbane Central. I now know why. As soon as there is a bit of garbage round, his eyes light up.

As stated by the Minister, one of the aims of the Bill is flexibility. The member for Nudgee took some exception to some of the flexibility that has been proposed. I admit he has had much experience in this field. I listened closely to what he had to say. I do not agree with all his comments, but I took note of them.

I wish to mention a couple of things that have occurred in my electorate. I wish to commend the Minister and his department. The Minister may remember that, some months ago, I approached him about a young lad who was reared in my area but who moved to Toowoomba and gained employment at a metal-manufacturing works. He was keen to be indentured as an apprentice. The first time the Minister's officers inspected the premises, they believed that the experience that the young lad would receive would not be sufficient for him to get full training as an apprentice. An appeal was made to me and I appealed to the Minister, who had his officers reconsider the matter. As a result, I was successful in having young Wayne Smith given an apprenticeship. I now have pleasure in informing the Minister that, at the end of 1985, Wayne Smith topped the course at the TAFE college.

Another example of flexibility on the part of the Minister and his department involved a young chap who was keen to get into the building trades. Honourable members would appreciate that not too many builders operate in small towns and that, in addition, the building trades tend to ebb and flow. The lad was able to find a builder who would

take him on but, because the builder was getting on in years and liked to have some sort of freedom in his life, he was not too keen on the idea. The proposal was worked out that the young lad could become indentured to the carpenter in co-operation with the boy's own father, who is a cabinet-maker. Honourable members would appreciate that cabinet-making and carpentry go hand in hand in the building trade. I do not know the outcome of those negotiations, but I know that the department has undertaken some investigations. The family and I thank the Minister and his department for their actions. At least now the family knows that there is some chance.

I am talking about flexibility. It is very clear that there is a great deal of co-operation between the Education Department and the Department of Employment and Industrial Affairs in the setting up of trade training and apprenticeships. Honourable members will recall the debate that followed the issue of the document *Education 2000*, in which it was suggested that it was necessary for trade-related courses to be introduced in high schools in Years 11 and 12. One can see that that initiative is very closely allied to the flexibility and the trade training to which the Minister referred.

It is probably common throughout the State, as it is in my electorate, that employers find it frustrating that their apprentices must undertake block release training. The employers find that very expensive because its cost must be added to their overhead costs, holiday pay, sick pay and the 17½ per cent holiday loading. It reaches the stage at which it mitigates against young people who want to learn a trade. The employer makes a commercial decision that it is just not on. I commend the Minister for the flexibility that he has built into the training system. He will receive advice from the regional advisory committees as well as the committee that oversees the whole project throughout the State.

The honourable member for Nudgee said that some short-cuts could be taken. Undoubtedly, the Minister has sufficient experts on his committees to examine that matter. I will be guided by the Minister. The honourable member for Nudgee questioned the Minister as to who would make the final decisions. It seems that the advisory committees would go to the Minister and a final determination would be made by the Minister. That is common practice in many departments.

I commend the Minister for the combination of the secondary and TAFE courses and the dovetailing of the trade relations courses with apprenticeships.

While talking about apprenticeships and vocational commercial training, I would like to digress a little and refer to the recognition of rural training. Already, Queensland is doing a tremendous job with its four agricultural colleges. Limited spaces are available. Nearly all young men who undertake courses at those colleges undertake a managerial position on a property, take over the family property or end up in the agricultural service field, dealing with chemicals and so on.

Mr Simpson: In a free world market you could employ every unemployed person in Australia.

Mr LITTLEPROUD: That could well be so.

The agricultural colleges conduct many short courses, whether they be for one week or one week-end. My experience with the Dalby Agricultural College is that it is possible for young men of any age to undertake courses in hydraulics, air-conditioning, servicing of generators, motor electrics, braking systems, wool-classing, animal husbandry skills and so on. As people gain accreditation for successfully handling those very short courses, perhaps thought could be given to providing some sort of documentation so that, when they seek employment, they can say, "I am accredited with this and that." They could then finish up being qualified agricultural workers. In the past, it has been the practice for a person to learn by experience in the bush. By word of mouth, he tells people how good he is. Knowing what some bush yarns are like, sometimes the stories are stretched somewhat. The Bill provides for a more formal recognition. Perhaps the Minister will examine that matter.

Recently, I read an article that was written by Professor Michael Porter. He referred to the large sum of money spent in Australia on trying to create employment for the 200 000 young people who are unemployed. He made the point that, since 1983, the Federal Government has spent $2,300m on programs to provide mainly short-term jobs to those 200 000 persons. Mathematically, it worked out that, for the same amount, the Federal Government could have given each person $11,500 in one grant. That indicates how ludicrous are some programs that are being forced upon the people by a very inflexible system.

When young people obtain jobs under schemes such as the Community Employment Program, the employment is short term and the disadvantages are manifold. Firstly, a person is pleased to obtain employment. In six months' time, he becomes unemployed and loses any chance of continuity of employment. He cannot make a decision on obtaining a loan to buy a motor car, a house or a piece of land. One needs to do some long-term planning before entering into a mortgage. Unemployed persons are denied that opportunity. That results from an inflexible system. The Minister would be well aware that the National Party and the National Farmers Federation have a plan for the deregulation of wages and a more flexible approach to trade training and labour relations.

The result would be the creation of more permanent jobs, which would enable people to borrow money with a degree of confidence because they would know that in a couple of years' time, or in 10 years' time, they would still have a job. People would have a trade and some sort of recognition. That benefit flows on to the financial world, because money can be lent to those people. The financial market picks up.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr LITTLEPROUD: The Federal Government's Priority One program still has to come up with its first job. Opposition members skite about the 600 000 jobs being provided by the Federal Government, but they do not mention at what cost. Members of the Opposition do not mention the huge deficit; they simply mention 600 000 jobs. More than half of those jobs are in the public service.

Mr Vaughan: You would deregulate the labour market. Let's deregulate the farming industry, too.

Mr LITTLEPROUD: The farming industry is deregulated, all right. It has been torn to shreds by the Hawke Government. And, last week, at a Rotary conference in Toowoomba, the wife of the Prime Minister had the audacity to speak about the plight of rural women!

I thank honourable members for their attentiveness.

Mr SMITH (Townsville West) (7.56 p.m.): I will begin my speech by dealing with the announcement today of the unemployment figures. Although Government spokesmen try to gloss over those figures, it is a matter of great concern that Queensland is leading the unemployment stakes. I believe that the figure for Queensland is more than 10 per cent.

The honourable member for Ipswich (Mr Hamill) touched on a matter of perhaps even more concern, that is, the very significant unemployment amongst young people in a State that, frankly, has neglected manufacturing industry.

The Queensland Government has ignored the concept of balanced development and, of course, Queensland has ended up in its present position. Not only has this Government ignored the needs of manufacturing industry; it has neglected a very great need for modern training. In this debate, honourable members basically have spoken about the plight of young people. In Queensland, a lack of Government leadership has been demonstrated with respect to training, which has left this State very much behind.

The Queensland Government talks about new technology. Certainly, it is trying to implement it; but, once again, it is too late. It is very difficult to make what amounts to a quantum leap from very outdated industry to new technology. The Queensland

Government is attempting to bypass almost a generation in the history of industrial development. That is a very tall order.

The Queensland Government has attempted to preserve the old concept of master/servant relationships and to ignore the rights of employees and the desirability of employees having a say in management—in other words, worker participation. That can occur at so many levels and be of very great benefit to the State, to the country and, of course, to everyone involved.

One matter of great importance—and it comes within the ambit of the debate tonight—is that most people in employment are bound to have to change jobs. Gone are the days when someone decided what his or her career would be and that was in fact a job for life. In my opinion, it is very important that that concept be grasped, because the onset of the acceptance of new technology will bring even more rapid changes. Unless the Government has as a part of its whole strategy a very broad acceptance and enthusiastic embracement of concepts of general education and training, people beginning employment in future, particularly apprenticeships, could find themselves in a difficult position in a few years' time.

I have always been concerned about young people—those undertaking apprenticeships or otherwise—becoming locked in employment. Frequently, good and capable people begin careers and, even though they might be coping, because they did not realise what they were getting into, perhaps six, nine or 18 months down the track it becomes quite clear that they would have been more successful in another field of endeavour.

Pre-apprenticeship training can have a very beneficial effect and provide a positive influence on people involved in the scheme because it provides an opportunity for young people to gain an idea of their likes, dislikes, skills and weaknesses. That can be done before they are formally committed to an apprenticeship or a career path. Before they take a step in the direction of a permanent career that involves signing on the dotted line for a four-year period, it is to be hoped that they will have an insight into the direction they wish to take.

In recent times, there has been a resurgence of support for apprenticeship schemes because parents and young people have come to the conclusion that in many instances an apprenticeship offers greater security of employment than other, more popular forms of employment, the requirements of which have been found by those who have selected the occupations to have steep hills and valleys in employment opportunities.

People must understand that the whole concept of apprenticeship training is changing. To begin with, in some fields it is no doubt true that people need more skills. Certainly, much greater flexibility is needed in the training of apprentices.

In contrast, it is also true that considerable deskilling has occurred. People have been locked into some trades for longer periods than necessary. Having said that, I balance it with the comment made by the honourable member for Nudgee (Mr Vaughan) about the desirability of apprentices being involved in a trade or calling for a longer period, in order to properly develop skills that will qualify them as competent tradesmen.

A consideration of the end results of apprenticeship training should include training that is broad enough to educate people sufficiently to enable them to pursue other career paths at a later stage, if that is desired. I cannot think of anything more tragic than someone's possessing only sufficient knowledge and training to tie them to a job which, after two or three years, they may not particularly like.

Often people discover at the end of apprenticeship training that they have a dead-end job because the needs of the community are changing. It may be that all they have to look forward to is a downward path. The Government should provide an opportunity for them to change the nature of their employment. People should be trained sufficiently to enable them to undertake different occupations, or exercise some other option.

I know that the Minister for Employment and Industrial Affairs (Mr Lester) has spoken to many employers throughout Queensland. I attended at least one of the meetings he held, and I heard many of the views held by employers throughout the State.

Mr Lester: The honourable member made a good contribution.

Mr Vaughan: What are you trying to do to him?

Mr SMITH: The Minister will destroy me.

The Government ought to consider seriously some of the unreasonable expectations held by employers. Having said that, I admit readily that there are good employers. There are also unreasonable employers who expect too much from their apprentices and who believe that, as part of the price of training those apprentices, the really good ones should be bound to them for ever and that they can empty out the others and keep turning them over.

Recently in the development of courses and apprenticeship schemes, I have noticed a number of Mickey Mouse courses emerging. I do not intend to be unnecessarily harsh in my criticism, because I have already said that I believe in the new industries and new approaches that are coming to light. However, I am doubtful whether a sound argument could be advanced for a formal apprenticeship scheme to attach to some of the occupations that are offered by industry and commerce. For example, I was in premises at the same time as an officer of the Minister's department when it appeared to me that a young man was being indentured as an apprentice motor-mower mechanic. I cannot see any justification for signing a young man up for four years of training to become a motor-mower mechanic.

Sir William Knox: There are plenty of big businesses in some of the outer suburbs that cater for motor-mower repairs.

Mr Casey: It would be good if someone could invent a motor mower that would start first kick.

Mr SMITH: That may be true, and I do not dispute that a need exists in the community for people who can perform that kind of work. However, I use that as a good example because I do not believe that it is reasonable to put a young person on for four years and say, "You're not skilled at repairing motor mowers until you have completed four years' training."

Mr Lester: A lot of them still can't repair a motor mower very well.

Mr SMITH: I just threw that in. There are many other examples.

Tonight, I want to talk about the success of the Townsville group apprenticeship scheme. About 45 apprentices were involved. Such a scheme largely eliminates the problem that was referred to earlier of people going out of business and apprentices being left with the prospect of having their indentures cancelled. The success of such a scheme depends very much on the local leadership. The leadership varies tremendously from town to town throughout Queensland. It should be encouraged because it creates additional opportunities for apprentices. More importantly, it provides additional experience for those apprentices who have the opportunity of moving among the various employers involved in the scheme. Because I have served on apprenticeship boards and apprenticeship training committees, I can speak on this subject with some authority.

At the end of the four-year period of apprenticeship, there can be a very wide variation in the levels of skill of the apprentices. I am referring to apprentices who have roughly the same aptitude. It really depends on how enthusiastically an employer sets about training his apprentice or whether he is out to get as much as he possibly can in terms of profitability from the apprentice.

I will cite another example in which the member for Nundah might be interested. Fairly recently, an employer came to me complaining bitterly about the block release scheme because his apprentice was away and that was costing him $450 a week. That was the profit he was making from his apprentice. The apprentice was what is referred to as a blockie. He was employed laying masonry blocks. Obviously, that employer is exploiting his apprentice. Although there is a degree of skill involved—I certainly would

not take that away—there is no doubt that employers in that trade who take on apprentices would be looking for the young and tough. Obviously, when an employer can make 200 or 300 per cent on his wages, an apprentice is a good proposition. I would not imagine employers in that trade taking on anyone over 40 years of age.

I want to make a couple of specific points about the Bill. The first relates to the regional advisory committees. The Minister said that they will have more direct input. Earlier, I cited the Townsville example as proving that the idea would be worth while.

The Minister also referred to having subcommittees for specific purposes. I am very keen on that idea because I have seen people serving on apprenticeship committees who have had no idea why they were there. The broad nature of the scheme caused that problem. Once subcommittees are set up to deal with particular areas, their advice will certainly be much more effective, helpful and authoritative than that of a full committee.

I also want to touch on the point raised by the member for Nudgee relative to the cancellation of an apprenticeship. The threat of cancellation hangs like a sword over the heads of many young people in an era when, frequently, apprentices are not able to complete their apprenticeship. The word "cancellation" has a terrible ring of finality about it. It was suggested earlier that, perhaps, it could be referred to as being stood down or held in abeyance. From a psychological point of view, that would be very helpful. On many occasions, parents have come to me with their lad whose apprenticeship had been or was about to be terminated. It is a very traumatic time for parents, because they have to make a decision on whether the lad vacates the apprenticeship immediately and leaves the city or hangs round in the hope of continuing his apprenticehip with another employer. There is a very great need to give as much assistance as possible to ensure that an apprentice is able to complete his training.

I am worried that, particularly in the tourist industry, which attracts many young people, apprentices or trainees are more likely to be denied their proper rates. I refer mainly to penalty rates. It is to be regretted that young people are being increasingly denied appropriate rates of pay.

Mr McLean: The in word is "flexibility".

Mr SMITH: And "deregulation" is another.

Young people are in a very poor position to defend themselves. Very often, they know little about unions and union protection. The Government, through its departmental officers, should be playing a much bigger role in ensuring that the exploitation of young people is kept to the minimum.

Much work remains to be done to improve apprenticeships and training generally. The Government should have given earlier evidence that it was prepared to co-operate better with the Federal authorities on the traineeship scheme. Again, it is to be regretted that a great deal of point-scoring has taken place. The Minister told us that he will be signing an agreement tomorrow. I am looking forward to hearing more about that. However, all the posturing and criticism in the lead-up to signing the scheme was unnecessary. As Queenslanders, we should be looking forward to much more co-operation, so that many more young Queenslanders can be put on the pay-roll.

Hon. Sir WILLIAM KNOX (Nundah) (8.12 p.m.): The Bill is welcome and is supported by the Liberal Party. I commend the Minister for bringing many of the provisions of the existing legislation up to date. We are debating comparatively young legislation—the original Act, introduced by the former member for Aspley (Mr Fred Campbell), dates from 1979—which started a new era of training in industry in Queensland. In many ways, it led the way in Australia.

One of the difficulties about the industry and commerce training system is that many people regard it as anachronistic. It is far from that. The only word in the system that probably dates the legislation—and this is not necessarily so in the eyes of those who know—is "apprenticeship". That word conjures up the master/servant relationship that has existed over hundreds of years. An apprentice today is a somewhat different

person from an apprentice in earlier generations. The time has come for a new word such as "trainee" to replace it.

Mr Davis: It is always amazing that, after you leave the Ministry, you find that it is a good idea.

Sir WILLIAM KNOX: That is not so. I thought it was a good idea when I was the Minister. The honourable member may be surprised to know that I put up this idea when I was the Minister. I found a general reluctance in the trade union movement to change the name because it was a word that the union movement understood.

Mr Davis: No! Never!

Sir WILLIAM KNOX: The honourable member would not know anything about it. All he has done in his life is try to put people out of work. He has not tried to employ anybody or do anything to benefit the community. Everyone knows all about him. He should restrain himself.

The word "apprentice" was one word that I suggested should be altered when I was the Minister, but many people felt that it was still appropriate.

Mr Prest: They were the good old days.

Sir WILLIAM KNOX: It is still an appropriate word. Indeed, it is used throughout Australia today. The word "trainee" or any other word that is appropriate could be used.

Mr Innes: They got rid of "journeyman"; there is hope, yet.

Sir WILLIAM KNOX: Yes, we do not hear very much about journeymen any more, although the previous generation would be familiar with the word. An apparently out-of-date word sometimes gives people the impression that the legislation belongs to a past era, but that is far from the true position. The legislation is very modern, and the way in which it supervises the training of apprentices in industry and ensures that they get their academic training is excellent.

Perhaps the criticism could be levelled that the multitude of committees and advisory committees that have been set up over the years tends to add to the top-heaviness of the administration. Because of the diversity of industry and commerce, a need exists for specialist advice services from people who are heavily involved in industry. The honourable member for Townsville West, who has served on those committees, will know how intimate the relationship is between the people who are involved in industry and those who are responsible for training.

The Government has a responsibility to young people, many of whom are young women, to ensure that they are adequately trained. The system was reviewed in 1979, and perhaps in the not-too-distant future it will be reviewed again.

One matter that I find rather interesting is that the definition section is being amended to provide—

> " 'Director, Division of Technical and Further Education' means the Director, Division of Technical and Further Education in the Department of Education. . ."

Reference has been made, although not in great detail, to the tussle between the Education Department and the Department of Employment and Industrial Affairs as to which department is really responsible for the training of apprentices. Although the Education Department is represented on the commission very forcefully by very competent people, the feeling is always there that the training of apprentices should be handled by the Education Department and not by the Department of Employment and Industrial Affairs. I think that that position will continue. Fortunately, the commission is headed by people who are intelligent and tolerant enough to know how to handle those sorts of tussles, and I think they work themselves out.

The basic equipment for block release training, academic training and so on is provided by the Education Department through the TAFE colleges and other institutions, but the supervision certainly rests very heavily with the people who are very close to industry. The philosophy, which I support, has been that it should be an industry-oriented monitored system. Of course, a very important place exists in that system for the Education Department. That applies to nursing courses and other specialist courses which, even though they are education-type courses, belong to industry. It is important to keep that point in mind. I hope the Minister feels that that is the correct philosophy, that is, that it should be an industry-supervised, industry-related system of training and that it should not become purely an academic form of training.

Mr Smith: Unfortunately, the TAFE college is devoting a decreasing level of resources to that type of training. It is moving exactly in the direction that you are talking about.

Sir WILLIAM KNOX: It is natural that it is, because TAFE colleges themselves are part of the Education Department system and their philosophy is a little different. As I have pointed out, those philosophical differences are resolved by a very strong and powerful Industry and Commerce Training Commission. As long as good leadership is shown on the commission, I do not think that the tussle between the Education Department and the Department of Employment and Industrial Affairs will adversely affect the training of young people.

That appears to be the philosophy, and I take it that the Minister shares the view that it should be an industry-oriented training scheme and a monitored scheme and should remain that way. Nevertheless, there are some shortcomings.

The proposed Bill refers to apprentices who have their time interrupted owing to economic and other circumstances. It is proposed to change the term "cancellation" of the indenture to "stand-down". I do not agree with the suggestion that the apprentices should be in suspense. A suspended apprentice sounds like somebody down at the race-track.

Mr Vaughan: Suspended indenture; not the apprentice being suspended.

Sir WILLIAM KNOX: The indenture may be suspended, but the apprentice is not going anywhere either. The term "suspension" connotes some misdemeanour; it is not an appropriate word.

Mr Vaughan: Stand-down.

Sir WILLIAM KNOX: People do understand the word "stand-down" in industry. Perhaps "retrenched" is another word that is used.

Many of the apprentices who have their training interrupted are able to resume training with other employers within a reasonable period. Some of the schemes have been designed, particularly in group apprenticeship systems, to enable many apprentices who would not have been able to complete their indentures to complete them under other masters. I believe that "stand-down" is appropriate. The Minister's advisers have probably searched the Thesaurus to find the best word to use, but "stand-down" is probably better than "cancellation".

The honourable member for Townsville West (Mr Smith) referred to Mickey Mouse courses and included motor-mower apprentices. Motor mowers may not be as glamorous as aircraft engines or trucks, but motor mowers provide a vital service in the community. I know several motor-mower service centres that employ young people as apprentices, and they are very happily employed. They are thriving businesses, not only selling motor mowers but maintaining, reconditioning and providing spare parts for motor mowers. It is a substantial industry in our community. I would not refer to it as a Mickey Mouse-type industry.

Mr Smith: My main point was that it does not require four years' training or something of that sort.

Sir WILLIAM KNOX: I dispute that. Knowing the proprietors of several of the firms, I would say that it does require a considerable amount of skill. Reconditioning motor mowers is a huge industry. A range of motor mowers has to be dealt with, and a range of work has to be attended to.

Mr Lester: We have more trouble with motor mowers than anything else, don't we?

Sir WILLIAM KNOX: With great respect to the honourable member for Townsville West (Mr Smith), I say that he does reveal a sort of job snobbery, which is one of the problems in the training of young people in the community. The labourer is worthy of his hire. Just because it happens to be a humble motor mower, as compared to a jet plane, or some glamorous futuristic-type of work, the work seems to be down-graded in people's minds.

Mr Innes: He is undoubtedly a four-stroke man, as opposed to a two-stroke man.

Sir WILLIAM KNOX: I do not know. The connotation of that is beyond me. It is probably unparliamentary.

The servicing of motor mowers is an enormous industry, and there are many other areas.

Some honourable members would probably down-grade hair-dressers. It takes quite a deal of skill and many years training to become a competent hair-dresser. The biggest single group of apprentices under the Industry and Commerce Training Commission comprises hair-dressers.

Mr Prest: Hair-dressing or hair-care?

Sir WILLIAM KNOX: The honourable member and I do not have much of a problem in that regard. As I said to somebody the other day, it is not so much the hair on our heads as the hair on our chests that really makes us men.

These days, hair-dressing is a very complicated and high-technology industry. I am astounded at what is now involved. I am pleased that it takes only 20 minutes for me to have a haircut. Some people take an hour.

Mr Vaughan interjected.

Sir WILLIAM KNOX: I think that the honourable member for Nudgee would have a hair-stylist look after his hair.

Mr Vaughan: Don't worry; I am not too far behind you.

Sir WILLIAM KNOX: We have special secrets that we pass on only from father to son.

One matter that causes concern is block release training. I discovered—no doubt the Minister has also—that the small employers feel very much put down in keeping apprentices on their staff, particularly when they do not see their apprentices for some time during block release training. I am sure that the Minister would have received representations on this matter. I do not know if he has been able to find a solution to it. The problem has been partly solved by the group apprenticeship system, which has worked extremely well for painters, plumbers and the like. Where artisans are involved, the apprentices can be moved from employer to employer with a common master, who ensures that the standards of training are maintained at a high level. That takes much of the burden off the small employer. In the main, those industries comprised small employers. I am sure every honourable member has received similar complaints from small employers.

I do not know whether the scheme for surrogate employers is still in operation. Some of those schemes worked well. Attempts have been made to overcome the problem. Among the small employers are hair-dressers, who have managed to obtain academic

training for their apprentices without using the block release scheme. Of course, they still receive their intimate training and supervision of their work by the master hairdresser. So ways do exist by which the problem can be overcome.

Nevertheless, more and more employers in small business are finding it extremely difficult to employ apprentices, although they would like to do so. Apprentices no longer fall into the category of cheap labour. No-one can say for a moment that apprentices today are the cheap labour that they might have been a generation or two ago. The employment of apprentices has become a problem for small employers.

I wish to bring to the Minister's attention a matter that is causing much worry in the community, particularly in the electrical trades. More and more electrical contractors are finding it difficult to retain their staff, because the registration of electrical contractors allows many employees to work in the community under their own steam. They operate at week-ends and at other times, even though they are in permanent employment as well. I am all for private enterprise and for people being able to use their skills, if they are qualified and have them recognised, 24 hours a day, seven days a week, regardless of whom they work for. However, that presents a problem for apprenticeship training.

Today the electrical trades have considerably fewer apprentices than was the case a few years ago. That is due entirely to the fact that the larger employers in the electrical contracting business cannot afford to retain apprentices when their own employees are working in competition with them outside normal working hours. A generation ago the general feeling in the community was: one man, one job. With shorter working hours and the fact that people have skills and qualifications that can be proved by certification—their work is recognised by local authorities, electricity commissions and so on—they can work out of the hours of their usual employment and in direct competition with their employer, thus prejudicing the employer's opportunity of employing apprentices.

That is a serious side-effect of allowing electrical contractors a free rein. I am not suggesting for one moment that people who have those qualifications should be denied the right of practice. Doctors in many hospitals are allowed the right of private practice. There is a way to overcome that difficulty. When legislation was amended by the Minister for Mines and Energy, we tried to establish a system under which employees, who were electrical contractors and held a certificate, were allowed the right of private practice outside their usual employment. In many parts of the State, that is particularly desirable, because the area in which they live might not have a qualified electrical contractor.

Electrical contractors work for sugar-mills and for large employers who are not themselves electrical contractors but are qualified to do the work that meets the standards of the Queensland Electricity Commission and the local authorities.

Mr Vaughan: You guys were in coalition when the Act was amended to allow that, and you voted for it.

Sir WILLIAM KNOX: The honourable member did not listen to me earlier. I said that there is a great advantage in having mobility of people with the certification of an electrical contractor. That may have its advantages, but a side-effect is that the bigger employers have found it difficult to maintain their proportion of apprentices or to maintain apprentices at all. There is an answer to the problem. I have made suggestions to the Minister for Employment and Industrial Affairs and the Minister for Mines and Energy so that the system can be better supervised than it is at the moment.

That brings me to another point that I think is relevant. An honourable member referred to the shortage of space at TAFE colleges. Recently, it was announced that 18 000 young people were turned away from tertiary education in this State. Parts of the tertiary education scene are the TAFE colleges and the areas of education available to the people who are endeavouring to become qualified through the apprenticeship system. The state of tertiary education is a crying shame and a disgrace. The problem is not unique to Queensland. Because of a lack of facilities for eager young people, whose parents are prepared to make sacrifices and are prepared to go long distances to obtain their education, nearly 200 000 young people have been turned away from tertiary

education in this nation. They are now being denied the opportunity of tertiary education in this country. As a result, of young people in tertiary education in OECD countries, Australia's participation rate is near the bottom. When one compares the 88 per cent participation rate in tertiary education in Japan with the rate of about 45 per cent in Australia, one can see that a tremendous opening exists in Australia. I am talking not about universities, but about this level of tertiary education. In Australia, there is a tremendous opening in the technical field, in skills, in the sciences and in engineering. In the twenty-first century, Australia will be desperately short of persons with such skills. Simply because young people are being turned away from tertiary education, Australia will be importing people to do the jobs that are required in this country. However, enough space seems to be found to look after a quota of people from other countries, whilst our own Australians are being turned away from those opportunities. I make that point because I believe that that is one of the areas in which the employment level could be considerably reduced.

Six new tertiary institutions are needed immediately in this State to cater for the 18 000 persons who are being turned away. In other States, more tertiary institutions are needed. If tertiary places had been found in this State for those 18 000 persons, the unemployment level would have been reduced from more than 10 per cent to 8.5 per cent. That would have been immediately reflected in the unemployment figures, because most of those people, at least for the months of January and February, are on the dole while they are sorting themselves out and looking for suitable work.

Many young people will never receive the training that they need and for which their parents are prepared to make sacrifices. As a result, they will become the flotsam and jetsam of the twenty-first century. The nation cannot afford that.

Mr CASEY (Mackay) (8.36 p.m.): A couple of matters cause me concern about the apprentice system and apprentices generally. It is all very well for honourable members to come into the House and tidy up this or that part of the Industry and Commerce Training Act, making adjustments here and there. In some respects, those adjustments are perhaps the mechanics of trying to solve a problem. That is not an answer, however, if it will not encourage and increase the number of apprentices in this State.

I raise a matter that concerned me a great deal a couple of months ago. I refer to a press release that was issued by the Minister on 8 January 1986. The Minister and the Government, through their extensive PR machine, indicate to the people of Queensland that wonderful things are happening in every sphere of the Government's administration of the State and the activities with which the Government is associated. The evidence from the Minister's own department, unfortunately, is that the PR machine does not reveal the truth.

In the press release to which I have referred, the Minister said that 5 300 new apprentices commenced work in Queensland during 1985. That is commendable. The Minister went on to say that the number of apprentices was very close to the 1984 level, which showed an increase of about 1 250, or 30 per cent, over previous years.

It is often said that one can do what one likes with figures; that they can be matched up according to what one wants to say. However, the Minister's claim is nowhere near the truth.

I will refer to extracts from the reports of the Minister's department. Those are the accurate figures, I believe. The section from which I have taken those figures deals with apprentices receiving technical instruction at the year's end. I refer to the last three years available, that is, 1982, 1983, 1984, remembering that the Minister said that the figure for 1985 was very close indeed to that for 1984. At the end of 1982, the total number of apprentices in the State receiving technical training was 16 753. By the end of 1983, it had dropped to 15 871. By the end of 1984, it had dropped to 12 327.

The Minister would agree that that is a very significant drop indeed. It is something in the order of 20 per cent for the whole of the State. Of course, the Minister says that the 1985 figures were very close to those of 1984; so one can assume that the figures

are much the same. Because the 1985-6 report is not available as yet—and it will not be available until late this year—the 1985 figures are not included in the scale to which I refer. By that time, of course, this State may have had a change in Government and the econony might be starting to move.

The Minister went on to say that the most significant increases have been in the country areas of the State. I accept that some courses are not available in country colleges of technical and further education and that students do have to travel to Yeronga and Kangaroo Point to attend classes. The figures for the total apprenticeship system for the first, second and third years indicate that enrolments in country colleges increased slightly between 1982 and 1983— from 5 766 to 6 107, respectively. However, by 1984, enrolments dropped to 4 698, which represents a decrease of 25 per cent over a 12-month period; yet the Minister says that the figures for 1985 are much the same as those for 1984.

In his press statement, the Minister went on to say that significant increases in enrolments had taken place in north Queensland. The Minister mentioned Rockhampton, and I am sure that people who live in Rockhampton would not be pleased to be included as a part of north Queensland. The Minister quoted also figures for Mackay and Townsville. The figures reveal that the number of apprenticeships in Rockhampton in 1982 was 852, but that dropped to 641 in 1984. In Townsville, there were 847 apprenticeships in 1982, but by 1984 that had been cut back to 795. In Mackay, there were 534 in 1982, but that slipped back to 492 in 1983, and then further declined to 492 in 1984. In each case, the number of apprentices who were actually being trained decreased.

I point out that the figures I have mentioned were extracted from an annual report of the Department of Employment and Industrial Affairs. I have photocopies, if the Minister would like to assure himself that I am not quoting shonky figures. The figures were supplied by his own department, and they set out clearly that a considerable decrease in the number of apprenticeships available in this State has occurred. It indicates also that, contrary to the impression that the Minister has tried to create through his public relations machine, all is not well for apprentices.

One has only to travel to the provincial areas of the State to discover that that is the truth of the matter. One need only speak to headmasters to find out how many former pupils have been able to obtain apprenticeships. The decline in opportunity is considerable, and that is why Queensland will find itself in the situation described by the honourable member for Nundah (Sir William Knox). Many other reasons can be found in the mismanagement that is part of the performance of the Queensland Government.

Why does the Government try to hoodwink the people of Queensland? Why does it try to pull the proverbial Roma wool over the eyes of members of the public—or is it Dalby wool in the electorate of the honourable member for Condamine (Mr Littleproud)? The honourable member ought to have a Condamine bell around his neck if he wants to find out what the correct figures are.

The figures to which I have referred show clearly what has happened throughout Queensland. Overall, a decrease in apprenticeships of 20 per cent has occurred, but in country areas the decrease is of the order of 25 per cent. It is ironical that the the real effect of the decrease is being felt in country areas, because those areas are represented by a political party that formerly was called the Country Party. There was once a group of honourable members who were supposedly elected to represent the interests of country people in this State, but I have clear proof of what has occurred since that party changed its name from the Country Party to the National Party. The Queensland Government has forgotten all about country people, and the minds of members of the Government have turned to the activities of people such as Sir Francis Moore and Sir Edward Lyons, and all the other ignoble knights in the land.

The figures also indicate very clearly that a significant decline in industry has occurred in provincial and country areas of this State. Apart from the south-eastern corner of the State, many of the regions of the State have suffered greatly over the past

four or five years at the hands of this Government because of the decline of industrial development. The decline in industrial development is the source of the problems that are beginning to emerge in the Queensland economy. One of the exceptions is the Mackay district. In that area, the decline has not been so marked for a period of several years because of the coal-mining and shipping industries that are associated with places such as Abbot Point, Dalrymple Bay and Hay Point. The industry associated with those places involves a good deal of mechanical equipment, and there was a demand for additional apprentices to be employed.

I give credit where credit is due. Specific industries have been established, but they have been based on the development of a resources boom in Queensland that has come to an end. The figures bear out the decline in the areas that I have mentioned.

Recently, I was fortunate enough to pay a visit to the southern States, and I had an opportunity of speaking to people involved in public service and private industry, as well as to representatives of promotional organisations involved in developments taking place in New South Wales and Victoria.

I was absolutely amazed to see some of the action being taken in those States to help overcome the problem of training apprentices. Those States are up and moving. They are taking advantage of the programs available from the Hawke Labor Government. They are not shoving them back into a corner and saying, "They are the evil socialists and we can't have anything to do with them." They are taking advantage of the programs and what they have been able to achieve in the field of training activities is there for all to see. And it is not all happening in the big city areas. I did not look specifically at the city areas; I also went into the provincial areas and was amazed to see the types of programs available there.

New South Wales is moving towards something to which I referred 17 years ago, on the first occasion on which I spoke in this Chamber about apprenticeships. I said then that young people are put on and straight away told to drive a bulldozer worth half a million dollars. They are expected to learn to operate the machine by trial, and error, even though it can be very costly to repair if they damage it. Such machines can do an enormous amount of work. Queensland employers still cling to the old master/apprentice system that is at least 200 years old.

Mr Littleproud: I spoke about that in my first speech, too.

Mr CASEY: The honourable member for Condamine entered this place through the back door only a few years ago.

Mr Littleproud: Yes, but you are not the only bloke who talks about it.

Mr CASEY: What has the honourable member done to get the Government to respond to those community demands? It is his Government that is in power; yet it has done absolutely nothing about the problem because the thick heads in the Cabinet do not realise that something needs to be done. Their attitude is, "It didn't happen in my barefoot days, so it shouldn't happen now." The solution to one of the great productivity problems is at hand, but this Government is doing absolutely nothing. It will not look at new training schemes so that new jobs using heavy equipment can be opened up.

Other States are already operating special courses or moving in that direction. The State Governments are providing the sponsorship using Federal Government training funds. Queensland is very badly in need of similar schemes. Other State Ministers are not acting as the Queensland Minister does and saying publicly throughout Queensland and in this Parliament that if apprentices end up out of work they should look round to see what they can find. If they cannot, too bad, so sad; away they go with their indentures cancelled. Not on your Nelly as far as the New South Wales and Victorian Governments are concerned! They have set up regional development programs under a system in which the resources of the local community are used. The apprentices are engaged in what is called social work in the community. I know that members of the National Party turn up their noses when one refers to social work. In New South Wales

and Victoria the apprentices are put together as a team under group masters who are paid to look after them. Assistance is provided by the Rotary, Lions and Apex service clubs, and building materials are contributed by members of the business community. The teams build scout and guide huts and community playgrounds. They are trained and kept in work until they become tradesmen.

Mr Littleproud: Six-month wonders.

Mr CASEY: The honourable member for Condamine refers to them as six-month wonders. I bet that he would like to have a number of apprentices working in his electorate for six months helping to erect scout and guide halls, looking after CWA buildings and playgrounds and building social amenities for the good of the community. All that is required is a little support and fresh thinking from this Government.

Why are so many young, potential tradesmen not getting an opportunity?

A Government Member: You have cleared the gallery.

Mr CASEY: Most of them are probably only tories. They do not have to cop it, but Government members have to stay here. They are getting paid for it.

Mr McLean: They have gone back for the freebies.

Mr CASEY: They have probably gone back for the freebies in Mr Speaker's room. The member for Warwick had better relieve Mr Deputy Speaker, who might like to join in.

More work in Queensland is being undertaken by subcontractors. That is the real reason for fewer apprentices. The Government's encouragement of contract work during the SEQEB dispute was a classic example of discouraging apprenticeships. Labour-only contracts ensure that the contractor gets the percentage on all material used, but the young men and women who are seeking apprenticeships are missing out. Very few subcontractors employ apprentices.

An honourable member said that the big contractors employ very few apprentices. That is so. A little while ago I spoke about the development of the coal mines in Queensland. In the past 15 years, the Government has spoken about nothing but the number of jobs available in the parts of the State where the new coal mines are being developed. In the Mackay district and its hinterland, about $2,000m has been spent by companies in developing coal mines, port facilities and storage facilities. The companies engaged to do that work did not employ one apprentice. That is the cause of one of our problems. The employers should be made——

Mr Littleproud: Prove that.

Mr CASEY: I do not have to prove that to the honourable member. The Minister knows about it because some of the work was undertaken in his area. He knows full well that the construction companies did not employ one apprentice. They pinched tradesmen hell, west and crooked and put them to work, but they did not employ one apprentice. They did not contribute one dollar to the training of apprentices. I acknowledge that, when the coal-mining companies were established and became productive units, they employed apprentices; but the construction companies did not do so.

As the honourable member for Nundah asked: is it any wonder that the State is running out of apprentices? The main problem is that the big employers are not in any way encouraging the employment of apprentices. Rather, they are encouraging labour-only contracts, with subcontractors being employed. The subcontractors also do not employ apprentices. Those are the practices that have to be eliminated, but they will not be eliminated by the Minister for Employment and Industrial Affairs, who lacks the courage to do it.

Mr STEPHAN (Gympie) (8.54 p.m.): I am pleased to speak in this debate. Once again, I have witnessed the knocking ability of the honourable member for Mackay. I

was interested to hear him talk about the good old Country Party. That is not what he said about 10 or 15 years ago. What has caused him to change his mind? Is he living in the past, reminiscing about what he thought would happen when he was Leader of the Opposition. When he was the Leader of the Opposition, he did not quite make it; but apparently, to his mind, those were the days of the good old Country Party. The member for Mackay should realise that we are living in the present and building for the future. That is what this legislation is all about.

The honourable member for Mackay spoke about community organisations and the role that they play. Their role is very important. They give advice and assistance to employers and employees alike, and particularly to school-leavers and those about to leave school. They encourage young people and advise them on what to expect from certain jobs. That is very important. People should never knock organisations such as Rotary and Lions and the important consultative role that they play.

Mr Casey: I didn't knock Lions or Rotary.

Mr STEPHAN: I heard the honourable member make derogatory statements about both Lions and Rotary. I am telling him what those organisations are doing in the community.

One of the most important features of the apprenticeship and traineeship system in Queensland, and indeed in all States of Australia, is the consultative process that has been established. The member for Nudgee referred to the active role that will be played by the committees that are being formed throughout the State. Very active committees have been established in a number of regional centres throughout the State. Those committees provide important local advice and recommendations on all aspects associated with the training of apprentices.

In the past, the regional committees have expressed some concern that their role was restricted to a recommending role, and that much of the real decision-making was done by the industry committees established under the head office umbrella of the Industry and Commerce Training Commission. Members who represent country electorates would be very well aware that the local regional advisory committees of the Industry and Commerce Training Commission consist of members who take a vital interest in the training and the welfare of young apprentices. They have an interest not only in the apprentices themselves but also in the training that is given to them by their respective employers. We would do well to note the role that these committees play and the advice that they are prepared to give. They know what is good for industry and for young people. They deal with those matters day after day. They realise the shortfalls involved.

Mr Vaughan: The regional advisory committees cover a range of industries, a range of trades.

Mr STEPHAN: That is right, they do cover a range of trades. On those committees are people who have a range of interests. They are able to give advice and support.

However, the committees have felt that their role has not been recognised as well as it could have been. I am pleased that the legislation, as the Minister has pointed out, provides for a more effective role to be taken by the various regional committees.

It is important that the decision-making takes place at the local level and that the members of the committees feel that they have an important part to play in the overall picture. The amendments in this regard, when effected, will stimulate interest at the local level, and the training programs and the supervision of the programs will be all the better for this progressive step. The member for Nudgee acknowledged that fact.

However, we need to be careful that, during these times of concern at Government regulation, there is not a proliferation of committees. I am sure that the Minister will keep under close review the activities of the regional advisory committees and all committees established under the auspices of the Industry and Commerce Training Commission.

I want to spend a little time addressing the important role that the commission and its very dedicated officers play in the promotion of employment opportunites for apprentices and trainees. The commission has a network of regional offices, which are staffed by field officers who are able to advise employers and prospective employees alike on the many facilities that are available to assist them in the training of not only their apprentices but all their employees. In country areas and other areas, many youths are unsure of what they want to do and what is available in the various trades in which they want to become involved.

The amendments proposed in the legislation will better assist in the operation of a smooth and efficient training system for employees in industry and commerce throughout the State.

Now I shall look at some statistics about apprentices and their intake. A good deal of knocking is going on in this area, too. The Queensland apprentice intake for the 12 months ended January 1986 was 5 326, compared with 5 400 for the previous 12 months and 4 257 for the 12 months ended 1984.

It is pleasing to note that the significant increase in intake in 1985 compared to 1984 has virtually been maintained in 1986. I feel sure that, with the improvement in operational procedures through the regionalisation of decision-making, the apprenticeship intake will be maintained at the current progressive levels. Honourable members should look at this rather than knock the fact, as so many try to point out, that the intake is going backwards.

Employees should not consider that the field staff of the commission undertake purely a policing role. In fact, their role is quite contrary to this, and the policing activities are not the major focus of their operations. The major concern of field staff in the Industry and Commerce Training Commission is to ensure that the apprentices are adequately trained, and the commission provides a consultancy role in this regard.

Officers can also assist employees in establishing training programs to maintain effective training records. The Minister would also agree that prospective employees should be encouraged to contact the regional office of the commission and seek the commission's assistance and advice.

A further amendment that I feel is worthy of specific mention is the proposal to allow for a stand-down of indentures of apprentices, or however they may be classified, where otherwise the cancellation of an indenture would be necessary at present.

In many instances, the inability of the employer, for very good reason, to continue employment causes a great deal of concern, particularly in the building industry, and also in other industries in which there is the ebb and flow of the building operation and the amount of work to be carried out. It is sometimes difficult to maintain a flow of apprentices in a particular business operation.

I commend some of the regional officers for the work that they do to place apprentices in these circumstances. In instances in which apprentices have been stood down or have not been able to be maintained by an employer, these officers have done a tremendous job in finding an employer who will take on the apprentices. I know of a number of people who have been helped in this way.

I mentioned the building industry and the hair-dressing industry. Honourable members should not underestimate those industries.

I know that it is of particular concern to persons, particularly those in the rural areas and specifically the parents of the apprentices concerned, where a young person may have undertaken quite a considerable period of his training and, although there may be a likelihood of his subsequent recovery, the employer's situation in his business is such that he is no longer able to maintain the apprentice in continual employment.

In the Minister's second-reading speech, he spoke of the concern that many people have with the word "cancellation" implying some finality of the indenture. From my own experience, I know this to be the case, and it is a forward step that the Government

is planning to allow the stand-down of an apprentice's indenture in situations in which there is a likelihood of work not being able to be continued.

I point out that this reasoning relies on the employer's being able to make a profit in industry. From what I can gather from some of the comments of the Opposition, "profit" seems to be a dirty word and employers should not dare to make a profit. Mr Kerin wants deregulation of primary industries and wants them to sink, but they need encouragement more than anything else. If there is to be deregulation, let the market-place determine all aspects of deregulation and all aspects of employment and see how far that goes.

I believe that this legislation is a forward step. It may be that, in some instances, wages will have to be decreased. It may be that the employment time or working hours may have to be increased. It may be that the productivity of employers and businesses may have to be maintained and improved. But is that not all for the benefit of the community and of this particular country that we are helping to support?

I support the Minister in the introduction of this legislation.

Mr INNES (Sherwood) (9.4 p.m.): The aspect that I would like to emphasise for a few minutes is the number of TAFE places available in the vocational and work-preparatory strands in Queensland. The general problem of the availability of tertiary education in Queensland has been recognised and is acute. In simple terms it can be summarised in this way: with 16.07 per cent of Australia's population, Queensland has 13.7 per cent of its university places, 14.9 per cent of CAE places and only 9.98 per cent of TAFE places in Australia for strands 1 to 5, which cover the vocational and work-preparatory strands. I have left out strand 6, which is macrame, needlework and similar adult education.

The figure of 9.98 per cent is extremely low, although it probably is not that low in terms of the amount of the educational Vote that goes to TAFE institutions. For good historical reason, Queensland has developed rural TAFE colleges, but they, like rural CAEs such as the Queensland Agricultural College near Gatton, are very high dollar-per-student institutions. The requirements of plant and real estate and the difficulty of servicing facilities in special locations cause those high costs. Probably in total terms the amount Queensland spends on TAFE is not 9.98 per cent but something higher.

The figure of 9.98 per cent in Queensland, which is the lowest in Australia, converts in numerical terms to 3 588 students per 100 000 of population and compares with an Australian average of 5 311; so Queensland is 1 723 TAFE places below the Australian average. Obviously the figures for the Australian Capital Territory could be slightly misleading. If one is speaking about university figures for the ACT, one must recognise that the Australian National University takes students from outside Canberra as well as from inside. At the CAE level and at the TAFE level, however, the figures deal only with the domestic market. In Canberra, for the domestic market, the number per 100 000 of population attending TAFE strands 1 to 5 is 9 953. I will express that in other figures. To equal the Australian figures for vocational TAFE courses, Queensland would need another 43 075 TAFE places. To reach the dizzy heights of Canberra's rate of participation in TAFE, Queensland would need an extra 95 600 TAFE places. Whichever way one looks at it, Queensland is a hell of a long way behind.

There are reasons for this. Queensland is a decentralised State. TAFE colleges, CAEs and universities cannot be built wherever 200 or 300 people live. However, it is a time for reflecting on where this State is going and on some central direction and planning as to where the State is going. It cannot all be left to the ad hocery of somebody from interstate who wants to build a development here or a development there. Queensland has a domestic crop of children who are entitled to the same sort of access to opportunity as other students in Australia.

The Minister for Industry, Small Business and Technology (Mr Ahern) quite properly has made a great emphasis on the importance of technology in the twentieth century and, considering the size of his Vote, has made great play about and given much publicity

to the possibilities of the technological age. He said on behalf of the Government that the future employment base lies with the secondary and service industry section.

The days of high employment in primary industries and mining industries—I am talking about employment; I am not talking about value or its significance to the economy—have gone. People will still be required to service those sectors, but the majority of employment will be generated in the sectors that service the primary industries and are more directly secondary and tertiary areas. Whether one refers to the technological strand, the high-tech future, secondary industry or service industry, one is referring to persons trained at least to the TAFE level. At the university level and the college of advanced education level, Queensland is very much the victim of failures by Federal Governments to recognise education's growth rate of the '70s and how far supply has slipped behind demand. Queensland is entitled to a greater proportion of the national cake to bring it up to the national average. Queensland is far more directly responsible for the financing of TAFE. Although I do not know the precise figures, perhaps up to 70 per cent of the TAFE budget is a decision by the State Government——

Mr Powell: Eighty-nine.

Mr INNES: Eighty-nine per cent of the decision is the State decision.

It is certainly significant. The decision-making on the setting up of TAFE colleges and the control of the type of courses available on the funds available will be a decision of the State, which it guards jealously. Like the Federal Government, in the future the Queensland Government has to look to that very important crisis of post-secondary education in Queensland. I do not think that the approach contained in the *Education 2000* publication will necessarily or adequately solve the problem. Whichever way one looks at it, Queensland requires courses of the type that are made available throughout the length and breadth of Australia.

A massive injection of funds is necessary to ensure the availability of TAFE, CAE and university education. For obvious reasons, the number of people who attend TAFE colleges is much larger. Whether one is talking about the person who will have computer dexterity, the person who will understand circuitry and the microchip technology or the person who will fabricate, weld or specialist weld—no matter where one looks at the future of the world—bearing in mind the statements made by the Minister for Industry, Small Business and Technology, and rightly so, about Queensland's position in the world, Queensland has an urgent or perhaps desperate need for greater spending at the TAFE level and a greater availability of vocational courses.

The total tertiary area is in crisis. All Governments have to participate in addressing that crisis. The Federal Government is responsible for two of the three strands. A large number of people are covered by the TAFE strand. Queensland must give special consideration to that area. Some countries have made a virtue out of their education system. One hundred years ago, in the country from which the Minister for Education and I would find our roots, a poor country set a great store by committing its resources to an educational system which in itself overcame those poor resources and set people free in the world. Those people led engineering, technology and educational success wherever they decided to settle. Brains can always be exported. One can always utilise brains and training in skills.

Mr FitzGerald: "True patriots all; for be it understood, we left our country for our country's good."

Mr INNES: Being married to someone of Irish extraction, I would not dare suggest that that might apply to Ireland.

However one looks at it, more tertiary educational facilities are required. Other members have addressed the systemic problems, the development of the labour market. Fewer apprentices can be afforded by suburban tradesmen, large electrical companies, small electrical companies or subcontracting carpenters as a result of the consequences of an industrial system that has priced the employment of apprentices out of the market.

That can be adjusted in other ways. Most employers—and I am talking about decent, responsible employers—would agree that the removal of block release would pave the way for more productive hours and a greater return for what is nowadays a large commitment in terms of apprentices. In this country, like the rest of the world, moves away from the traditional apprenticeship areas in which some internal readjustment might help the situation, the teaching of skills and the acquisition of skills at places such as tertiary institutions will be necessary.

I rose to concentrate on an aspect that was not highlighted by other speakers. Queensland is facing a crisis. New tertiary educational facilities are needed as a matter of urgency. Students in Queensland who are being told to stay at school and who are undertaking higher levels of schooling than students in the rest of Australia will have a right, in future years, to feel desperately cheated and deceived unless this State Government, like the Commonwealth Government, plays its part in making available those tertiary places.

Hon. V. P. LESTER (Peak Downs—Minister for Employment and Industrial Affairs) (9.16 p.m.), in reply: I sincerely thank all honourable members who contributed to the debate. The honourable member for Bulimba (Mr McLean) obviously carried out a good deal of research and tried very hard to make a good contribution. I do not have the slightest doubt that his contribution was very genuine.

Mr McLean: Don't point the bone at me.

Mr LESTER: The honourable members for Mount Gravatt (Mr Henderson), Maryborough (Mr Alison), Nudgee (Mr Vaughan), Condamine (Mr Littleproud), Townsville West (Mr Smith), Nundah (Sir William Knox), Mackay (Mr Casey), Gympie (Mr Stephan) and Sherwood (Mr Innes) all made contributions to the debate.

By and large, I think it was a meaningful debate. All honourable members had a positive attitude; all honourable members want a better deal for the young people of Queensland. It is as simple as that.

This is a significant piece of legislation administered by my department and it is necessary that I keep the legislation under constant review. It was quite a simple matter.

Some years ago, it was quite a simple matter for a young person to be apprenticed in a particular trade and he or she could expect to spend the rest of his or her lifetime working in that same occupation. With the rapid increase in technology in most occupations, it is unlikely now that a young person will remain right throughout his career in exactly the same job in which he began his working life. It is necessary, therefore, that appropriate mechanisms be instituted to ensure that each person remains trained in the most up-to-date technology affecting his job.

The Government has set aside funds during this year for a consultancy study to be undertaken into retraining requirements for industry in Queensland, and that study is currently under way. Members will appreciate, however, that it is necessary to ensure that any training and retraining programs have the necessary legislative support, and the amendments in this Bill will go towards ensuring that the Government is able to implement quickly appropriate training programs for our young persons entering the work-force and appropriate retraining programs for people during the course of their working life.

Presentation of amendments to the Industry and Commerce Training Act is a vehicle by which the training methods can be reviewed continually. The Queensland Government has adopted a progressive attitude by directing its attention to the training of young people and retraining of people who are a little older.

Queensland was the first State to introduce legislation of such a nature which departed from the old apprenticeship style of legislation. When the original legislation was introduced in 1979, it was regarded as legislation for other States to follow, which they did. All States have either followed the lead of Queensland or are about to.

The Queensland Government also saw a need to introduce a formal traineeship program and, in 1984, the hospitality traineeship program was established in the Cairns region. Although only small numbers of people have been available to undertake the traineeship scheme, it is a scheme of which the Queenland Government is justly proud. Considerable support has been forthcoming from relevant employer and employee organisations, and I am grateful for the co-operation that has been established among all parties in getting the hospitality traineeship program under way.

The Queensland Government made a submission to the committee of inquiry into labour market programs, which is generally known as the Kirby committee. When the Kirby committee brought forward its recommendations, many of them revolved round a traineeship program for young persons. That also was the major thrust of the submission made on behalf of the Queensland Government. That is something of which the Queensland Government is very proud, and it intends to support the traineeship scheme. An agreement between the Federal Government and the Queensland Government in respect of the traineeship program will be signed tomorrow. The Federal Minister for Employment and Industrial Relations (Mr Willis) will be arriving in Brisbane shortly and, together, we will launch the program. I am pleased to say that is a very good example of co-operation between the Federal Government and the State Government. Politics will be cast aside in an attempt to help the young people of this nation.

Mr McLean: Well done.

Mr LESTER: I thank the honourable member.

As honourable members are aware, the traineeship option was taken up by the Commonwealth Government and it forms an integral part of the endeavours designed to alleviate youth unemployment in this State and throughout the Commonwealth. The amendments presently before the Queensland Parliament will update the provisions of the Act and improve its flexibility as a piece of legislation operating in the employment and training field.

Once again, I thank all honourable members for the contributions that they have made to the debate. If any honourable member wishes to take up any other matters with me, no doubt that can be done in Committee. However, if any honourable member wishes to take matters a stage further, I will be happy to deal with those matters either by way of personal representation or deputations.

Committee

Mr Booth (Warwick) in the chair; Hon. V. P. Lester (Peak Downs—Minister for Employment and Industrial Affairs) in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 7, as read, agreed to.

Clause 8—Amendment of s. 20; Composition—

Mr VAUGHAN (9.23 p.m.): I would have thought that the Minister would answer the questions that I raised during the second-reading debate. Instead, all that he did was beat about the bush and beat up his second-reading speech. I asked him a question about changes in the composition of the Industry and Commerce Training Commission. More specifically, I asked him to elaborate on and explain why it is necessary to increase the composition of the commission from 14 to 18. It is only right that the Minister should give answers to the questions that I have asked. If he does not, I want to know why.

Mr LESTER: I did say that I would be happy to discuss matters in Committee, and I will do so. At the outset, I realise the effort that the honourable member for Nudgee put into his consideration of these amendments, and I acknowledge that he is genuine in his concern. Lengthy delays often occurred in country areas because decisions had to be made in Brisbane. I am dealing at present with the regional areas. The honourable member commented on them as well.

Mr Vaughan: I am dealing with the commission now, not regional advisory committees. They come later.

Mr LESTER: One of the reasons why there was an increase in the membership of the commission and a reduction in the number necessary to form a quorum was that, unfortunately, as much as I do not like to admit it, quite often a quorum could not be obtained. The number required to form a quorum was reduced in an attempt to keep the commission going. On many occasions, all members were present. However, all too frequently, insufficient members attended. Unfortunately, the union members offended just as much as anyone else. The Government had to do something to overcome the problem, and this decision was made after consultation with the commission, including members of the union movement, employers' representatives and Government representatives.

Mr VAUGHAN: The Minister just dealt with clause 10. I am speaking to clause 8. I still want to know why he has seen fit to increase the membership of the commission from 14 to 18, why he has seen fit to increase the number of employers' and employees' representives by one from six to seven, and why he has seen fit to add another representative of the Minister for Education and a representative from the Commonwealth Department of Employment and Industrial Relations. I indicated in my speech during the second-reading debate that I can appreciate the reasoning behind the addition of the representative from the Commonwealth department. The Minister has not answered my question.

Mr LESTER: I would have thought that the point I made about the lack of a quorum was a fairly decent answer. The Government was faced with a problem and this amendment seemed to be the answer. However, if the honourable member wants me to go into just a little more detail, I will.

The Industry and Commerce Training Commission has recommended that its membership be increased to provide for further representatives of employers and employees to cover an area of industry and commerce not presently represented on the commission. In other words, more union groups and employer groups wanted to be represented and the only way that that could be done fairly was to increase each group by one. That will give the commission a little more flexibility. It was democracy in action. Somebody asked for a little more and the Government gave it.

The commission has also recommended that a further appointment be made from the education field. It has also recommended that the Commonwealth department responsible for the administration of manpower programs be represented on the commission. The reason for the additional Commonwealth representative is fairly simple. It is involved in the area of traineeships. In the past, only TAFE was represented on the commission, and it was decided to widen the representation by including the Education Department as such. The proposals give effect to recommendations made by the commission.

I repeat that a number of people felt that they were not being represented. Following their representations, we decided to go ahead with these proposals, even though the people who approached us were really not happy with what we decided. They want even more people, although I do not think that that would work. A compromise decision was made.

Mr SMITH: The Minister said that problems were being experienced in achieving a quorum. I do not believe that increasing numbers is the answer. In fact, it seems to me that a committee of 18 would be fairly unwieldy. Has the Minister considered the possibility of appointing permanent proxies for existing members?

Mr Vaughan: They've got six proxies.

Mr SMITH: Have they?

Mr LESTER: The proxies do not always turn up, either.

Mr Prest: Why don't you replace them?

Mr LESTER: Just how hard does one get? Does one use a fine-tooth comb and sack them all, and replace them with people who will attend? However, a number of members opposite get upset when the Government sacks people.

Clause 8, as read, agreed to.

Clause 9, as read, agreed to.

Clause 10—Amendment of s. 31; Procedure at meetings—

Mr McLEAN (9.31 p.m.): This clause amends section 31, which relates to the number required to form a quorum. The Minister referred to this matter in answering the query raised by the member for Nundah about why the membership was being increased from 14 to 18. I understand that it is necessary to cater for the extension under the Bill. However, I do not understand why the quorum should be reduced from 8 to 6. The Minister's answer on the first point is not in any way satisfactory. If the Minister says that the quorum is to be reduced from 8 to 6 because people do not attend, there can be no justification for his not taking strong action against the members. We are discussing a Bill that affects the livelihood of young people. We have spent the last two hours debating the contents of the Bill, but the Minister has just told us that, because he cannot get members of the committee to attend meetings, he intends to reduce the quorum from 8 to 6. I cannot accept that without further reasons.

Mr LESTER: That is fair enough. To be honest, we have had a problem with this committee, as with many other committees. They are not necessarily committees attached to my department. It should be remembered that many of our union friends are equally unreliable, if not more unreliable than the other members. The whole issue has been discussed. This suggestion was submitted for consideration by Parliament. I will be watching what happens very closely. I have told the members that, if there is no improvement, I will be approaching Parliament with dramatic changes. Either they want to do the job or they do not want to do it. I am giving them one more chance.

Mr McLEAN: Do I take that to mean that if the attendance is down to six over a period, the Minister will change the make-up of the committee?

Mr LESTER: I have a very good mandate from Parliament to do that. All honourable members seem to agree on it. The honourable member for Bulimba might talk to his friends the union members and tell them to pull their socks up. I will tell the employer groups to pull their socks up, and the Government members will all attend. Let us see whether all can work together to improve the situation.

Clause 10, as read, agreed to.

Clause 11, as read, agreed to.

Clause 12—Amendment of s. 37; Composition—

Mr VAUGHAN (9.33 p.m.): I have drawn attention to the fact that the Bill contains provisions that enable the Minister to increase the number of persons on the industry and commerce training and advisory committee. I ask the Minister to consider what he said in his speech, namely, that there are instances in which additional representation may be appropriate. Will the Minister elaborate on the instances so that I may gain some idea of what he has mind? What are the instances in which additional representation may be needed?

Mr LESTER: This clause amends section 37. In general, the membership of the industry and commerce training advisory committee will consist of equal numbers of employer representatives and employee representatives other than the chairman and the TAFE representative. There are instances, however, in which the commission considers that it will be beneficial to have representation from an area not directly represented by employers and employees. In the case of the tourist industry, for example, a representative from the tourist development board could be very useful to help deliberate in that

employment-generating area. That could apply equally to the rural industry, which was mentioned by the member for Condamine.

Clause 12, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 13 to 22, as read, agreed to.

Clause 23—Amendment of s. 72; Inability of employer to provide work for an apprentice—

Mr VAUGHAN (9.35 p.m.): In my speech during the second-reading debate, I referred to the provision in clause 23 that will amend section 72 of the Act, which refers to cancelling the indenture of an apprentice. I feel that perhaps the Minister is amending the wrong subsection of the Act. Section 72, which deals with the inability of an employer to provide work for an apprentice, states—

> "(1) An employer who is unable from any cause to provide work for an apprentice may agree with the Commissioner and the guardian of the apprentice, if any, or the apprentice to arrange a transfer of the apprentice to another employer."

That is fair enough. Then it states—

> "Where the employer and the guardian, if any, or the apprentice cannot reach agreement, the employer or the guardian, if any, or apprentice may apply to the industry and commerce advisory committee concerned to arrange the transfer and execute an assignment of the indenture or to have the indenture cancelled."

That is the point at which I thought it might be more appropriate to suspend the indenture. The Minister said that parents, guardians and apprentices were concerned about indentures being cancelled.

Clause 23 seeks to amend subsection (2) of section 72 of the Act. That subsection states—

> "An employer who from any cause is unable temporarily to provide work to employ fully an apprentice during ordinary working time may apply in writing to the Commissioner for permission. . ."

Then clause 23 seeks to insert the words—

> "to stand down the apprentice or".

The point that I am making is that clause 23 seeks to apply that stand-down provision to the situation in which an employer is unable temporarily to provide work for the apprentice. But subsection (1) of section 72 is the subsection that refers to cancellation. I do not believe that it is appropriate to talk about standing down an apprentice in subsection (2) because it deals only with a temporary situation in which an employer cannot provide work. It is not dealing with the situation in which an employer definitely cannot provide work and the apprentice's indenture has to be cancelled. I ask the Minister to look at that matter.

I think that it would be more appropriate to amend subsection (1) of section 72, which refers to the indenture being cancelled, than subsection (2), which refers to an employer being temporarily unable to provide work for an apprentice.

Mr LESTER: I accept the honourable member's point. I personally do everything I possibly can to ensure that an indenture is not cancelled. I have been involved in a number of such cases, and a resolution has always been reached. I am sure that honourable members on both sides of the Chamber can verify that. However, I shall look at what the honourable member has said. It is fair enough.

Mr PREST: I refer to the stand-down of an apprentice. Because of lack of work and the number of apprentices employed, engineering workshops have stood down half of their apprentices for one week and re-employed them the next week. The apprentices were not entitled to unemployment benefits while they were stood down.

Today, the first thing that young people do when they begin work is enter into a hire purchase agreement to buy a motor car. When they are stood down for a week,

they experience difficulties in making repayments under that hire purchase agreement. Something is wrong when employers are allowed to do that sort of thing.

Mr LESTER: I suppose it is either do that or put them off altogether. That is the cold reality. It is a compromise. I know the shortcomings in it, and I could not agree more. However, it is a position that I am prepared to take up even with Mr Willis, when I meet him next week, because it is common throughout Australia.

Clause 23, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 24 to 42, as read, agreed to.

Bill reported, without amendment.

Third Reading

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

MOTOR VEHICLES SECURITIES 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 provide for the registration of instruments creating security interests in motor vehicles and trailers, to amend the Bills of Sale and Other Instruments Act 1955-1981 in certain particulars and for other purposes."

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) (9.44 p.m.): I move—

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

The Bill will establish a motor vehicles security register to enable the holders of security interests in motor vehicles to record their interests. As a consequence, potential purchasers of motor vehicles will be able to ascertain details of any such interests before entering into a contract to purchase a vehicle.

Provision is therefore made for the registration of instruments evidencing security interests in motor vehicles. A person who is the holder of a security interest in respect of a motor vehicle and which is presently evidenced by an instrument that is registered under the Bills of Sale and Other Instruments Act, will be given an opportunity to make application to the registrar for that instrument to be registered under this Bill.

This provision will come into operation before the other provisions of the Bill, and in the interim the provisions of the Bills of Sale and Other Instruments Act will continue to apply to those instruments. In future, all security interests which relate to a motor vehicle will be registered under this Bill and will not be capable of registration under the Bills of Sale and Other Instruments Act.

The register to be established pursuant to this Bill will contain—

the name of any person who is the holder of a security interest evidenced by an instrument;

the registration number endorsed by the registrar on the instrument;

the date on which that instrument was registered; and

such details of the motor vehicle the subject of the security interest evidenced by the instrument as may be necessary to identify it.

The proposed register therefore adopts an asset-indexed system as opposed to the less desirable name-indexed system that is embodied in the present bills of sale regulation. Upon application in the prescribed form and upon production of an instrument executed in duplicate, the registrar will be required to register the instrument and enter the appropriate particulars in the register.

The Bill incorporates a system of priorities of securities. It also establishes the rule that a purchaser for value in good faith and without notice of a security interest who purchases an interest in a motor vehicle acquires a good title to that motor vehicle free of the security interest.

The circumstances in which a person will be taken to have notice of a security interest will be limited to where—

he has actual knowledge of the existence of that interest;

the instrument that provides evidence of the security interest is registered and the registration has become effective; or

having become aware of the existence or possible existence of a security interest he chooses not to make any inquiry concerning its existence.

A person will be able to obtain verbal advice from the registrar as to whether or not there is an entry in the register in respect of a security interest in a specified motor vehicle. A person will also be able to obtain a certificate of an entry in the register.

Provision is also made which will allow a purchaser of a motor vehicle or a holder of a security interest to be paid compensation should the purchaser suffer any loss as a result of an error in the register.

The proposed motor vehicles securities register offers a solution to the problems which may now arise when a person purchases a vehicle only to have it repossessed or to discover that a debt is still outstanding.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate, on motion of Mr Prest, adjourned.

REAL PROPERTY ACTS 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 Real Property Act 1861-1985, the Real Property Act 1877-1981 and other specified Acts to facilitate the computerisation of the office of the Registrar of Titles, to make other amendments and for related purposes."

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) (9.47 p.m.): I move—

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

The Real Property Act of 1861 was assented to on 7 August 1861 and introduced the Torrens system of land title registration to Queensland. Prior to that time there was no official register of interests in real property in the State. A conveyance of land was accompanied by the transfer of the title deeds, which showed all previous owners of the land after its alienation from the Crown. It was essential for a purchaser to ascertain whether this chain of ownership was complete, as that established his title to the land.

That led to very complex conveyancing procedures. Enormous problems were created by the loss of title deeds. To counter those difficulties it was decided to adopt the Torrens system of public registration of title, which gave proprietors an indefeasible title upon registration of their estates in the Titles Office.

The value of the system has stood the test of time and is acknowledged to be among the world's best. The Titles Office, then as part of the Office of the Registrar General, began the administration of the Real Property Act in January 1862, so that January 1987 will mark the 125th anniversary of the opening of that office in Queensland.

The Real Property Act of 1861, although amended significantly in 1877 and 1952, remains, to a large extent, the same Act as the Queensland Parliament adopted from the prototype of Sir Robert Torrens's South Australian Act. It has served the community well; but, with the volume and complexity of modern-day conveyancing needs, it has become necessary for the Titles Office to computerise its records and procedures in order to give to the people of Queensland the high level of service expected in this age of modern technology.

To that end, plans have been made for the progressive introduction of a computer-based register. In order for the Registrar of Titles to introduce the first stage of the computerisation program, the unregistered dealings system, it is necessary for the Real Property Act to be amended. The purpose of the Bill is to give the registrar authority to introduce this system and to provide the legislative basis for successive systems that will lead to a fully computerised register by 1994.

The Bill provides that the registrar is to maintain a register of all parcels of land under the Act and of all estates and interests in those parcels. The register may be maintained wholly or partly on paper, microfilm or some other medium or in such a device for storing and processing information as the registrar considers appropriate. This will allow the registrar to operate both the existing paper register and the new computer-based system simultaneously during the transitional period before all information is transferred to the computer's data base. The present register book will become part of the new register so that existing rights and interests in real property will be preserved and protected.

The Bill provides also for the repeal of all document forms in the Real Property Acts. Those will be replaced by forms prescribed by regulation that will have a simplified and standardised format essential for the efficient transfer of information to the computerised register.

In addition, the Registrar of Titles will be given the power to license persons to print and sell the prescribed forms. In this way, the registrar will be able to maintain strict control of the quality and style of printed forms lodged in the Titles Office.

Computerisation of the register will end the present time-consuming and labour-intensive procedures associated with manually recording details of dealings in the register book and on the duplicate copy of the certificate of title held by the registered proprietor.

In future, a new certificate of title containing all details currently in the register will issue after every dealing affecting a parcel of land under the Act. That will result in a great reduction in the number of damaged and defaced certificates in circulation.

Because of these changes, it will no longer be appropriate to refer to the "register book" or to "entering memorials" in the register, and the Bill removes all such references from the Real Property Acts. A considerable number of other Acts contain similar references to the Titles Office register, and they are listed, together with appropriate amendments, in the schedule to the Bill.

In addition to the computerisation amendments, the Bill also contains a number of other significant changes to the Real Property Acts. The first of those amendments provides for the microfilming of any part of the register or any instrument held in the Titles Office that the registrar wishes to destroy.

For some years, old documents have been destroyed by the registrar to provide space for newly lodged dealings. Despite all efforts being made to avoid wrongful destruction, a few documents, which have later been required for further dealings, have been inadvertently destroyed. This amendment will ensure that a microfilm record of the contents of a destroyed document is retained in the Titles Office as part of the register.

Provision is made also for the return, at the registrar's discretion, of a suitably perforated cancelled instrument of title to the last registered proprietor. That will enable such a proprietor to obtain from the registrar an old title of particular historical significance.

The second additional amendment validates the registrar's practice of issuing, in the name of a time-share developer, separate certificates of title, each for an undivided tenancy in common, of all time-share interests being offered for sale by that developer. This amendment overcomes a problem that has emerged with a number of large-scale time-share projects that have offered several thousand time-share interests for sale.

The Titles Office has had great difficulty in keeping an accurate record of the number of interests in all the different units in a large time-share building and in issuing titles in respect of all of those interests. To counter those difficulties, the registrar has come to an arrangement under which titles for all the interests in a time-share development are issued to the developer, who then passes the titles to individual purchasers at the time of sale. These purchasers then simply lodge their titles in the Titles Office with their transfer documents. The Bill provides that the registrar has, and always has had, the power to issue titles in this fashion.

The Bill also incorporates a limited number of changes that the Law Reform Commission has approved as part of its continuing review of the Real Property Acts. They include the removal from the Acts of the antiquated expressions "seisin", "demise" and "distrain" and the omission of references to " bills of encumbrance", which are no longer necessary following the broadening of the definition of "mortagage" in the 1985 amendments to the 1861 Act.

The commission also approves of the inclusion in the Bill of a provision that acknowledges the registrar's long-standing practice of not issuing title documents to registered proprietors who are under the age of 18 years. These documents are kept in safe custody by the registrar until the registered minors reach the age of majority.

Finally, the Bill provides for the removal from the Acts of provisions dealing with transfers and charge. The interest secured by these rarely used documents can be adequately secured by mortgage. The Law Reform Commission also approves of that amendment.

These amendments, particularly those dealing with the computerisation of the register, will provide the framework for the efficient and reliable operation of the Titles Office well into the next century. They will guarantee that the great service that the Titles Office has provided to the people of Queensland for almost 125 years will continue and that the office of the registrar will remain at the forefront of technological development in the State.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate, on motion of Mr Prest, adjourned.

BILLS: REMAINING STAGES

Suspension of Standing Orders

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

"That so much of the Standing Orders be suspended as would otherwise prevent the Milk Supply Act Amendment Bill; Queensland Grain Handling Act Amendment

Bill; Superannuation Trust Funds (Protection of Employee Entitlements) Act Amendment Bill and the Criminal Law (Rehabilitation of Offenders) Bill from being taken through their remaining stages at this day's sitting."

Motion agreed to.

MILK SUPPLY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading—Resumption of Debate

Debate resumed from 12 March (see p. 4082) on Mr Turner's motion—

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

Mr KRUGER (Murrumba) (9.57 p.m.): I point out that I do not approve of the principle of moving the suspension of Standing Orders to allow this debate to proceed. Frankly, I was close to dividing the House. However, at this stage honourable members are stuck with it.

I will tell honourable members the difficulties that arise. In December 1985, an amendment to the Milk Supply Act was debated. The Bill was rushed in during the last stages of the sittings in such a way that mistakes were made. I state quite clearly that that will occur again on this occasion.

Once again, the Government is rushing through legislation that ought to have been considered carefully. This practice ought to cease. I make it known that in no way does the Opposition condone the practice. However, as the two pieces of legislation with which I am concerned are fairly simple, I have been able to absorb the intent of them.

I point out that the last time that amendments to this legislation were rushed through the House was in December 1985. A problem arose, and debate on the Bill was left until the last minute because certain people were doing, or a particular person was doing, a deal at the time. That should not have happened. It has been the practice for some time. I will not go into the matter in detail, because I do not want to waste the time of the House. However, in his second-reading speech the Minister said—

> "The Milk Supply Act Amendment Bill 1985 was introduced into the Parliament in December 1985 primarily to provide for the introduction of a system of negotiability of producer market milk entitlements within processor groups."

Prior to the freezing of transferability, the full milk quota entitlement could be sold with the farm. The proposed change that relates to new transferees is that they may now take with them only a litreage that relates to what has been paid for.

The legislation presently before the House protects a privileged group of three—QUF Industries, South Coast Dairy Co-operative Association and Suncoast Dairies Pty Ltd. Take the example of South Coast Dairy Co-operative. As at 30 June 1985, the entitlement was approximately 70 per cent. In that privileged group, individual farms were given quotas, some of which were 85 per cent and some which were 50 per cent of production, which was quota milk. Thus, some farmers were advantaged and some farmers were severely disadvantaged under the quota scheme adopted by the processor.

Previously, the disgruntled supplier of under 50 per cent quota milk could take the average entitlement to 70 per cent. However, under the new provisions, only 50 per cent will now be transferable.

If the processor fails to pay all the quota during the calendar year 1985, the privileged will remain privileged, and the haves-and-have-nots syndrome will continue or become worse. One of the worst features of that scheme is that by failing to pay the full quota, the processor will penalise a farmer who can transfer only his entitlement that reflects the quota for which he was paid. In that way, the individual farmer will be penalised because the processor, either through inefficiency or mismanagement, fails to pay the full quota.

In October 1985, sales recorded for the South Coast Dairy Co-operative represented 102.5 per cent of quota, but the association paid only 97.8 per cent of that quota. By doing that, the processor ensures that the farmer will miss out on the benefit of a quota he could otherwise transfer, merely because of the poor financial position of the factory.

An illustration of that anomaly might help. Based on 100 litres, farmers who receive a quota of 50 per cent are able to transfer a litreage of 70; but under the provisions of the legislation that was brought forward last year, a farmer will be able to take 50 litres or less if the factory has not paid the full quota.

For the information of the House, I shall quote the contents of a document written by someone who is very concerned about the state of the industry. The document reads—

> "The prime consideration of a co-operative must be equitable benefit to all its producers. In many co-operatives (including the S.C.D.) this is not the case.
>
> Volume of through put is to the economic advantage of the processing unit:
>
> In aiming at this efficiency principle, those entrusted with direction and management, commonly and unnecessarily ignore individual producer rights.
>
> They would seem impervious to the injustice they allow flourish, and indeed nourish, to the advantage of the processing unit and a minority of producers.
>
> Some would have us believe the aim of the Milk Entitlements Committee is to strip our co-operative of Market Milk Access. This is not so. The charter of the M.E.C. is:
>
> More Equitable Market Milk Distribution amongst producers, via the processor.
>
> We have not and will not achieve more equitable market milk distribution until justice to the individual producer is reflected by the use of an equitous growth allocation formula within our co-operative. Some would rather advantage themselves further, by acceptance of transfers or new suppliers (so lowering processor entitlement while retaining their inequitous growth advantage.)
>
> I have made repeated appeals, both written and verbal to our co-operative board and management. For too long my proposals and intentions have been subject to misinterpretation, neglect, innuendo and accusations, by some selfish producers, and processing management.
>
> Through personal crisis I was unable to attend those group meetings at which incorrect assertions were made about my proposals. I now take the opportunity of conducting an unbiased meeting, to answer all doubts which may exist about the justice of my proposals.
>
> Central to our co-operative problems is the resent inequitous volume growth formula, assumed by many to be just. Of major importance also, is the 'clout' assumed by our processing unit. The processing unit is the tool of our co-operative. . ."

That was written to producers who sold to the South Coast Dairy Co-operative by a man who will not mind if I mention his name. Mr Dan Dolan wrote to the Minister for Primary Industries (Mr Turner), and I understand that the Minister does not disagree with Mr Dolan's proposal for an equitable distribution. I understand that Pat Rowley commented to the effect that no-one could dispute the fairness of Mr Dolan's suggestion.

I mentioned to Mr Speaker this morning that I wished to have incorporated in *Hansard* a document that was reprinted in *The Australian Dairyfarmer.* I table the report and seek leave to have it incorporated in *Hansard.*

Leave granted.

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

Base cause of overproduction

All our milk allocation systems were designed to encourage volume production.

In the vastly improved technology climate, these systems have led production to outstrip market availability.

In an attempt to streamline vast over-production, we have been offered a choice between;

(a) "Rationalisation by market forces" (meaning no more than economic cannibalism—the individuals of our industry can ill afford the resulting financial stresses nor our country the further unemployment).

or

(b) "Production restraint by entitlement" (seen by some as a legrope rather than a preservative for the industry). To operate this fairly under differing milk allocation systems will be impossible.

Both the above fail to address the real problem of outdated unjust milk allocation systems in the dairy industry.

Aided by bureaucrats and a minority of people whose interest stops at "self", the answer to our problem is neglected.

(Perhaps it is too simple for an educated mind and too fair for a greedy one.)

We must have one system of milk allocation which will encompass the basic rights of stability and just opportunity.

None of our existing systems has achieved—nor ever will—these basic rights in full.

To penalise none and equate opportunity; we must recognise existing market milk access and attribute growth according to a producers' percentage supply over his market milk access;

e.g.

Market milk access	500 litres
Production	1000 litres
Percentage to participate in growth	50 litres

To attribute growth to the individual; we divide the individual excess percentage by the aggregate of the supply group excess percentage, then multiply this by the litres of growth attributed to that supply group.

e.g.

Individual excess percentage	50
Aggregate of supply group excess	2500
Growth attributed to supply group	500 litres
Growth attributed to the individual	10 litres

Ease of calculation influenced my choice of example.

However, I guarantee authenticity of those formulas when applied to the real situation.

Provided allowance payment is made for handling and marketing costs, these formulas can also be used in distributing national growth between supply groups.

If we utilise these formulas, "equitable market milk distribution" will be achieved and "equitable production restraint" can be applied, when necessary.

Mr Pat Rowley commented that no one could dispute the fairness of the suggestion, when it was put to him.

Mr Neil Turner's reply was that he saw no fault in the suggestion and would be prepared to accept it, if the industry so desired.

And here is the stumbling block.

We seem concerned more with personal milk production than organising our industry.

We must balance these as they are both of critical importance.

If we continue to allow minority self interest groups and others to dictate policy, we will remain in the cycle of boom and bust we have all witnessed within the last ten years.

To dispel apathy within our industry will be to the advantage of our country, states, and, most importantly, the vast majority of individuals who constitute the dairy industry.

In summing up, I would like to say this.

It is argued at length between, within and from above states about who is advantaged and who isn't and why not.

There are takeovers, amalgamations, disposals, proposals, comments drawn, given and misconstrued.

Market milk access is what it is about.

However, the real picture of market place viability is distorted by differing volumes of production and the interpretation of this under our differing milk allocation systems.

In arguing a particular case of equity, the real problem is overlooked, i.e. the incompatible mechanics of market milk allocation under our differing milk allocation systems presently in use.

It is as yet not too late to sideline the foolishness and present a sound, viable, equitable plan which does not further disembowel any individual, or section of our dairy industry.

I invite discussion on my suggestion and can be reached on (075) 330126, usually after 7 p.m.

Dan Dolan, "Canberra",
Currumbin Valley, Qld. 4223.

Ed's note: Pat Rowley is president of the Australian Dairy Farmers Federation and Neil Turner is Queensland Minister for Primary Industries.

As I mentioned at the beginning of my speech, the legislation was rushed through the House last December and it was presented in an incorrect form. What really happened was that the wording of clause 7 of the Bill presented in 1985 related to section 36. Section 17 of the original Act was incorrectly referred to, instead of section 36. One could really say that the house is now being put in order. Under this legislation, section 36 will become a workable part of the Act.

I did take up the time of the House to mention other parts of the legislation relative to the negotiability of producer market milk entitlements because I felt that that matter was relevant and certainly worthy of comment. The Minister raised that point in his introductory speech.

We on this side have no opposition to the intent of the Bill. Our only opposition is to the problems caused by rushing legislation through the House. I hope that the Minister's staff, or whoever prepared the legislation, has it right this time. I certainly hope that members do not see a repetition of legislation being rushed through the House and having to be brought back to clear up problems.

Hon. W. D. LICKISS (Mount Coot-tha) (10.5 p.m.): In his second-reading speech, the Minister clearly spelt out the purpose of the Bill, which is to rectify an error in the 1985 legislation. The Liberal Party accepts the Minister's explanation and supports the Bill.

Hon. N. J. TURNER (Warrego—Minister for Primary Industries) (10.6 p.m.), in reply: I thank honourable members for their contributions to the debate. I have explained the reason for this simple procedural Bill, which is simply to rectify an error in the drafting of the previous Bill. The Bill contains no new provisions and there are no changes to the Act. I thank members for their support.

Motion (Mr Turner) agreed to.

Committee

Clauses 1 to 3, as read, agreed to.

Bill reported, without amendment.

Third Reading

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

QUEENSLAND GRAIN HANDLING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading—Resumption of Debate

Debate resumed from 12 March (see p. 4083) on Mr Turner's motion—

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

Mr KRUGER (Murrumba) (10.7 p.m.): Once again, I want to make it clear that I did want to read and study more material on this Bill. However, it does seem to be

quite a reasonable piece of legislation, hence my not dividing the House on the motion to suspend Standing Orders.

Before dealing with the legislation, I must say that the advances since the foundation of the grain-handling authority have been significant. The authority has to handle an enormous amount of bulk grain these days. The grain industry is growing and needs to have facilities available to handle the bulk of material that is produced.

As the Minister pointed out, one of the main sections of the legislation relates to the warehousing facility for the storage of grain for which there is no requirement for delivery to a marketing board. It has to accommodate the warehousing of non-statutory grains such as grain sorghum and oil-seeds in south-east Queensland. The growers of those crops have been involved in the advancement of the industry and the grain-handling authority. Growers need storage facilities while they are waiting to sell their crops. I see nothing wrong with that, provided the statutory boards can meet their requirements. In doing so, the board's suppliers should take precedence over the growers who are not connected with the board.

I am concerned about commodities other than grain being stored and handled in the grain-storage facilities. Little explanation has been given as to what the other commodities will be and whether they could in some way be detrimental to grain-handling. I should like an indication from the Minister of the type of commodities other than grain that he has in mind being handled in the grain facilities.

The Minister spoke of the flexibility that the amendments will provide. Flexibility is essential for the handling of seasonal crops and crops that have to be stored for varying periods. Flexibility may be essential for handling commodities other than grain. I repeat that I am concerned about the other commodities to be stored.

The Minister spoke of several other matters which, basically, seem to be reasonable. I am a little concerned about certain proposals, but I will deal with them in Committee.

The grain-handling authority has made major progress in handling grain and its organisation generally. Most grain-growers, whether they be statutory authority growers or other growers, should be very pleased with what has happened in the past few years. At this stage, I should be very pleased if the Minister would explain the other commodities that may be stored.

Hon. N. E. LEE (Yeronga) (10.12 p.m.): On behalf of the Liberal Party, I am happy to join the debate. Recently, some members of the Liberal Party inspected the Fisherman Islands complex. I could not be present on that occasion, but my colleagues told me how large the complex is and how much money has been spent on it. This Bill is designed to allow the capital investment to be utilised to capacity. I compliment the Minister on having the vision to look ahead. If millions of dollars of capital is invested, it is important that it should earn a return.

The Opposition primary industries spokesman said that he did not know which additional items are to be stored. Perhaps I should sound a note of warning in that context.

The Bill will allow the authority to store grain not sold by or to a board and grain owned by growers who have not found a buyer. That will be excellent for the growers, because the storage of grain in the west or on the Darling Downs presents problems. Grain is often stored in the open air, without cover. Storm rains damage the grain. When wheat with a high moisture content is sent to Brisbane it can change from prime, hard wheat to lower grade wheat. I compliment the Minister for having the foresight to ensure that this capital investment is utilised fully.

Bulk Grains Queensland has spent millions of dollars in developing a deep-water port that can handle ships of up to 60 000 tonnes. They are as large as some of the ships engaged in the coal trade. Because the port will be able to accommodate those large ships, the cost of transporting grain to overseas markets will be reduced. It is a

very competitive market and anything that can be done to reduce transport costs is a very good thing.

It is important that this capital investment be utilised to the fullest between the wheat season, the sorghum season and other grain seasons. The complex will not be idle.

The Bill allows for the storage of other commodities. In fact, it provides for the warehousing of other commodities. I am sure that the Minister, in his reply, will inform the House what he means by "warehousing". I hope he does not mean that commodities will be warehoused in the open spaces at the complex. No doubt he will refer to the types of commodities that will be warehoused in this complex. Before warehousing takes place, the matter has to be referred to the Minister, and that certainly is a safeguard. It is important that this warehousing by the Queensland Grain Handling Authority does not compete with private enterprise near the Fisherman Islands complex, which is already warehousing those commodities. I hope the Minister will answer that question.

The Bill allows the Queensland Grain Handling Authority to build up reserves, and it is good that it can do that. Of course, the Queensland Graingrowers Association built up some reserves and then foolishly entered the difficult futures market and, unfortunately, lost a large amount of growers' money. I hope that the authority will not enter the futures market with the reserves that it is being allowed to build up. To operate in the futures market requires great expertise.

Mr Davis: It is like the races.

Mr LEE: It is worse than that. A punter on a racecourse has a guide to form, but a person does not have that when he enters the futures market.

Mr Davis interjected.

Mr LEE: I know that the honourable member does not know what futures are. A true hedger must have the commodity, not just a piece of paper. That is the difference between a person who punts on the stock exchange and a person who hedges on the futures market.

Mr Davis interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Mr LEE: The honourable member is like one of those galahs that go, "Quark, quark, quark" when they are chased from a feedlot. Unfortunately, he has a more gravelly voice than a galah.

I am sure that the Minister will advise the House that the authority will not engage in trading on the futures market in a big way. These will be reserves, the intention of which is to assist the grain industry during lean periods. I am sure that is what the Minister means.

The Bill excludes from liability action taken in good faith. There is nothing wrong with that. I have no doubt that the Queensland Graingrowers Association used the futures market in good faith. It lost a large sum—it incurred millions of dollars of debt—but it did so in good faith. Surely it is not the intention to provide a let-out by relieving people of responsibility if they do something in good faith.

Mr Borbidge: There are clauses like that in much of the legislation.

Mr LEE: I do not disagree with the clause; but those in authority should not do other than that which they are entitled to do. Perhaps the Queensland Graingrowers Association was entitled to trade on the futures market, but that is an extremely specialised field. I hope those people who are covered by the Bill do not repeat the mistakes of the Queensland Graingrowers Association. Surely that lesson has been learnt. The industry should not burn its fingers again.

I do not disagree with a clause to protect people who do things in good faith.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will address his remarks through the Chair.

Mr LEE: I would be very disappointed if this clause was put in specifically to allow people to escape from their responsibilities. I do not believe that that is the Minister's intention, but it would be a great disappointment to the Queensland grain industry if that were to be the result. I trust that the amendment in the Bill will not permit millions of dollars to be lost, as happened with the Queensland Graingrowers Association.

The Liberal Party welcomes the Bill because it believes that at all times capital should be utilised to its capacity. I am sure that that is the intention of the Bill.

Hon. N. J. TURNER (Warrego—Minister for Primary Industries) (10.23 p.m.), in reply: I thank honourable members for their contributions to the debate. The objects of the Bill are in accord with industry requests. Concern has been expressed by both honourable members about the utilisation of the grain-handling facility when it is not needed for grain. It will not be detrimental in any way to the grain industry. Simply stated, the provision is designed to allow an investment of countless millions of dollars to be possibly put to some other use when grain is not being handled. If there were a fire at the sugar terminal, it might be necessary to load sugar through that facility. There is no ulterior motive. It is simply to allow for that opportunity to be grasped if other commodities may be handled.

In reply to the honourable member for Yeronga (Mr Lee), who has a deep knowledge of the grain industry, I would point out that the warehouse facility is not for the storage of refrigerators and washing machines; it is to allow for the storage of grain. It has no relevance to a warehouse in general.

Trading in futures is not on. The bulk grain authority is solely a handler of grain; it is not a marketer of wheat or any other grain. There is no risk of loss of reserves in futures trading. The reserves will be used by direction of the Minister for the equalisation of costs of handling and that type of thing. There is no trading in futures by Bulk Grains Queensland as such.

As I have indicated to the House, the Bill is actually in line with the recommendations of the industry. I thank honourable members for their contributions.

Motion (Mr Turner) agreed to.

Committee

Mr Randell (Mirani) in the chair; Hon. N. J. Turner (Warrego—Minister for Primary Industries) in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 5, as read, agreed to.

Clause 6—New s. 8A—

Mr KRUGER (10.25 p.m.): Clause 6 inserts a new section 8A, part of which states—

" . . . the person who for the time being holds office as Chairman of the State Wheat Board—

(a) shall be entitled to attend any meeting of the Authority and shall be given a reasonable opportunity to be heard in respect of any business of the Authority;

(b) shall be notified of every meeting or adjourned meeting of the Authority as if he were a member thereof;

(c) shall not be entitled to vote in respect of any business of the Authority and shall not be taken into account for the purpose of determining whether a quorum of the Authority is present;

(d) shall, in respect of his attendance at a meeting of the Authority, be entitled to the same remuneration and expenses as a member of the Authority."

I think I know the reason for the insertion of that provision. At present, the chairman of the Queensland Grain Handling Authority is also chairman of the State Wheat Board. I have read articles that indicate that the current chairman of the authority will not seek re-election to that position. It is common knowledge that the Speaker of this House, the member for Toowoomba South (Mr Warner), has indicated his intention to retire prior to the next State election and that he is to be the new chairman of the Queensland Grain Handling Authority.

Mr Casey: Jobs for the boys.

Mr KRUGER: Yes, jobs for the boys.

The reason for providing the opportunity for the chairman of the State Wheat Board to attend meetings of the authority is that the present chairman of the authority will be able to assist the new chairman in the running of the authority. I believe that the current chairman of the State Wheat Board intends to continue in that capacity.

Mr Casey: He does not have anyone in the House helping him to do his job.

Mr KRUGER: He is sometimes given some indication of what he ought to be doing in the House, but that is another matter.

It seems to me that the clause has been included to allow the current chairman of the State Wheat Board to assist in the running of the Grain Handling Authority, even though he will no longer be the chairman of that authority.

Mr TURNER: When the honourable member speaks about future chairmen of different boards, he must be living in the dream-time. Apparently he has looked into a crystal ball and found out something that neither I nor anybody else knows anything about. After listening to that, I can only assume that today must be 1 April.

Mr Casey: That is because the deal has been done with the Premier, not with you.

Mr TURNER: No deal will ever be done by the honourable member for Mackay in relation to who becomes a member of any board. The Government knows his position.

Mr Kruger: You didn't do too well at that meeting in Canberra on 1 April 1985.

Mr TURNER: Is the honourable member speaking about the sugar industry?

Mr Kruger: You mentioned 1 April. I was just bringing you back to the meeting in Canberra on 1 April 1985. You didn't do too well out of that.

Mr TURNER: Tomorrow I will see how well the sugar industry will do. The State will learn the Federal Government's position on the sugar industry.

I was speaking to the Bill when the honourable member for Mackay made a half-humorous, derogatory remark and the member for Murrumba made a facetious remark in an attempt to cast aspersions on the Speaker of this House. That had nothing to do with the Bill. That did not do the honourable member for Murrumba or the honourable member for Mackay justice.

The clause ensures proper consultation if separate chairmen were appointed to Bulk Grains Queensland and the State Wheat Board. The Government envisages that there would be one chairman. However, the Bill allows for more than one. It will enable proper consultation to take place.

Mr Kruger: Are you saying that the chairman of the Wheat Board would be there to fill the vacuum?

Mr TURNER: As I said earlier, in the event of there being separate chairmen, provision is made for proper consultation to take place. I thought that I made that point quite clear.

Clause 6, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 7 to 15, as read, agreed to.

Bill reported, without amendment.

Third Reading

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

SUPERANNUATION TRUST FUNDS (PROTECTION OF EMPLOYEE ENTITLEMENTS) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading—Resumption of Debate

Debate resumed from 12 March (see p. 4085) on Mr Harper's motion—

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

Mr GOSS (Salisbury) (10.31 p.m.): The legislation was introduced only yesterday. On behalf of the Opposition, the union movement and all Queensland workers, I register strong objection to the indecent haste with which the legislation is being passed through all stages. Members of the Opposition realise that at this time of the night, and at other times during the parliamentary session, they are subject to the tyranny of numbers and to the abuse of those numbers by the Government, so at this stage we are not going to waste time on a division.

The problem with the indecent haste is twofold. Firstly, indecent haste of this type has led on many, many occasions—or, as the Premier and Treasurer (Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen) would say, "on many, many, many, many, many occasions"— to unworkable legislation or defective legislation that necessarily must be amended subsequently. That has happened time and time again with the Minister for Justice and Attorney-General. We saw it with the land sales legislation, with the secondary mortgages market legislation, and with this legislation, which the Minister introduced in October 1984 and, if I recall correctly, had the distinction of ramming through all stages in two and a-quarter hours. If we are dealing with this legislation with indecent haste, to use the terminology of the Criminal Code, the legislation was introduced in October 1984 with grossly indecent haste.

Because of the rush with which legislation is passed, the Government not only produces unworkable or defective legislation but also denies the basic right of the community and interested parties to read the legislation, to participate in any meaningful way in the debate and to comment on the legislation.

When the Minister replies, I would like him to tell me who has been consulted about this legislation. Has the Minister consulted any unions or union representatives? Has he consulted with any representatives of the insurance industry? If he has, with which representatives has he consulted? Has the Minister consulted with any reasonable cross-section of interested parties, or has he consulted only with the usual rag-bag of mates from the Queensland Confederation of Industry?

Today, I spoke to some people from the union movement and initiated one contact with a member of the insurance industry who is well placed to hear about such matters. He has certainly not heard about any consultation with the industry. If that is wrong, the Minister will undoubtedly tell honourable members about the reasonable cross-section of the community with whom he has consultation on this important legislation.

It is important legislation because of the number of people it affects and the amount of money involved. It is more important to have consultation when legislation will be rushed through with indecent haste. What is the reason for the rush? Perhaps the Minister would like to tell honourable members the reason why the legislation is being rushed through. Is the real reason that the Premier and Treasurer wants to close down this place as quickly as possible—as early as next Tuesday—because he is afraid of the way in which matters are developing here, particularly because of the millstone that is

represented by the Minister for Tourism, National Parks, Sport and The Arts (Mr McKechnie) and the various other scandals that seem set to burst forth upon the Queensland Government, and have been doing so for some considerable time, not to mention the gaggle of members on the back benches who seem to have trouble choosing between the many and varied factions that now seem to operate?

Mr Lingard interjected.

Mr GOSS: The honourable member for Fassifern, who is interjecting so loudly, might like to tell honourable members whether he is a member of the Sparkes faction or a member of the Hinze and Ahern faction, which undermined the Premier and the Minister for Tourism, National Parks, Sport and The Arts. Perhaps the honourable member for Fassifern does not want to state his position because he still believes that he can become the Minister for Education. That would indeed be a sad day for Queensland.

Mr Hamill interjected.

Mr GOSS: Yes, I would be happy to meet the honourable member for Fassifern in Logan, if he is prepared to do so.

I will return to the Bill. Once again, legislation is being rushed through the House in 24 hours, with no adequate reason having been given for it. Opposition members look forward to the Minister's reply.

Why cannot an opportunity be afforded to unions, the representative organisations of the workers, to respond and comment on the legislation? The legislation purports to protect the workers of Queensland. However, those workers have no opportunity or right to be consulted.

I suppose, with hindsight, somewhat naively, not realising, of course, that when the Minister introduced the legislation yesterday it was intended to rush it through tonight, I wrote to a number of union secretaries enclosing copies of the legislation so that they would have an opportunity to comment. It may have been that that decision was made some time today. If so, why?

Why is it that, time and time again, legislation is rushed through this House? It was as a result of the legislation being rushed through in October 1984 that the Government produced defective legislation. It is too rigid. Now it has to be loosened up in a number of respects so that it might work. The Government has not done the job properly and now, a year and a half later, it must be corrected.

I have mentioned consultation with the unions. The Opposition believes that that is absolutely essential to create workable legislation that truly responds to the needs and aspirations of working people. It is because the Government failed to consult on the last occasion that it failed to produce workable legislation. "Failed" is the operative word. The Minister and the Government have failed yet again in carrying out the most important function of government, that is to legislate.

As legislators, Government members have yet again proved themselves to be failures. This legislation is not an isolated instance. As I have said, it has occurred time and time again. I cite the examples of the Land Sales Act and the Mortgages (Secondary Market) Act and so on. It appears that the Minister and the Government have not learnt the lessons of the past.

The Government's failure to consult and its dubious motives—to which I will refer later—behind introducing the original legislation puts the lie to its professed claim to be acting in the interests of workers and protecting their interests. If the Government were sincere in that belief, if it held any shred of truth, consultation would have taken place. An opportunity would have been provided for all to reflect on these important changes to this important legislation.

At the same time as the Government professes to be acting in the interests of workers, it professes to be a non-interventionist free enterprise Government. This section of the market-place is quite competitive and well capable of responding to and serving

the interests of participating workers without this sort of intervention, which has been roundly condemned by people in the industry who certainly would not traditionally be on the Opposition's side of the political fence.

I turn briefly to the history of this legislation and the history of the struggle to gain reasonable superannuation benefits for the average working person.

The present superannuation drive has its origins in the statement of accord on economic policy determined between the Australian Labor Party and the Australian Council of Trade Unions, based on the wage-fixing principles laid down by the Australian Conciliation and Arbitration Commission in the 1983 National Wage Case. Those wage-fixing principles provided for full half-yearly indexation of wages to be joined to movements in the Consumer Price Index in exchange for a commitment on the part of unions to the effect that no additional claims would be made.

In its 1983 decision, the commission stated—

> "The Principles have been formulated on the basis that the great bulk of wage and salary movements will emanate from national adjustments. These adjustments may come from two sources—C.P.I. movements and national productivity."

In regard to increases in wages that arise from productivity increases, Principle 3 of the 1983 wage-fixation principles stated—

> "Upon application and not before 1985, the Commission will consider whether an increase in wages and salaries or changes in conditions of employment should be awarded on account of productivity."

Prompted by the depreciation of the Australian dollar, the prices and incomes accord was renegotiated in late 1985. On 4 September 1985, the Federal Treasurer (Mr Keating) and the Minister for Employment and Industrial Relations and Minister Assisting the Prime Minister for Public Service Industrial Matters (Mr Willis) issued a joint statement that detailed an agreement reached between the Federal Government and the ACTU. Briefly, the agreement provided for a two percentage-point discounting of award wage increases due in April/May 1986, to take account of the increase in CPI that resulted from the depreciation of the Australian dollar, and to compensate wage-earners for the reduction in their standard of living, personal income tax was to be reduced by an amount equal to an increase in take-home pay that was the equivalent of 2 per cent. Those cuts will apply from September 1986. However, the agreement provided also that the 4 per cent productivity increase claimed by the ACTU, and later before the commission, should result in a 3 per cent increase to be taken in the form of new or improved occupational superannuation.

As all honourable members know, one of the controversies that surround the proposed superannuation scheme concerned a view held by some people that union control of superannuation funds would create the possibility of changing the balance of political, economic and industrial relations power in favour of trade unions. However, clear standards had been laid down by the Federal Government, including safeguard elements that were designed to protect against the possibility of funds being misused.

Mr Borbidge interjected.

Mr GOSS: I will provide the honourable member for Surfers Paradise with a short explanation of some of the safeguards so that he may be reassured. Firstly, in relation to supervision, the Government specified an appropriate mechanism for establishing cost-effective, non-duplicative supervision of funds that would ensure that the security of the funds was maintained and that all revelant standards and guide-lines were complied with. In-house asset restrictions were put in place to provide security of benefits and would continue to apply, with consideration being given to the establishment of a general limit—a figure of 5 per cent was one that was mentioned—relative to the extent to which any superannuation fund may invest in a company or an asset other than public securities or bona fide pooled funds.

Trustees of a fund would not be permitted to provide loans to members outside of the existing arrangements. In addition, trustees would be precluded from charging the assets of a fund, except to obtain temporary finance for the fund. Further, supervisory controls would require that fund assets be directed only towards bona fide earning purposes. To that end, all investments in a fund would need to be at arm's length. Funds will not be used to provide support for unions in undertaking industrial campaigns or form part of strike funds, etcetera. Further, funds would also be required to be audited annually by an auditor. Actuarial reports would have to be furnished at regular intervals if they are to be of the defined benefit type. Other information that would be required by a supervisory authority would also have to be provided, and prescribed information would have to be made available to members. Those requirements will apply to all funds, whenever established; the timing of their implementation is subject to further consideration in the light of ongoing discussions with employers, unions, insurers and those involved in the superannuation industry.

Substantive arguments in favour of the proposed superannuation arrangements exist, and I will list some of them. Firstly, this measure will increase the retirement living standards of wage and salary earners. Secondly, the extension of superannuation to the approximately 50 to 60 per cent of the work-force that does not have the benefit of superannuation will ensure that all Australians will be able to enjoy a satisfactory standard of living upon retirement. Thirdly, with the ageing of the population, the extension and improvement of superannuation will reduce pressure on the tax-payer to finance retirement. Fourthly, the payment of the 3 per cent productivity increase in the form of superannuation improvements rather than increased pay will augment the supply of funds available to the economy for investment purposes and reduce the need for overseas borrowing. Fifthly, the payment of the productivity increase in the form of superannuation will further preserve the accord and, in that sense, provides the most important justification for its existence.

In the period that the accord has been in operation the level of industrial disputation has fallen and there has been a moderation in wage demands, an increase in Australia's economic growth, a fall in the rate of inflation, an increase in the rate of employment growth, a fall in the rate of unemployment and an increase in the private share of national income. I would add, as a postscript, particularly relative to the field of employment and unemployment, that Queensland continues to be about 1 per cent above the national average when it comes to unemployment and continues to lead the country in terms of being the worst State to provide for employment for its working people, and particularly for its youth.

Turning from the history of the actual fight for superannuation benefits, I want to refer briefly to the history of this legislation and that fairly sorry day—24 October 1984—when the Liberal Party joined with the Government to suspend Standing Orders to have this important legislation rammed through in just two and three-quarter hours.

Mr Comben: And Mr Miller.

Mr GOSS: And Mr Miller, the so-called Independent Liberal National. As I said, the legislation was rammed through all stages in two and three-quarter hours.

Mr Harper: You didn't oppose the procedure.

Mr GOSS: I have already registered our strong objections, and I have stated quite clearly what they are and the reason why we did not take the fairly futile step at that stage of dividing the House.

As the Minister seems keen on interjecting, I invite his interjection as to the reason why this legislation must be rushed through in 24 hours. He is suddenly silent when it comes to interjecting in that regard.

Mr Harper: The Opposition did not seek to do anything about the suspension of Standing Orders. Are you saying that you don't divide the House if you realise you haven't got the numbers?

Mr GOSS: It is a matter for consideration in each case. I do not agree with what the Government is doing tonight. When the Minister telephoned me before lunch, I indicated that there was no agreement. What the Government has done is contrary to Standing Orders, as the Minister well knows. The Government has suspended Standing Orders, yet no reason has been given for rushing this legislation through within 24 hours. Yet again, I invite the Minister to interject with a very good reason why he pushes this legislation through with such indecent haste.

Mr Harper: A very sound reason; it is a decision of the Government.

Mr GOSS: That is not a substantial reason, of course. To say that it is a decision of the Government is exactly the same kind of argument that the Government demonstrated relative of Lindeman Island; exactly the kind of arrogance with which it disagreed and brushed aside public outrage and concern over the——

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Randell): Order! I suggest that the honourable member get back to the subject-matter of the Bill.

Mr GOSS: I am responding to the Minister's interjection by saying, relative to the superannuation legislation now being debated, that if the sole reason that the Minister can advance is that it is a decision of the Government, the Government is displaying arrogance in the same way that its arrogance has been manifested relative to those other issues that I mentioned—Lindeman Island, the Arts Department scandal involving the misuse of public funds and so on.

Relative to the effects of superannuation and such schemes, I have mentioned some of the benefits and some of the very good reasons why working people and their union organisations should be successful in obtaining such benefits.

I quote briefly from page 1674 of *Hansard* where the Minister, commenting on such schemes, said—

> "Nevertheless, trade unions, as representatives of employees, are continuing pressure for the extension of superannuation entitlements.
>
> In general, superannuation schemes are a useful adjunct to employee/emloyer relationships, for they encourage a greater stability in the work-force and thus more harmonious industrial relations. They also provide a mechanism whereby capital can be accumulated and invested, thus aiding the general economic well-being of the community."

It is hard to disagree with that; but it is easy to disagree with the motives that prompted that legislation, which was not truly in the interests of protecting working people. It was more related to the desire by the Government to provoke an industrial dispute in the period leading up to the Federal election.

Mr Harper: How can you claim that?

Mr GOSS: Because the Government's intentions were quite transparent at that time. It was widely agreed by all knowledgeable and independent commentators that that is really what the Government was up to. I will now quote from page 1 679 of *Hansard* of 24 October 1984. The Opposition spokesman, the honourable member for Wolston, said—

> "This is a provocative and deliberate attempt by the Government to create industrial unrest in Queensland . . . the Opposition will stand by and support the rights that the building workers in this State and in Australia have and will have in the future under the superannuation scheme that they have established.
>
> The Government has a deplorable record not only in industrial relations but also in its dealings with the Building Workers Industrial Union and the building industry."

I whole-heartedly agree with what the honourable member said.

Mr Harper: I challenge you to tell the House how many hours were lost by that legislation?

Mr GOSS: It was very fortunate that the Government's motives were so transparent that the building unions decided to sit down and find a way round them, thereby defeating the thrust and purpose of the legislation.

Mr Harper: Where did they sit down?

Mr GOSS: They sat down and worked it out with their advisers. They then approached the relevant Government department and got what they wanted. They were in that position because of the long struggle by the building industry unions to obtain benefits for their workers. For many years, the coalition Government, particularly the National Party section of it, had frustrated building workers in their attempts to obtain portability of long service leave, a benefit that existed in other States. The National Party section of the then coalition Government repeatedly frustrated the rights and aspirations of the building workers to obtain portability of long service leave.

When an opportunity arose to have the superannuation scheme off and running, the unions took it and decided not to be side-tracked by the provocation offered. I extend my congratulations to Mr Hughie Hamilton and the other people who were involved in the strategy and decision to thwart the provocation offered by the Government in the period leading up to the 1984 general election.

Mr Comben: When Hughie Hamilton sat down with the Minister at the press conference, he said that he signed it under duress.

Mr GOSS: There it is. It is on the record. It cannot be argued against.

I now intend to quote further from the speech made by the honourable member for Wolston. Page 1 680 of *Hansard* reads as follows—

> "The trade union movement and the Australian Labor Party make no apologies for seeking an extension of superannuation entitlements to any employee. I certainly make no apology for the attitude that the Federal Government adopts towards imposing taxation on lump-sum superannuation payments. I entirely support that attitude. The whole intention of superannuation is to take some of the weight off the shoulders of Governments that have to contribute ever-increasing amounts for what is becoming an aged community in Australia. It was never intended that superannuation schemes should provide lump-sum payments.
>
> . . .
>
> As I have stated, this Government is jackbooting over the democratic rights of the people and over the bastions of the free enterprise system, including some of the biggest insurance companies in this State. The Government supposedly supports those groups. Those people will also be affected on a Commonwealth basis and I hope that they are well aware of that fact."

That reveals, yet again, the yawning gap between the rhetoric and the performance of the Government, particularly when it claims to be a free enterprise, non-interventionist Government.

The last quote I wish to read into the record is taken again from the speech made by the member for Wolston, who said—

> "I point out that the company that is handling the investment fund—this superannuation scheme—is none other than Colonial Mutual, which is one of the most respected business names in Australia. It has earned that respect from the way it has handled its business affairs not only with this Government but also with all Governments in Australia, and the way it has invested moneys in this State."

At least it is investing money in this State, not in Turkey.

Some of the Bill's provisions are clearly machinery or administrative, to which there can be no objection.

As I said at the outset, quite insufficient time has been allowed to consider this legislation. I sincerely hope that, in the limited time that I have had to consider it and from the discussions that I have had with a couple of people, I have not missed important matters or the type of drafting errors that tend to occur when legislation is pushed through at the rate that it is.

I refer to the provision that deals with the right of the registrar to refuse to approve a trust deed where the investment does not meet with his approval. When the Minister responds, I ask him to clarify for honourable members the precise reason for that provision. I understand that it might well be the subject of a challenge down the line, anyway. I really do not understand the need for that provision.

I query what the Minister or registrar will require in the particularity of investments as they are set out in the trust deed. I would have thought that the investments specified in the trust deed would be described in fairly broad terms. Perhaps the Minister can inform us of the precision that will be required in describing those investments, what type of investments will be approved and, indeed, what type of investments will be disapproved. There should be something on the record so that people intending to apply or to submit deeds will know where they are going and how to order their affairs.

It seems to me quite obvious, as a matter of common sense, that the relevant insurance company and unions will be seeking from the market-place the best possible deal combined with appropriate security. They will be operating on the best professional advice. Why is this provision necessary? The Minister may have a reason for including the provision, but it was not specified in his second-reading speech, so we do not know. I invite the Minister, in his response, to tell us why the provision is necessary, what sort of precision he requires in describing investments, what type of investments will be approved and what type of investments will be disapproved.

The next clause of the Bill to which I refer deals with the circumstances under which the registrar may withdraw approval of a trust deed by notice in writing given to the trustees of the scheme. Four separate provisions are set out that would trigger that right of the registrar to withdraw approval.

Firstly, he may withdraw approval if the scheme is being managed other than in accordance with the trust deed, imprudently or improperly. I would like those terms clarified. They seem to be broad and vague. Secondly, the registrar may withdraw approval if, in respect of the superannuation scheme or the trust deed that provides for it, any provision of the Act is not satisfied. Thirdly, he may withdraw approval if the trustees have wilfully failed to comply with a requisition. Fourthly, he may withdraw approval if the trustees have obstructed or hindered the proper discharge of any function or the proper exercise of any power under the Act.

I would like an indication from the Minister that the notice given under that section of the Act will specify the provision under which it is given and, further, that it will set out the circumstances under which the provision has been brought into play.

It seems fair to say that this provision is, once again, a direct interference in the market-place and in the free enterprise operation of the superannuation industry, and is one that is unnecessary because of the nature of the industry and the obvious necessity and duty on the part of unions to go elsewhere, to start asking questions themselves and to take the necessary action should there be any untoward activity or mismanagement of their scheme. It is obviously in the interests of their members to ensure that the scheme be managed properly in all respects. They would act not just in the interests of their own members but because of their accountability to their own members to ensure that the situation in which the registrar's approval was withdrawn would never arise.

For example, in the building unions' case, the management and expert advice would come back to a company such as Colonial Mutual. Why is this mechanism necessary, and will the registrar specify in detail the particular subsection under which he takes action, and the grounds?

A new provision in the legislation will allow the registrar to examine trust deeds.

I do not know whether that is strictly necessary, but at first glance it seems a commonsense provision that will facilitate the approval of deeds. It should benefit all concerned.

The next provision relates to the circumstances under which the Minister can grant exemption from the regulation section of the legislation. The Opposition has no objection to that. Can the Minister indicate to the House, because he has not done so in his second-reading speech, on what grounds or on what criteria a scheme will be exempted or not exempted? How is that to operate? Consideration must already have been given to this. The Minister should be in a position to inform the House on that.

Mr Harper: It was in discussions with union officials.

Mr GOSS: I beg the Minister's pardon?

Mr Harper: That clause was introduced as a result of discussions, particularly with union officials.

Mr GOSS: I am referring to the provision that will allow an exemption of a particular scheme. In discussing that provision with the unions, did the Minister also discuss with the same unions the other provisions of the legislation? I invite the Minister's interjection again. The Minister indicates "No" by shaking his head. He indicated by shaking his head from side to side that he did not, and I would be interested to know why.

Mr Harper: No. What I have indicated is that the people with whom I had discussions is my business and my responsibility. Some of those discussions were in confidence, and I do not intend to breach that confidence.

Mr GOSS: I did not ask the Minister to indicate who they were. I made no reference to who the people were. What I asked was whether the Minister had discussed with those people, whoever they may be, the other provisions of the Act, and he shook his head from side to side, which I took to mean, "No". I would be curious why that course of action was followed and why there was not consultation, when the Minister has indicated to the House that he had an opportunity to discuss at least this provision with various unions or union representatives—or at least one; I do not know how many—yet apparently he chose not to discuss other sections. That is a significant charge and one that the Minister should answer. I invite him to answer it now, or he may wish to answer it later.

Mr Harper: I have already answered it.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Randell): Order! I suggest that the honourable member continue with his speech. The Minister has ample opportunity later to answer the honourable member.

Mr GOSS: The Minister has chosen to interject on a number of occasions.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I remind the honourable member that I have made a direction. I ask the honourable member to continue debate on the legislation. The Minister will be given an opportunity later to reply. I ask the honourable member to resume his speech.

Mr GOSS: I take it that there is a clear implication that there will be no more interjections from the Minister?

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable member will resume his speech.

Mr GOSS: I see. That is as clear as mud, Mr Deputy Speaker.

The legislation contains a provision for temporary relief to be granted by the Minister in relation to the regulation part of the section. That seems to be a reasonable and practical provision. The Opposition has no objection to that.

The next provision allows an employer to withdraw from the scheme on the expiration of a period of notice of at least three months. Once again, I ask the Minister

when he replies—not now, of course—to indicate why that provision of three months' notice is necessary. It seems to me to be reasonable if the business is winding up, for example; but, apart from that, I do not understand it. Obviously, if the Australian Conciliation and Arbitration Commission makes the 3 per cent productivity increase part of the award, this provision will be irrelevant.

The next clause on which I comment relates to the relaxation of the previous provision that required all three trustees to be resident in Queensland. Honourable members will recall that the Act provides for three trustees, one of whom shall be a representative of the employer, one of whom shall be a representative of the employees, and one who shall be an independent person. As I understand the Bill, the Minister may approve that one or more of the trustees of the superannuation fund may be persons who ordinarily reside outside Queensland. As I recall the Minister's second-reading speech, he said that up to or no more than half of the trustees may reside out of Queensland. I cannot find that passage in the Bill at the moment, so I will address it later. Perhaps the Minister could indicate whether there will be any restrictions, or the criteria to govern whether or not that applies to the employer representative, the employee representative or the independent representative.

The next provision to which I refer, and to which the Opposition will object, is the provision that the Governor in Council, upon the issuing of a withdrawal notice by the registrar under section 12 of the Act, may remove one or more of the trustees of the superannuation scheme and appoint such number of persons to be trustee or trustees of the superannuation scheme as is necessary to replace the person or persons removed from office. That is a dangerous provision. All of the trustees could be removed. Another example is that the representative of the employees could be removed as a trustee and replaced by a nominee of the Government. That would mean that none of the trustees would have the confidence of the workers or would be a representative of the workers. Who would be nominated? I suppose a typical appointment by this Government to fill a trustee position would be some eminent person like Sir Edward Lyons. How appropriate that would be! What sort of difficulties and dissension would that cause among workers in an industry or scheme if their representative was removed and replaced by some hack or lackey appointed by the National Party?

Such action would be quite inappropriate even if the Government took the unusual step of appointing to such an office somebody who was not a hack or lackey of the National Party. It would still be possible that the person would be quite unsuitable and not have the confidence of the workers involved in that industry or scheme. They are entitled to have trustees who represent them, just as employers are entitled to have a trustee who represents them. Both groups are further entitled to a trustee who is truly independent. I think it is high time that the Government slowed down on unnecessary intervention in the market-place and on unnecessary intervention in such schemes.

Therefore, what I suggest is that if it became imperative to remove one or more of the trustees, the Government, through the Governor in Council, should appoint somebody to that position only temporarily so that fresh trustees could be nominated to fill the respective categories, whether the nominee needs to be a representative of employers or employees or be an independent person. I am sure that all reasonable people would agree with such a provision.

They are the main provisions of the Bill on which I want to comment. The other provisions are largely mechanical or administrative and the Opposition has no particular objection to them. I stress that my comments have been made on the basis of having only a very short period in which to consider the legislation and only a very limited opportunity to consult one or two people on what the Government seeks to do.

I repeat the warning of the Oppositon that rushing legislation of this type through in such a short space of time with quite inadequate consultation risks simply having to come back next year and fix it again. In the meantime, people who are involved in the industry and people who would be interested parties, whether they be employers, employees or whatever, risk prejudice to the conduct of their affairs in the same way as

other people have been prejudiced by the failure of legislation to operate efficiently in other areas. I have referred already to the Land Sales Act and other pieces of legislation.

Mr BORBIDGE (Surfers Paradise) (11.9 p.m.): In supporting the legislation, I cannot help but remark in passing on the act of outrage by the honourable member for Salisbury about how the Queensland Government is again pushing legislation through the House without due or proper debate. It is interesting that honourable members opposite seem to be very eager to forget what their comrades in other Parliaments round Australia, including the Federal Parliament, do on a very regular basis. I remind the honourable member for Salisbury that, on the last day of sitting of the New South Wales Parliament last year, 37 Bills were put through the Legislative Assembly.

Mr Simpson: They didn't even read some of them.

Mr BORBIDGE: As the honourable member for Cooroora said, Ministers tabled second-reading speeches. Legislation was passed through the New South Wales Parliament about which members knew nothing.

Mr Scott: What has this got to do with the Bill?

Mr BORBIDGE: It has a lot to do with the Bill. It shows the hypocrisy of honourable members opposite.

Mr Simpson: Deceit.

Mr BORBIDGE: As my friend the honourable member for Coroora said, deceit.

I can only say that the honourable member for Salisbury and his colleagues on the opposite side of the Chamber have been proved wrong again. They will continue to be proved wrong whilst they continue to demonstrate blatant hypocrisy inside and outside this Chamber.

Mr Davis interjected.

Mr BORBIDGE: The Opposition Whip can get as excited as he likes; Government members do not take very much notice of him.

Mr McPhie: We can't even understand what he says.

Mr BORBIDGE: As my friend the honourable member for Toowoomba North said, sometimes Government members have trouble understanding what the Opposition Whip says.

The legislation is a further commitment——

Mr Davis interjected.

Mr BORBIDGE: Mr Deputy Speaker, if the raving idiot to my right would contain himself, I might be able to make a contribution to the debate.

The legislation is a further commitment by the Queensland Government to ensure that adequate protection is given to Queensland employees and employers relative to superannuation. As the Minister indicated in his second-reading speech, the Bill seeks to facilitate the efficient operation of the Act and enhance the protection afforded to all concerned. The legislation will make the Act more effective and more efficient. The Bill warrants and deserves the unanimous support of this Assembly.

Mr Simpson: It protects the workers. Their highly paid union-leaders have no respect for the workers.

Mr BORBIDGE: As the honourable member for Cooroora says, the legislation protects the workers of this State.

In his second-reading speech, the Minister indicated that the legislation is in stark contrast to the superannuation policies of the ACTU and the Australian Labor Party,

which the honourable member for Salisbury (Mr Goss) tried to justify a few moments ago.

The national debate on the so-called superannuation issue should concern all thinking Australians. I do not include the Opposition Whip in that category. The Federal Government, in coalition with the trade union movement, is attempting to bring about the de facto socialisation of Australia by creating a monopoly of political and financial power in the hands of the union movement and the ALP. That is what Labor's superannuation scheme is all about. It is designed to make the employers of this country pay for a massive, politically sponsored corporate monster to compete against them and, ultimately, to consume them.

The Federal Government/ACTU campaign, which is backed and supported by honourable members opposite, is the greatest financial take-over attempt in Australian history. It makes the Holmes a Court bid for BHP pale into insignificance. The final objective is to compete with and destroy private enterprise in Australia.

Mr Scott interjected.

Mr BORBIDGE: I will produce evidence from the political party of the honourable member for Cook. It is appropriate for me to read from a paper delivered to the 1981 ALP Special National Conference. I recommend that honourable members opposite listen to this. That paper states, in part—

> "What we must recognise at this early stage of Union involvement in the Superannuation issue is that control over the funds will provide Unions and Governments with considerable financial leverage. That leverage can be used to advance the cause of socialism in Australia."

That statement was contained in a paper delivered to the 1981 ALP Special National Conference.

Under the Federal Government proposal, at least 3 million Australian employees will be forced into union-controlled superannuation funds. By way of management payments and trustee fees levied upon its funds, the union movement will collect somewhere between $44m and $156m per annum.

Historically, most private company superannuation funds have received these services free of charge. Already, there are indications that the real aim of the trade union movement is to increase the 3 per cent rate to 15 per cent of wages. Management and trustee fees——

Mr Davis interjected.

Mr BORBIDGE: The honourable member for Brisbane Central is a bit touchy on this issue. Perhaps members of the Labor Party do not like Government members canvassing what that party is up to.

Mr Davis interjected.

Mr BORBIDGE: The honourable member for Brisbane Central, who is getting so excited, will be caught out, and caught out badly.

Management and trustee fees on that 15 per cent will give the union movement and, indirectly, the political wing of the Australian Labor Party, between $220m and $780m annually.

Their combined financial, industrial and political muscle will ensure that the trade union movement controls the Australian economy and the political system of this nation in a sinster and devious manner financed by employers—not by employees, not by trade union members, not by workers, not by Labor Party members of Parliament or Labor Party supporters, but by the employers of Australia.

This country has already reached the parlous position in which a majority of Australians are either employed by Governments or are in receipt of welfare payments.

Over the past decade, the number of people dependent upon welfare payments in Australia has increased from 1 788 000 to 3 350 000, an increase of 87 per cent. Over the last 10 years, the cost of welfare has increased from $3.7 billion to $17.8 billion.

In Australia, the stage has now been reached at which there are more tax-consumers than tax-payers, and these tax-consumers are predominantly constituents of members of the Labor Party.

Honourable members opposite talk about the productivity claim. I will deal with a few matters that ought to be taken into consideration.

Mr Comben: You are a tax-consumer.

Mr BORBIDGE: I suggest to the honourable member for Windsor that he contain himself; he might just manage to learn something.

Taking the period since 1981, a number of factors can be listed that should be deducted from any productivity increase attributable to labour. I ask honourable members to take note. The extent to which average weekly wages have exceeded the Consumer Price Index should be considered. The effects of the shorter working week—the 38-hour week—should be regarded as an employer contribution towards productivity gains. The massive wage explosion that occurred in 1982-83 in many industries should also be taken into account.

Since 1981, the Australian Conciliation and Arbitration Commission has awarded the unions redundancy payments, which should also be deducted. The cost to employers of job protection legislation, in cases in which that legislation has been enacted by State Labor Governments, should also be taken into account. The burden of pay-roll tax and the costs involved with workers' compensation should also be considered although it would be well known to all honourable members that, in Queensland, those costs are considerably lower than elsewhere.

Recent fringe benefits taxation should be considered as another increased cost brought about by a Labor Government, which should be legitimately offset against productivity. A claim that a 3 per cent productivity case exists is a major confidence trick that is being perpetrated on the Australian people. The simple fact of the matter is that Australia is extremely uncompetitive in the world market-place. Government members realise that, and I would hope that fair-minded members of the Opposition would accept that proposition. It is ironic that 3 per cent contributions will not provide any meaningful retirement benefit for Australian workers. In fact, the benefit at that level of contribution would be less than the age pension in the long term.

The superannuation objectives of the Australian Labor Party and the trade union movement amount to the greatest single threat in the history of Australia to private enterprise, small business and those who are self-employed. They represent nothing more than a greedy grab for power—political power, industrial power and economic power. It is about time that the people in this country—in particular some of the ignorant members of the Opposition—acknowledged that, over the past five years, the increase in the average weekly wage has been 20 per cent ahead of the cost of living increases as measured by the CPI.

Mr Davis interjected.

Mr BORBIDGE: I take the point made by the Opposition Whip, the honourable member for Brisbane Central (Mr Davis). I have worked. Moreover, unlike most of the members of the Opposition, I have employed people. If members of the Opposition employed people, they would see the other side of the coin and, as a result, the Australian Labor Party would adopt a far more responsible attitude than it has demonstrated today. For the benefit of the Opposition Whip, I will repeat those figures. Over the past five years, the increase in the average weekly wage has been 20 per cent ahead of the cost of living increase as measured by the CPI. The alleged growth in the Australian economy is the result of big deficits, big spending and big Government.

The growth figures are fraudulent and phoney. They are financed by a huge overseas deficit and by massive Federal Government expenditure—all of the things that are associated with policies supported by people such as the honourable member for Brisbane Central.

I welcome the assurance given by the Minister that the Queensland Government will not stand by idly while the trade union movement and some political hacks attempt to take over not only the role of Government but also the economy that operates in Australia.

I support the legislation that is presently before the House. I trust that the Queensland Government will continue to implement the legislation necessary to ensure that superannuation schemes that are financed by many are not manipulated by the few.

Hon. Sir WILLIAM KNOX (Nundah) (11.23 p.m.): The Liberal Party supports the Bill.

Mr Davis: Why?

Sir WILLIAM KNOX: Because it sets out to protect both employers and employees in schemes that can be seen to be emerging.

Mr Davis: The Confederation of Australian Industry will not like it.

Sir WILLIAM KNOX: The Confederation of Australian Industry is intending to challenge in the High Court of Australia the productivity claim that is the basis of the ACTU application for an increase. It intends to do so because the Australian Conciliation and Arbitration Commission is not an appropriate body to be dabbling in superannuation schemes. To anybody who looks closely at a scheme under which funds are provided by the employers, without contributions being expected from employees—a scheme under which there are golden handshakes galore at the end of the line—it would be obvious that it is simply a postponed wage increase. It is all very well for the member for Salisbury to talk about the accord; this is a device to get round the accord.

What the ACTU is proposing is not a superannuation scheme at all; yet it is able to travel under the guise of one because it uses the structure, the financial arrangements and the managerial skills of people who are involved in that sort of business. We in the Liberal Party do not have any objection to, and if fact encourage, occupational superannuation. Many tens of thousands of Australians at all wage and salary levels enjoy the benefits of belonging to superannuation schemes of various sizes. Some are not as advantageous as others. They vary enormously. However, when one measures the benefits of the ACTU superannuation scheme against the benefits of existing schemes, one realises that anybody who joins the ACTU scheme of his own free will is doing himself and his family a grave disservice.

Mr Comben: How's that?

Sir WILLIAM KNOX: All the actuarial figures have been published. Employees who join the ACTU scheme do not know what it is all about.

Mr Comben interjected.

Sir WILLIAM KNOX: I am not saying that; I am just making an observation about the ACTU scheme. Hundreds of schemes are available in the community, all having varying benefits depending on the amounts of contribution.

Mr Comben interjected.

Sir WILLIAM KNOX: The ACTU scheme is all right if those in it know what it is. However, if people want a better scheme, there are better ones available than the ACTU scheme. The plumbers' scheme in Queensland is certainly better that the ACTU scheme.

A challenge will be made to the jurisdiction of the Arbitration Commission to hear the productivity claim. I hope that that challenge proves successful, because it seems to me that the arbitration tribunal should not be used for the purpose for which the ACTU is seeking to use it.

The essential part of this legislation is that which seeks to protect both the employers and employees in any schemes registered in this State. The registration of superannuation trust deeds is an excellent move.

Trade unions are forcing their attentions on employers. The Prime Minister stated that the trade unions will not be allowed to coerce employers; yet direct pressure has been applied to employers, particularly those in the transport and building industries, to join the ACTU scheme.

Mr Davis: You're always knocking unions, Bill.

Sir WILLIAM KNOX: I have good reason to knock them in this instance, because the employees are not getting freedom of choice in what is being proposed.

Mr Innes: The employer is not getting freedom of choice, either.

Sir WILLIAM KNOX: The employers certainly are being coerced.

Mr Campbell: A lot of employees have not had freedom of choice, either.

Sir WILLIAM KNOX: The Federal people say that they will publish the guide-lines. Many schemes other than the ACTU scheme will conform to those guide-lines. I know of one that has already been approved by the Federal Treasurer. It is in place—

Mr Davis: And which is that one, Bill?

Sir WILLIAM KNOX: The scheme for all the employees of the Real Estate Institute of Queensland already has the approval of the Federal Treasurer.

There is no reason for employees to be bludgeoned into joining the ACTU scheme, yet union organisers and their henchmen have been trying, very successfully in some cases, to convince employers that their employees should belong to that scheme. They are telling the employees that it is the best scheme available, but that is not true.

What is the scheme all about? The ACTU scheme is all about controlling the investable funds of the nation. It is hoped that more than $4,000m will come under the management of people beholden to the ACTU. Employers will have no say in the distribution or investment of those funds. That is abhorrent to my party, and I take it that it is abhorrent to the National Party. It has nothing to do with benefits for the employees; is all about power. Honourable members have seen that the ACTU has been able to influence the Federal Government's policy to such an extent that the Prime Minister and the Treasurer have to go to the ACTU, cap-in-hand, to get approval of their policies.

Mr Davis interjected.

Sir WILLIAM KNOX: I have seen it. When attending a summit meeting, the Prime Minister sneaked around in the dead of night, through a side door at the Lakeside Hotel, to wait on the executive of the ACTU so that he could caucus on the summit. That is exactly what he did in the dead of night; he deserted the summit.

Some of the members of the ACTU are not even elected by their own members. They are appointed by the executive to sit on the ACTU. They sit on the ACTU as appointees, not as elected representatives. They are not elected by the members of the ACTU, and they are certainly not elected by the people of Australia; yet the Prime Minister of Australia sneaks around to get his travelling instructions from them and to make deals with them.

What did Mr Keating do the day before yesterday? He briefed the ACTU on the policies of the Government. I should say that it was the other way round; it was the ACTU that was briefing Mr Keating on what would be acceptable to the ACTU.

That side of the power base is being looked after very carefully by the ACTU. It now wants financial power. This is a legitimate way in which it could get it. It may be a legitimate way, but it is not a way that I believe is acceptable in our community. There is coercion of employers, and employees do not have a choice.

Mr Davis interjected.

Sir WILLIAM KNOX: The investment of institutions in Australian public companies is of such magnitude that when the names of the largest 20 share-holders in any of the big companies are published, it can be seen that about 18 or 19 of them are the names of institutions.

When the unions are managing at least $4,000m a year, I am sure that they will very quickly wield enormous power in this country. In addition, there is the funny arrangement about a management fee. I am not sure whether it is a commission——

Mr Littleproud: It is the bit off the top.

Sir WILLIAM KNOX: The bit off the top—the $1 a head—goes to the union funds, to be used, no doubt, to provide other than services in managing the funds. I will call it by its correct name: it is the commission that the unions will receive. It will be a substantial source of income for the trade unions that do not deserve it. In any case, it should not belong to them.

That is what this legislation is trying to combat. The employers are fighting in the courts as they should be. Some of them should have been much quicker off the mark than they have been. I trust that they will succeed. The State can legislate only within the limit of its jurisdiction, and this legislation attempts to ensure that employers and employees in Queensland get a fair go.

Mr CLAUSON (Redlands) (11.35 p.m.): Mr Deputy Speaker——

Mr Comben: Clawless Clauson.

Mr CLAUSON: The honourable member will find out.

Honourable Members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Randell): Order! Tonight, I have given both sides of the House very liberal treatment. I want honourable members to settle down and listen to the speeches in comparative silence. I will not warn honourable members again.

Mr CLAUSON: This Bill is a logical extension of the 1984 legislation. As the honourable member for Nundah has stated, it provides further protection for employers and employees.

The Bill contains measures that are designed to protect employers and employees. Also, it empowers the registrar to approve trust deeds to protect the funds that are vested under these arrangements. It is necessary to ensure that funds that are being administered are administered properly. Of course, in any legislation, it is necessary to ensure that that happens. The registrar is able to withdraw his approval by notice in writing to the trustees or to any of them: if the trust is managed improperly, imprudently or otherwise than in accordance with the trust deed; if in respect of the scheme or trust that provides for it any provision of the Act is not satisfied; if the trustees or any of them or any person concerned in the management of the scheme fails to comply with any requisition issued under the Act; or if the trustees or any of them or any person concerned in the conduct of the scheme obstructs or hinders the proper discharge of any function or the proper exercise of any power by any person for the purposes of the Act.

The registrar can examine a trust deed to see whether it complies with the Act and furnish an opinion. The opinion is not to be taken as an approval of the trust deed; it is just a commonsense guide-line for people who may wish to set up a scheme of this nature. It makes common sense that someone might go along and obtain an opinion from the registrar to ensure that the scheme that is being proposed is satisfactory and will operate properly within the law.

The Bill also provides for the constitution of trustees. Once again, that is a commonsense feature. It provides for employer representation, employee representation and independent representation, which can be either individuals or a body corporate, or a combination of each. Of course, the residency qualifications make sense when this type of legislation is being considered. It is common sense for the trustees of a scheme to reside in the State in which they are administering the fund.

The Minister's right to override is quite sensible. As a matter of fact, if there is no contact with a trustee or director outside the State, he could be a bankrupt or a criminal person. Naturally, it is favourable that those guide-lines and safeguards be embodied in legislation.

The legislation will enhance the position. If the trustees administering a fund are unsatisfactory, the Bill will enable the various Government departments to operate the trust satisfactorily, and Stamp Act exemption is provided for any transactions that are necessary as a result. I support the Bill in that regard.

The Bill is in contrast to the hopes of the ALP. The honourable member for Surfers Paradise quoted from the report of the 1981 special national conference of the ALP. It stated—

> ". . . control over the funds will provide unions and Governments with considerable financial leverage. That leverage can be used to advance the cause of socialism in Australia . . ."

At this point, I would like to contrast those aims, which are the backbone of any superannuation scheme that the ALP and the unions cook up between them, with the statement made by the honourable member for Salisbury (Mr Goss) when he was bleating about the accord. What a joke! What morals? What progress for the Australian worker? What gross, self-serving hypocrisy? There is no regard whatever for the individual. The only aim of the ALP and the unions in regard to the superannuation scheme is total fiscal control of Australia.

An Honourable Member interjected.

Mr CLAUSON: Labor's policy is designed to remove the freedom of choice, not to the contrary. The Bill will prevent that type of scandal in this State. The members of the ALP can only see dollar signs. Money means power, and they have realised that. They are the socialist capitalists, if I might call them that. They want the money in their pockets, not in the workers' pockets or the employers' pockets, and that is all there is to it. Imagine the millions of dollars that would be available to the unions and to the ALP, which is dominated by the unions, if their legislation went through.

Mr Davis interjected.

Mr CLAUSON: It would break the country, and you know it well, Mr Davis. That is why you are so touchy about it.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Randell): Order! I ask the honourable member for Redlands to address the Chair. I also ask the honourable member for Brisbane Central not to interject when the interjections are not being accepted.

Mr CLAUSON: The spectre portrayed on this particular proposal of the ALP and the unions is horrendous for this country. The Queensland Government will continue to stem this attempt at socialist elitist policy and will continue to protect its constituents from this engineered robbery.

I support the Bill.

Mr COMBEN (Windsor) (11.42 p.m.): Since the contribution by the honourable member for Salisbury (Mr Goss), honourable members have heard nothing but sound and fury signifying absolutely nothing. The Minister said that Hughie Hamilton accepted the State Government amendments on the earlier occasion and that he went into a superannuation scheme quite happily and endorsed it. The truth is that on 1 December 1984, the *Daily Sun* in Queensland quoted Mr Hamilton as follows—

> "Sitting beside Mr Harper at yesterday's signing ceremony, Mr Hamilton said the State Government has acted disgracefully in enacting the new law in only two hours in Parliament."

He said that his union had agreed to comply with the Government's new law under duress.

The article continued—

> "Mr Hamilton said he would have preferred to have been part of the ACTU scheme.
>
> 'But we're realists and have agreed to comply with the Act that has been passed,' he said.
>
> 'Our rights have been interfered with and the Government is wrong, but we are realists and with the history of this State and government, that's the way we had to go.'
>
> Mr Harper commended the unions for agreeing to accept the form of trust deed required under the new Act."

So much for Mr Harper's saying that Mr Hamilton had agreed to the Act!

It has been seen that this Government is an interventionist Government that is interested only in getting its own way, and is also the lackey of the Queensland Confederation of Industry Limited.

The honourable member for Surfers Paradise (Mr Borbidge) quoted all sorts of statistics about the increase in welfare spending in 10 years and the percentage of people who are now tax-consumers in Australia. He made no mention of his many friends in the tax avoidance industry. He said that in that period Australian revenue absorbed by tax-consumers increased from 3.7 billion to 17.8 billion. He did not happen to mention that all honourable members, who receive a salary, are also tax-consumers, as is every public servant throughout Australia.

The figures that he quoted—the rubbery ones produced by the Queensland Confederation of Industry—are based on the premise that anyone who does not work for private enterprise is a tax-consumer. Immediately, every pensioner and every public servant is lumped into those statistics. I can think of no better example of "lies, damned lies and statistics" than the statistics used by the National Party and the Queensland Confederation of Industry.

The Chamber then listened to a "quite reasonable" speech by the member for Nundah (Sir William Knox), who again mouthed the words of the Queensland Confederation of Industry. We on this side of the House will have no part of him.

The House heard an interesting speech from the man who has said to be the clawless Clauson. This evening, the House saw him as being not only clawless but also tongueless, witless and, from the way that he performed, probably childless.

Mr Davis: And he had a prepared brief from the Minister.

Mr COMBEN: Yes, he had a prepared brief handed up by the Minister. But whatever the member for Redlands might have been trying to say, he was outshone by the member for Toowong, who by way of interjection on one of my colleagues, said, "The boongs are doing you over." If I have heard a more undignified and improper racist slur in this place, I cannot remember it. I shall certainly have pleasure in referring

the honourable member's comment to the Commissioner for Community Relations. The member for Toowong stands condemned by his own mouth. He shall lose his seat at the next election. I do not particularly like the thought of supporting Denver Beanland, but even that third-rate person——

Mr Davis: Will run second.

Mr COMBEN: That is what I was about to say. That third-rate person will run second to—what is his name——

Government Members interjected.

Mr COMBEN: The member for Toowong.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Randell): Order! I ask honourable members on both sides of the House to observe some decorum. The debate is degenerating. I ask the honourable member for Windsor to continue with his speech and stick to the subject-matter of the Bill. I warn those members who are continually interjecting.

Mr COMBEN: Mr Deputy Speaker, I probably was a little off the mark in referring to the imminent win by the Labor candidate for Toowong, Mr Jack Ford. I apologise for that.

To discover the reason for bringing this Bill before us tonight, one really needs to go back to 24 October 1984—that disgraceful, sordid day in Queensland political history when, as was well known, the members of the Opposition in this place were attending a luncheon with the Prime Minister of Australia (Bob Hawke) in the city centre. An informal agreement had been reached with the Government; members of the Opposition would be a little late in getting back, and the Government promised that nothing controversial would be brought on. I can remember walking into this place at 25 past 2 and learning that three divisions had been called and that the Government had, without any warning, introduced one of the most heinous pieces of legislation that had been seen for several years. As a result of that, the Opposition was not properly placed. "Treachery" is the only word to describe the Government's actions. It was treachery of the worst sort.

It is interesting to read what some of the journalists in this city said about that particular day. The editorial in *The Courier-Mail* of the next day was titled "A dangerous and silly Bill". That editorial read—

> "If the Queensland Government's idea behind its new superannuation legislation was to provoke the trade union movement, it has been only partially successful so far. But the legislation does more than provoke trade unions. It establishes an unprecedented level of control by the State Government over the operations of all superannuation funds in Queensland—control with the potential for great abuse.
>
> It is a pity that the Queensland Government, alone now among Australian governments, sees industrial relations in such a provocative, confrontationist fashion. The level of industrial disputes has rarely been lower; the prices and wages accord—although described by the State Minister for Employment and Industrial Affairs, Mr Lester, as 'a wicked document'—has meant that unions no longer resort to strikes for wage increases.
>
> . . .
>
> Although the Queensland Government's Superannuation Trust Funds (Protection of Employees Entitlements) Bill purports to protect employees, it really does nothing of the sort. Instead, it interposes the Government between employers and employees in what is essentially an industrial affair and it restricts employees' rights to the superannuation scheme of their choice."

The theme of the Queensland Government's intervention into what should be an industrial relations affair is to give an employee a free choice to say, "I will go into a scheme," or "I will not go into a scheme." That is the incredible irony of this Bill and the original Act.

The editorial in *The Courier-Mail* concluded—

"The contradiction of an allegedly free-enterprise government legislating to confer commercial advantage seems to have escaped the Government.

But it cannot have escaped the Government's notice that such legislation is almost guaranteed to cause industrial unrest. The proposed law is both dangerous and silly. Dangerous, because the scope of the powers is wide and unnecessary; silly, because it threatens two years' industrial peace."

Mr Borbidge: They were proved wrong.

Mr COMBEN: The commentators were not proved wrong. There is a mass of evidence against the actions of the Queensland Government in passing the original Bill.

Another article in *The Courier-Mail* on 25 October stated—

"This effort surpasses anything the Government has done before. At a time when most of the Opposition was at the Hawke luncheon, it brought on legislation which has the potential for industrial chaos.

This shoddy operation can only bring the Parliament of Queensland into further disrepute."

The Parliament of Queensland will be restored to its proper level of respect by the people of Queensland only when there is a change of Government. Following the Lindeman Island issue, that will not be far away.

Another comment was made by hardly a bastion of socialism, the financial editor of *The Courier-Mail* (Brian Hale), whom I have always considered to be a rabid right-winger in his writings. He is certainly not an interventionist of any sort.

Mr D'Arcy: He doesn't like the Minister.

Mr COMBEN: Mr Hale does not like the Minister very much. He often comments about him. I agree with my colleague the honourable member for Woodridge.

Mr Hale is always right. He wrote—

"It is hard to recall previous acts in the financial arena that for sheer stupidity have been seen by the financial community as rivalling the State Government's new laws on superannuation.

But the sadness for Queensland is that both the new legislation and the manner of its introduction were supported by the Liberal Party as well as by the National Party."

Of course, it was supported by that independent National/Liberal/Independent, Mr Col Miller.

At the same time, members of the Life Insurance Federation of Australia believed that "incompetent" is not an adequate word with which to describe the legislation. One leading insurance executive said that it was ironic that a Government which loudly trumpeted its free enterprise rhetoric could introduce such an extremely socialistic measure. It was incredible legislation.

My last comment is from Mr Peter Morley. He lives in the Windsor electorate. Usually, I would support his views. He said—

"The State Government's gross abuse of the democratic system over its superannuation proposals has one prime purpose—to keep the nationally devised Building Unions' Superannuation Plan (BUS) out of Queensland."

Mr Innes interjected.

Mr COMBEN: If the honourable member for Sherwood did not always attempt to speak in the eighteenth century stilted English of Sir Samuel Griffith, honourable members in this Chamber would occasionally understand him. Unfortunately, he lives in the past and has delusions of grandeur about being Chief Justice of Queensland one day. The

truth is that he will be flat out making a living when he returns to the bar at the Jindalee Hotel.

Peter Morley's article continued—

> "To achieve that goal, parliamentary procedures were defiled in another inexcusable display of the National Party's arrogance this week that turned the Legislative Assembly into a sausage machine."

Opposition members have often said that the Queensland Parliament is a sausage-machine.

Mr Lee: A Windsor sausage.

Mr COMBEN: If we are talking about Windsor sausage—a butcher producing a great feast of a Windsor sausage would have more respect for his equipment than that demonstrated by the Government and the Liberal Party, whose approach to that legislation seemed more appropriate to a charnel-house.

All the criticism levelled at the Government over its wicked haste has been justified. That legislation and the manner in which it was brought in was universally damned. The manner in which this legislation was introduced into the House last night should, similarly, be dammed.

I was certainly looking forward to having the opportunity, over the week-end, of talking to union-leaders about the legislation and ascertaining their thoughts on it. I was looking forward to having the time to contemplate the legislation properly. What happened? Members of the Opposition entered the Chamber and discovered that, once again, the Standing Orders were being suspended——

Mr Borbidge: You didn't even divide on it.

Mr COMBEN: The Opposition knows the futility of such divisions in this House. The truth is that the Government has the numbers and that a sausage-machine is in operation in this Parliament.

Mr FitzGerald: A Windsor sausage.

Mr COMBEN: It is not as good as a Windsor sausage; it is a sausage full of red meat and fat. The only resemblance between the system in this Parliament and the Westminster system is that the carpet is green and there is an aisle between the Opposition and the Government. I am glad that Government members keep the brucellosis on their side. However, one day, members of the Opposition will sit on the Government benches, and they will fumigate the Chamber and eradicate the sorts of things that now go on.

When the legislation was introduced, the then shadow Minister for Justice, the honourable member for Wolston (Mr R. J. Gibbs), said that the sole reason for its introduction was to try to provoke union unrest at a time when a Federal election was pending. It is ironic that this Bill should be debated at a time when the minds of honourable members are turning towards an early State election and the Government is seeking an issue on which to wipe the slate clean in relation to the events of the past few weeks.

Again I say that this legislation, like the original Act, is full of sound and fury but signifies very little. Once again, the drafting of the original Act has been shown to be very poor, necessitating the introduction of an amending Bill.

On a couple of occasions, the Minister has tried to take to task my colleague the honourable member for Salisbury (Mr Goss) over his criticism of the Parliamentary Counsel. The Minister has said he believes that the honourable member for Salisbury is arrogant in doing that.

When amending legislation such as this is brought before a House as often as it is in this House, it shows that the Minister's draftsmen and departmental advisers did not really know in which direction the legislation was headed, that they had not had time

to consult all the sections of the community that would be affected by it, and that they had not considered every aspect of it. It proves that the honourable member for Salisbury has intelligence and foresight and that, unlike many Government members, he always speaks with a single tongue.

Mr Goss: Mr Comben, I take this opportunity to say how astute you are.

Mr COMBEN: I thank the honourable member for Salisbury. I trust that that means I will receive his vote at the next caucus elections.

In conclusion, I say that the Bill attempts to improve the lousy drafting of a lousy Act, for a lousy purpose, thought up by a lousy Minister and a lousy Government. It is opposed by a wide section of the Queensland community. If this Bill had repealed the original Act, it would have benefited Queenslanders.

The legislation's alleged purpose of protection has been demonstrated to be false and misleading. It does not protect the employers or the employees. It takes away a free choice; it takes away protection. The sooner this legislation is repealed and proper legislation is introduced by a future Labor Government in this House, the better it will be for all Queenslanders.

Mr CAMPBELL (Bundaberg) (11.58 p.m.): This debate is basically about the division of capital and labour. It is a debate about the haves and the have-nots. Through industry superannuation, ordinary people have been afforded a chance of having superannuation. It has been up to industry superannuation to provide the lead for what is now being offered to the workers not only of Queensland but also of Australia.

A feature article by John Lyons in *The Australian* is very interesting. It sums the debate up in the following way—

> "While the implications of Australia's superannuation revolution are as complex as they are enormous, the preamble to the new chapter in this country's financial history is simple.
>
> In the bluntest terms, superannuation schemes have been blatantly abused by many employers who have for years seen them more as a source of cheap capital, a means of protecting themselves against takeover bids, and as tax rorts rather than genuine retirement schemes."

Friday, 14 March 1986

A revolution has occurred in Australia. The trade union movement has had to put back into the superannuation schemes the original purpose for which they were established—benefits for the employees.

The article continues—

> "To some extent, the punishment for the sins of some employers is now being visited upon them all."

That is what has happened. Selfish people, represented by parliamentarians such as the honourable member for Surfers Paradise (Mr Borbidge), have made use of the system to abuse their employees, but they have now been caught out.

Let me now examine what has happened in some instances. Private superannuation schemes have been established by some small business entrepreneurs—and Government members are always ready to protect them! In the end result, the only person who obtained benefit from the scheme was the manager. The scheme was designed so that the manager could sack every employee before he became eligible to an entitlement. It is because of such action that a superannuation scheme has been established by the Australian Council of Trade Unions. In the words of Garry Weaven of the Australian Council of Trade Unions, "What we are about is teaching employers in industry how to run superannuation schemes efficiently." That is what it is all about.

Only last year a private study was conducted by Noble Lowndes Australia Ltd into the performance of superannuation funds. It revealed the interesting fact that, in the

past five years, only three out of 14 leading funds produced a significantly higher return on investment than the clients could have easily achieved themselves. In other words, the managers were not operating the schemes efficiently.

Mr Davis: Mr Borbidge said that he was an employer of labour. Did he have a superannuation scheme for his employees?

Mr CAMPBELL: Probably not.

The spokesmen for primary producers and tourism represent large numbers of employers. It is an interesting but well-known fact that employers in those industries do very little for their employees. That is because they do not care for people, and they do not care for their workers.

I read recently an article in *The Australian Financial Review* that examined superannuation by reference to the nature of the industries. Apparently, on an Australia-wide basis, only 39.5 per cent of employees are members of a superannuation scheme. More than three million workers are not. The two industries that had the lowest levels of superannuation cover for employees were recreation/tourism, in which only 12.6 per cent of employees were covered by superannuation, and agriculture/forestry, in which only 15.3 per cent of employees were covered. The new proposal seeks to redress that by providing superannuation at an inexpensive rate.

Government members would not get off their backsides to concern themselves about the long-term interests of workers. The statistics I have just quoted indicate that two of the key industries that support Government members do not provide superannuation for the workers. They show up the so-called advantages of private enterprise. They show also how much private enterprise looks after the long-term interests of the workers. Honourable members should compare the figures for the public sector, in which 61 per cent of employees are covered by superannuation, with those in the non-Government sector, in which only 29.5 per cent are covered.

It is also interesting that the Queensland Government proposes, by the introduction of this legislation, to protect employees. Why was this Government not concerned about protecting employees during all the years that employees were being ripped off? It is only now, when employees are being protected by the trade union movement and have taken action to protect themselves, that the Government has been prompted to do something. That is typical.

What the honourable member for Nundah (Sir William Knox) had to say about the ACTU's scheme was also very interesting. He said that the employees would be better off out of it. They are not even receiving a beneficial return on their funds in the ordinary schemes. That is what this Government wanted to protect the unions from. The BUS Scheme has been returning 17.5 per cent on its members' investment. That is what this Government intends to protect the workers from! How beneficial! How protective the Government is towards employees!

The Storemen and Packers Labour Unions Co-operative Retirement Fund returns 20 per cent. Is it not marvellous that this Government is trying to protect workers from schemes that return 17.5 per cent and 20 per cent when, in many cases, the schemes run by employers have been used to rort the system? Those are the sins that the Government and the employers are paying for.

The Government claims that this legislation has been introduced because the introduction of union superannuation funds would affect freedom of choice.

Mr Borbidge: Name the private schemes that are rorting the system.

Mr CAMPBELL: The Bjelke-Petersen Foundation is one.

Government Members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Booth): Order! The House will come to order. The honourable member will address the Chair, and there will be fewer interjections.

Mr CAMPBELL: Thank you for your protection, Mr Deputy Speaker.

For years, the Government has been talking about protecting employers. Why has it not protected employees? For decades, the Government has done nothing to protect employees and even under this legislation it is not interested in protecting them. It was said when the Bill was introduced that it contained nothing to protect employees. In fact, for years there was no chance of employees having any say in the disposition of their superannuation funds. Now the Government is concerned about employers not having a say in what is done with superannuation funds. That is not correct, because there was always going to be and always has been employer representation on union superannuation funds.

The Government is also concerned about management fees going to the unions or the Labor Party. That is what the Government is trying to stop. I want to know where those fees are going now. I cite the example of the National Party's own booklet, in which the Federation Insurance Company says, "If you come and take out insurance or superannuation with us we will give 10 per cent commission to the National Party." That is public knowledge. I know that cane-farmers are told, "Join Federation Insurance and give 10 per cent to the National Party." In addition, a co-operative mill——

Government Members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The House will come to order. I know that it is late and tempers are a little frayed. We will have some decorum.

Mr CAMPBELL: I think that, tonight, the Opposition has killed the argument that the Government has been looking after employees. It simply has not done so. The Government is now saying, "Let's have free enterprise." However, an article headed, "Government may take new superannuation line" states—

> "The State Government is considering giving preference in Government projects to companies contributing to superannuation schemes such as the Queensland United Employers Superannuation Trust."

Is that not a great thing to say about free enterprise in Queensland?

Mr Borbidge: Who said it?

Mr CAMPBELL: The industrial reporter for *The Courier-Mail,* Dennis Connors.

In an editorial on 26 October, that same newspaper showed concern about the legislation. It cannot have escaped the Government's notice. It stated—

> "But it cannot have escaped the Government's notice that such legislation is almost guaranteed to cause industrial unrest. The proposed law is both dangerous and silly. Dangerous, because the scope of the powers is wide and unnecessary; silly, because it threatens two years' industrial peace nationally for some dubious short-term political gain."

Nowhere have I found that commentators have said that the Government is really concerned about looking after the employees.

Peter Morley wrote—

> "If the unions are wise, however, they will ignore what might be regarded as provocative action."

Sergeant Merv Bainbridge of the Queensland Police Union said that the Government was hypocritical in this Bill. He said—

> "For years the police super fund has, at the direction of the board, provided cheap loans to shire councils and hospital boards at below safe ruling interest rates."

In other words, that is not in the interests of the employees.

Mr Austin interjected.

Mr CAMPBELL: Isn't it wonderful that the Minister for Health expects employees to lend money from their funds?

An Opposition Member interjected.

Mr CAMPBELL: The Nurses Union is another. The Government would like to take the money from the Nurses Union funds. There are many other funds that it could consider getting money from at 3 per cent.

Another article in *The Courier-Mail* was headed " 'Super' law: you could lose money." In part, it read—

> "The State Government cannot guarantee that you will not be out of pocket . . ."

Is that the way to look after employees? It has been a political stunt from go to whoa. I will finish by echoing the words of Brian Hale, who said—

> "In short, the legislation—from a financial and not political standpoint—is ill conceived and financially damaging."

Hon. N. J. HARPER (Auburn—Minister for Justice and Attorney-General) (12.11 a.m.), in reply: I thank honourable members for their contributions. I assure the honourable for Salisbury that the Act has achieved its purpose, that is, accountability to employees and security of funds being held in their name. The Bill will further strengthen the Act in line with the resolve of the Government. It will also enable the responsible Minister to accommodate existing schemes into which, among others, unions have entered. In no small way, the Bill is in the interests of responsible unions and their members.

The honourable member for Salisbury treated the House to a monotonous monologue in an attempt to justify the irresponsibility of his comrades in Canberra and in the ACTU. No doubt it was the monologue of an anonymous author.

I am glad that the honourable member for Salisbury read into *Hansard* once again the proven inaccurate comments of his predecessor the former Opposition spokesman on Justice. No doubt the honourable member for Wolston will know why the member for Salisbury should try to embarrass him in that way. But so be it.

The honourable member asked questions about two clauses in the Bill. Clause 9 deals with the amendment of section 8. The amendment relates to the amendment contained in clause 13 (5). Under that clause, it is proposed that trustees will be empowered to invest trust moneys in any investments other than investments specifically authorised by a statute, that is, the Trusts Act of 1973-1985. The trust deed must contain a provision authorising the trustee to invest the trust moneys in specified investments or classes of investments, or to invest the trust moneys in classes of investments specifically approved by the registrar. Under this amendment, the registrar is empowered to refuse to approve a trust deed if the proposed investments do not meet with his approval; in other words, if the investments are made imprudently or improperly.

As to the honourable member's other question—I believe he was referring to new sections 12 and 13. At present, there is no provision in the Act to withdraw an approval once it has been granted. This amendment will empower a registrar to withdraw his approval on the grounds specified in section 12 (1), thus preventing a scheme from continuing to operate illegally. The amendment also relates to the amendment contained in clause 15, under which the Governor in Council is empowered to appoint new trustees where the registrar has given a notice of withdrawal of appeal.

As to the grants of exemption—I invite the honourable member's attention to the scheme. If a scheme operates in accordance with current standards in the industry, it is probable that an exemption may be granted.

The provision relating to withdrawal from a scheme has been included because some union trust deeds purport to prohibit an employer from withdrawing from schemes without the permission of the trustees. That applies even if the employer no longer has

any employees in the industry covered by the scheme. The unions' aim is to prevent an employer from joining schemes other than trade union schemes.

As to the removal of trustees—I simply point out that that provision is designed to allow a scheme to continue when existing trustees have not been obeying the law and the approval for the scheme is withdrawn under proposed new section 12. Once again, that will provide protection. I note that the member for Bundaberg thanked the Chair for giving him protection. He should be thanking the Government for giving employees protection under this legislation. This provision will provide protection for the beneficiaries of the scheme.

The honourable member for Surfers Paradise, in a few very well-chosen words, indicated that he has a grasp of the purposes of the legislation and of the socialistic fast track down which the Opposition's comrades in Canberra are taking Australia. The honourable member correctly told the House about Australia's hastening demise at the hands of the Opposition's comrades not only in Canberra but also in the Australian Council of Trade Unions.

Mr Scott: Utter nonsense, and you know it.

Mr HARPER: The honourable member's comrades are taking Australia to socialism as quickly as any nation can go.

The honourable member for Nundah also indicated quite clearly that he understands what the ACTU scheme is all about—socialisation and power. He, too, gave the House a preview of the trade-union-dominated, non-elected, socialist-republic form of Government towards which Labor would lead Australia.

The honourable member for Redlands upset the Opposition by exposing the fallacy of the so-called accord. Alone, the Premier and Treasurer of Queensland had the courage to put the facts on the table at the time when the accord was introduced. Now, the whole of Australia realises the truth of his forecast.

Motion (Mr Harper) agreed to.

Committee

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

Clauses 1 to 9, as read, agreed to.

Clause 10—New ss. 12 and 13—

Mr GOSS (12.18 a.m.): I would like one point clarified. I asked a question but I do not think that the Minister answered it. If a notice is issued by the registrar under proposed new section 12, will he have to specify not only the provision that has triggered the notice but also the grounds on which it is based?

Mr HARPER: Obviously, that would be a matter for decision by the registrar.

Clause 10, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 11 to 13, as read, agreed to.

Clause 14—Repeal of s. 17 and new section—

Mr DAVIS (12.20 a.m.): I find clause 14, which deals with trustees, rather amusing. One part of it reads as follows—

> "... where trustees of a superannuation fund are or include natural persons, each of them shall be a person who ordinarily resides in Queensland."

That type of language appears in other parts of the clause.

I wonder how the Bill will protect the workers of this State. When Lindeman Island was being debated recently, there were five or six on the board of East-West Airlines who were trying to rape that island. They all lived in Western Australia, except the

Premier's mate top-level Ted. It was all right for those people from interstate to take over Lindeman Island. Castlemaine Tooheys has been taken over by another Western Australian, and there are hardly any Queenslanders on its board. Now this sort of rubbishing legislation is brought forward, and it has to cover a person who ordinarily resides in Queensland. For this legislation, the people must reside in Queensland. When there was legislation which was going to rip the heart out of an island and revoke the national park, the only Queenslander on the board was top-level Ted Lyons, the mate of the Premier. The rest are all from Western Australia. What a farce; what a rort!

Clause 14, as read, agreed to.

Clause 15—New s. 24—

Mr GOSS (12.22 a.m.): The basis of the Opposition's concern about clause 15 has already been outlined by me during the second-reading debate. I will not canvass that again in detail, but I do so briefly.

The Opposition's concern is that the Government, in the guise of the Governor in Council, may remove trustees on the basis of the notice of withdrawal having been given under section 12. That may be fair enough. The Opposition can accept that, if there was mismanagement or improper activity, it may be necessary to remove trustees, but we say that it is a dangerous mechanism to simply have a situation in which the Government can replace duly appointed trustees who are truly representative of the employees or the employer, or the independent person, with trustees of the Government's own choice.

Reference has been made tonight to Sir Edward Lyons. Are the unions to face a situation in which their representative is removed from the board by the Government and replaced by somebody such as Sir Edward Lyons? As the Premier has found in the last week or two, an appointment such as that is sure to doom the enterprise to spectacular failure. The Opposition feels that superannuation schemes should not be subject to political appointments of trustees in substitution for the duly appointed trustees representing the employer, the employees and the independent person. Therefore, if it is absolutely necessary to replace a trustee or a number of trustees, any appointment by the Governor in Council should be on a strictly temporary basis only until such time as other appropriate trustees and other appropriate representatives can be nominated to fill the position, whether it be the position of the employer trustee who has been struck off or whether it be the employee trustee who has been struck off, or the independent person.

Therefore, to overcome the danger of the National Party Government making political appointments of trustees to replace the original trustees, I move the following amendment—

> "At page 9, after line 16, insert the words—
>
> 'Provided that such appointment shall be on a temporary basis only and for a period of not more than one month and only until a fresh nomination or nominations are received by the Registrar to fill the relevant trustee position or positions provided for under section 23 of this Act.' "

I conclude by saying that if there were no concern about a political appointment—that is a real concern in this State—it is quite conceivable that the trustee appointed could be somebody not representative of the particular group that he or she purported to represent and did not have the confidence of the employees or the employers in that particular industry. That could only lead to problems and to friction. Therefore, it is important that a mechanism be provided so that trustees who are appointed by an employer or by employees and are truly representative of them fill those positions, rather than have them filled by appointments of the Government of the day.

Mr HARPER: The spokesman for the Opposition really does himself and the role that he plays in this House little credit by making such a comment. Obviously, the honourable member has disregarded the new section 17, which is contained in clause

14 of the Bill. That quite clearly states that trustees will be appointed in the ratio of 1:1:1. One of those shall be the representative of the employees for whom the superannuation scheme is proposed. The honourable member tried to bring in red herrings and to divert the attention of the House to quite frivolous matters. He suggested that when there is a failure of the trustees and a withdrawal of approval under the new section 12, political appointments will be made. However, he did not suggest that when the Committee was dealing with the new section 17, which is contained in clause 14. I ask the honourable member to be consistent. He should try to do credit to the research that he should have done into the Bill.

If the honourable member would give a little thought to the matter, he would realise that it is quite impossible for the Government to accept a suggestion that a period of one month would be sufficient to replace trustees in the event of a failure. Clause 15 has been included in the Bill for a particular purpose in the event of a failure. Of course, the Government will honour the commitment that is inherent in the new section 17—the honourable member need have no fear of that—but the Government will not accept constraints of the nature suggested by the Opposition. In all seriousness, I suggest to the member for Salisbury that it is quite inappropriate that any such constraints be suggested for this particular clause.

Mr GOSS: My research is not defective at all. To rebut my argument and to reject the amendment I moved, the Minister says that the requirement that the representative act in the interests of the employer, the employees or an independent person is already contained in clause 14, which provides for a new section 17. That is no safeguard at all. That is a quite shallow argument. The State has already witnessed the Government's track record in the case of Patrick Field, when the Government purported quite dishonestly to appoint that man as a representative of the Labor Party, or as a representative of people who vote for the Labor Party. That was quite a dishonest and dubious act on the part of the Government. It is one which is within its power to repeat under this provision. Certainly the union representatives to whom I spoke have a genuine concern about the potential for this Government to make a political appointment of a trustee who it claims represents the employees under the new section 17 but who is in fact nothing more or less than a political appointee. The safeguard is needed. It is not an unreasonable constraint.

If there is a failure, the trustees can be removed. The Opposition does not object to that. However, it provides that it should be a temporary situation. I think that a month is a reasonable time in which to find replacement trustees who are truly representative of the employees or the employer, as the case may be. The scheme and the workers should not be burdened by an appointment by the Government of a person whom they do not welcome and whom they do not trust.

Mr HARPER: Again, I suggest to the honourable member that he has failed to understand proposed section 17. In fact, he has failed to understand existing section 17. I have total confidence in the *Hansard* record. In referring to section 17, I believe that the honourable member said, "One shall be representative of the employer, or one shall be representative of the employees, or one shall be an independent person." It does not say anything of the sort. At present, the Act and the new section 17 state not "or", but simply "one shall be representative of the employee, one shall be representative of the employer and one shall be independent." It is not a case of "or". There is no possibility of the three trustees being representative of any particular group. If the honourable member feels uncomfortable about it, I suggest that he read *Hansard.* He will see that he used the term "or".

Mr GOSS: I reject the somewhat pedantic and nit-picking but typically rural analytical ability of the Minister and point out to him that I am as capable as he is of reading the section. I have read the section in the same way as the Minister just quoted it. I was referring to three different positions. We could be dealing with the trustee who represents the employer; or we could be dealing with the trustee who represents the employees; or we could be dealing with the independent person. That does not detract

one bit from what I said. There is still the capacity on the part of the Queensland Government to replace the union representative with a political appointment of its own choice, a person whom the Government purports and dishonestly claims to represent the workers and the union. Union-leaders are concerned about that. Because they have that genuine concern, they want the protection for the employees and the unions that the Minister professes to offer. He has still not answered the Opposition's argument. The Opposition persists with its amendment.

Question—That the words proposed to be inserted in clause 15 (Mr Goss's amendment) be so inserted—put; and the Committee divided—

AYES, 27		NOES, 45	
Braddy	Warner, A. M.	Ahern	Lee
Burns		Alison	Lester
Campbell		Austin	Lickiss
Casey		Bailey	Lingard
Comben		Bjelke-Petersen	Littleproud
D'Arcy		Booth	McKechnie
De Lacy		Borbidge	McPhie
Eaton		Cahill	Miller
Gibbs, R. J.		Chapman	Muntz
Goss		Clauson	Newton
Hamill		Cooper	Powell
Kruger		Elliott	Randell
Mackenroth		FitzGerald	Row
McElligott		Gibbs, I. J.	Simpson
McLean		Glasson	Stephan
Milliner		Gygar	Stoneman
Palaszczuk		Harper	Tenni
Prest		Harvey	Turner
Scott		Henderson	Wharton
Smith		Innes	
Underwood		Jennings	
Vaughan	*Tellers:*	Katter	*Tellers:*
Veivers	Davis	Knox	Kaus
Warburton	Fouras	Lane	Neal

Resolved in the negative.

Clause 15, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 16 to 21, as read, agreed to.

Bill reported, without amendment.

Third Reading

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

The House adjourned at 12.43 a.m. (Friday).