

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

THURSDAY, 29 OCTOBER 1987

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

THURSDAY, 29 OCTOBER 1987

Mr SPEAKER (Hon. K. R. Lingard, Fassifern) read prayers and took the chair at 10 a.m.

PAPERS

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

Reports—

Library Board of Queensland for the year ended 30 June 1987
Queensland Performing Arts Trust for the year ended 30 June 1987
Royal Queensland Theatre Company for the year ended 30 June 1987
Port of Brisbane Authority for the year ended 30 June 1987
Queensland Probation and Parole Service for the year ended 30 June 1987
Government Motor Garage for the year ended 30 June 1987
Queensland Government Printing Office for the year ended 30 June 1987.

The following papers were laid on the table—

Proclamations under—

Biological Control Act 1987
Primary Producers' Organisation and Marketing Act Amendment Act 1987

Orders in Council under—

Explosives Act 1952-1981
Marine Parks Act 1982
Queensland Film Industry Development Act 1977-1981
Fisheries Act 1976-1984
Regulation under the Brands Act 1915-1979
By-laws under the Queensland Grain Handling Authority Act 1983-1986

Reports—

Timber Research and Development Advisory Council, South and Central Queensland for the year ended 30 June 1987
Timber Research and Development Advisory Council, North Queensland for the year ended 30 June 1987
C Q Producers' Co-operative Association Limited for the year ended 30 June 1987
Sugar Board for the year ended 30 June 1987.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT**Marine Board Investigation into Reef Link II Fire**

Hon. M. J. TENNI (Barron River—Minister for Water Resources and Maritime Services) (10.03 a.m.), by leave: This week in this House, the honourable member for Townsville East made a number of incorrect statements concerning the accuracy of the investigation by the Marine Board of Queensland into the Reef Link II fire off Townsville on Sunday, 5 July.

It is obvious that the person or persons giving the honourable member his information has or have a personal axe to grind in attempting to suggest that that very destructive

fire was a result of design deficiencies in the \$2.7m catamaran that was built by NQEA of Cairns.

Although the Marine Board report recommended a number of improvements in building practices, it found that the overriding reason for the fire was the condition of the vessel when it put to sea on that day.

Mr SMITH: I rise to a point of order. The Minister is misleading the House. He is clearly attempting to protect the interests of NQEA in his home city at the expense of the owner and operator of the craft.

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

Mr TENNI: The findings of the Marine Board were the result of a very detailed inquiry involving extensive interviews with 27 witnesses, including NQEA employees, the designers, International Catamarans Pty Ltd, Lloyds Register surveyors and experts in forensic science and electrical circuitry.

Depending on the decision of the master to voluntarily surrender his master's grade 4 certificate of competency for three months, the findings will be subject to challenge during any formal investigation of the charge of misconduct against the master under the Queensland Marine Act.

Mr Smith: Do you know that the insurers are going to sue the builders?

Mr TENNI: The honourable member can sit there and cop it. I copped it off him yesterday. Now he will hear the truth.

It appears that the ALP wants to have two bob each way when it comes to the question of marine safety in Queensland.

Although the member for Cairns only recently attacked the Marine Board and the Department of Harbours and Marine for allegedly being too lax in the policing of safety requirements, the member for Townsville East is now attempting to save the reputation of staff members involved in the Reef Link operation by claiming that the Marine Board does not know what it is talking about. Unlike the ALP, I have every confidence in the ability and fairness of the board.

I turn now to the allegations raised by the honourable member. It is completely incorrect for him to suggest that there were only 50 litres or less of fuel in the starboard bilge when the vessel put to sea.

Although the alarm, which indicates that a bilge is flooded——

Mr Smith: Tell me——

Mr TENNI: I will tell the honourable member everything, so he should just sit there and cop it.

Although the alarm, which indicates that a bilge is flooded, failed to operate, in Cairns NQEA recovered some 1 100 litres of fuel and water from the starboard bilge. Approximately 75 per cent of that mixture, or about 800 litres or more, was distillate fuel.

It is clear that the honourable member has failed to grasp the chain of events which led to the near destruction of this 30-metre vessel. There is overwhelming evidence that the fire occurred as a result of fuel igniting after being sprayed by the starboard engine flywheel onto the turbo-chargers and exhaust manifold. The self-ignition temperature for distillate occurs at 380 degrees Celsius or above, which is not what the honourable member told this House. The engine exhaust system, including the turbo-chargers, has an operating temperature of 500 to 515 degrees Celsius. I point out that expert advice was given to the board indicating that there was ample time for the system to reach those temperatures before the fire began.

The intense flash fire which followed was of only short duration, but it was sufficient to melt or ignite overhead electrical cables in the starboard engine room. It is more than likely, as the honourable member pointed out, that the crew did smell burning plastic.

Mr Smith: Nonsense!

Mr TENNI: It is not nonsense. The honourable member said that yesterday.

Following the flash fire, the PVC insulation in the vessel's electrical cabling was progressively destroyed by repeated short circuits. This had the effect of setting fire to adjacent combustible materials throughout the passenger deck. I also point out that the standard of electrical cabling was much higher than that required by the Standards Association of Australia, as the cabling had been rated for the air temperature of the engine room. The location of the circuit-breakers was also in accordance with industry requirements.

I repeat that the Marine Board found that there would not have been a fire aboard the Reef Link II if normal maintenance procedures in regard to the vessel had been followed. It is equally misleading to talk about the adequacy of the design of the vessel's fire-fighting system. The fact is that Reef Link II put to sea, when it clearly should not have done so, with only one of its two fire and bilge pumps operating. The starboard pump was in a dismantled state.

The board found that no attempt was made by the master and crew to physically fight the fire. The port engine, which could have given power to the port fire and bilge pump, was shut down by the master. The honourable member should not protect him. The master also displayed ignorance about which valve was required to be opened to gain water for the port pump.

It is incorrect for the honourable member to claim that the starboard engine was shut down to allow the evacuation of the passengers and crew. It was impossible to shut down this engine as the control lines to the bridge had been destroyed by the fire. In fact, this engine was later shut down by Reef Link's shore-based engineer, in the presence of the Townsville Harbour Master, after the fire had been extinguished. At the time, the engine was still running even though there was a break in the propeller transmission.

Although I appreciate the honourable member's sincere interest in this matter, he should make a point of checking his facts more thoroughly.

I repeat that members of the ALP cannot have it both ways. They cannot condemn the Marine Board for allegedly failing to be tough enough with the commercial craft in the far north and then criticise the board when it has done a very thorough and exhaustive investigation in another part of the State.

I repeat also that the Queensland Government has every faith in the ability and judgment of the Marine Board. I would suggest to the honourable member that he should check with his cousin, who is an engineer with the company in north Queensland, and tell him that in future he should give the honourable member the truth and not the deliberate untruths that are being told to the people of Queensland.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

Green Paper on Computer Related Crime and the Criminal Code of Queensland

Hon. P. J. CLAUSON (Redlands—Minister for Justice and Attorney-General) (10.10 a.m.), by leave: There has been considerable speculation in recent years as to whether the Criminal Code of Queensland and indeed the criminal laws in all jurisdictions are adequate to meet the growing threat of computer related crime. Although the Criminal Code has stood the test of time for many years, it has been suggested that our criminal laws should be updated to take account of recent developments in computer technology.

White-collar crime and computer crime are areas which can readily erode the confidence of the public in the administration of the criminal law. For this reason I

have prepared a Green Paper which comprehensively analyses the existing Criminal Code provisions in order to identify those areas which are in need of amendment.

From this examination, it is apparent that a number of amendments to substantive Criminal Code provisions are necessary. In the Green Paper, it is proposed that the following sections of the Criminal Code be amended—

- (a) an amendment to section 441 of the Criminal Code relating to the offence of fraudulent false accounting;
- (b) an amendment to section 437 of the Code relating to fraudulent accounting by directors and officers of companies;
- (c) an amendment to section 438 of the Code relating to false statements by officials of companies;
- (d) an amendment to the forgery provisions of the Code;
- (e) an amendment to section 499 of the Code relating to the falsification of registers; and
- (f) an amendment to the penalty provisions for offences of wilful and unlawful damage to property.

I must say, however, that the Criminal Code has been generally satisfactory in dealing with charges involving the misuse of computer technology. Indeed, there is no recorded instance in which the criminal law has not been able to be utilised in the appropriate circumstances.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! There is too much audible conversation in the Chamber.

Mr CLAUSON: The Green Paper also deals in a comprehensive manner with the issue of unlawful use of computers and gaining unauthorised access to computers. No other Australian jurisdiction has introduced legislation proscribing such conduct; however, the Tasmanian Law Reform Commission has recommended that such activities should be criminalised.

It is suggested in the Green Paper that the provisions of section 408C of the Criminal Code may be utilised when this type of activity occurs. There is some doubt, however, as to the validity of this interpretation.

The complexity of many of the issues raised in this examination is such that I am of the firm opinion that it is desirable to consult broadly on this matter. Accordingly, I am seeking public comments on all of the proposals raised in the Green Paper and on matters associated with the issues raised. Copies of the Green Paper will be available from my office and I would invite any persons who feel they may be able to make a contribution to forward submissions to me by 31 December 1987.

Mr Speaker, I table the Green Paper on computer crime.

Whereupon the honourable member laid the document on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr INNES (Sherwood—Deputy Leader of the Liberal Party) (10.14 a.m.), by leave: Yesterday, I was subjected to the oldest and most obvious misrepresentation technique in the book by the Deputy Premier, Mr Gunn: put a false premise forward and then destroy it.

The Deputy Premier said that the prime thrust of my remarks on the ABC's *7.30 Report* on 19 October was that a briefing given to the State Cabinet by personnel from the Australian Bureau of Criminal Intelligence—which he confirmed was on 26 August 1985—was an attempt to force action in Queensland regarding prostitution and illegal gambling, and that such a claim was devoid of any element of truth. He went on to say that the briefing dealt with drugs and associated murders on an Australiawide basis. That is not an accurate or truthful summary of what I said, and I reject it.

I refer to my comments made on the *7.30 Report* and I say that the words I used as to the subject of the briefing were that the briefing was to do with drugs and prostitution. I repeat the word "drugs". I described it as a lengthy briefing. I said that it dealt with organised crime nationwide, involving Queensland and the rest of Australia; that it dealt with names and relationships; and that at least one of the names was the same as a name mentioned in the *Four Corners* program and in the Fitzgerald inquiry.

The prime thrust of what I said on that program was that the briefing of an entire Cabinet by Australia's top criminal intelligence body was unique; that it occurred because of a failure, at police force to police force level, to achieve a level of co-operation that was being sought; that no other Cabinet in Australia in fact was briefed; and that the Government should put all the information that it was given at that time in the hands of the Fitzgerald inquiry.

Based upon those facts and based upon the evidence that had then been given by Constable Slade, the undercover officer of the Queensland police force, who in evidence had said that he had given a report to the Queensland police force and to the Australian Bureau of Criminal Intelligence on drug activities in north Queensland, I also made the comment that the Australian Bureau of Criminal Intelligence appeared to act on it and that the Queensland police force did not appear to act on it. In relation to that matter and the Sturgess report, I made the comment that the Queensland Government had failed, with conspicuous vigour, to pursue the matters that were contained in those reports.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

Sale and Lease-back of Electric Rail Passenger Carriages

Mr WARBURTON: In directing a question to the Minister for Transport, I draw his attention to page 4009 of the document entitled departmental accounts 1986-87 regarding the sale and the lease-back of a total of at least 228 electric rail passenger carriages to a consortium of bankers. I ask: does this mean that all but 36 of the State's electric passenger carriages have been privatised to a consortium of bankers on lease-back arrangement? Is it intended that those further 36 carriages will be allowed to be sold and then leased back, if that has not happened already?

I ask him also: when was this apparent privatisation of the Brisbane and surrounding areas electric rolling-stock approved; by whom, and when was it publicly announced? Could he also advise what banks are involved and how much was paid in terms of the purchase price for each of those pieces of rolling-stock, and what are the detailed terms of lease-back arrangements?

Mr LANE: I obviously do not carry around in my pocket the details required to answer that question. On the next day of sitting I will be happy to answer the question with as much detail as is appropriate, if the Leader of the Opposition puts it on notice.

Mr WARBURTON: I do so accordingly.

Use of Northern Development Office by National Party Spokesman in Leichhardt

Mr WARBURTON: I direct a question to the Premier and Treasurer. Further to my question of 14 October 1987 to the Premier concerning the appointment of Kevin Byrne, regional development officer of the Northern Development office in Cairns, as National Party spokesman in Leichhardt, I ask: is the Premier aware that on 27 October Mr Byrne, describing himself as National Party spokesman for Leichhardt, issued two press releases attacking the Federal member for Leichhardt?

Mr Tenni interjected.

Mr WARBURTON: I have got a reaction.

Those press releases gave the telephone number 070 523330 as the contact point for further information. As that is the telephone number of the Northern Development

office in Cairns, is that or is that not proof that State Government resources are being used to prepare and distribute National Party propaganda in the far north and that the so-called Northern Development office is in fact a publicity base for the National Party? I ask: what action is the Premier prepared to take to stop this blatant misuse of public funds?

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: The honourable member talks about a blatant misuse of public funds. Goodness me! Does he want me to tell him a little bit about his party and how it does those sorts of things and how the people in Canberra do those sorts of things?

Mr Warburton: I want you to answer my question.

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: There is no blatant misuse of public funds; that is the answer.

Turkish Coal Deal

Mr FITZGERALD: I ask the Premier and Treasurer: could he inform the House on the latest developments in his efforts to obtain a coal contract to supply a Turkish power station?

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: This is a very exciting exercise in which I have been involved on behalf of the Government. I have certain information from Prime Minister Ozal and Energy and Resources Minister Turel. At an appropriate date I will give the details, but not just at the moment. One or two things have yet to be finalised. In the middle of next month there may be a big signing ceremony in Turkey.

Reward for Information on Killer of Janet Phillips

Mr SHAW: In asking a question of the Deputy Premier, Minister Assisting the Treasurer and Minister for Police, I refer to the article that I am sure he has seen in yesterday's *Telegraph* that quotes Mr Brian Phillips as saying that the terrible occurrence has left his family extremely distraught, to put it mildly. I can verify that. Mr Phillips has also stated that he believes there are people who know the identity of the person or persons involved. From my own inquiries I can verify that these views are also shared by investigating police. I now ask: will the Minister take to Cabinet a submission that a reward be offered immediately for information leading to the conviction of the person or persons involved?

Mr GUNN: I thank the honourable member for his question and his interest in this case. I can well appreciate the feelings of the Phillips family. I extend my sympathy to them. It is a very, very sad case indeed. Any information that can be given by any person would be appreciated by the police. I request any person who might have information to come forward, because it could be helpful. The Government will be guided by the Acting Commissioner of Police on the offering of a reward.

Inquiry into Land Valuation System

Mr SHAW: In asking a question of the Minister for Corrective Services, Administrative Services and Valuation, I refer to his statement in the *Courier-Mail* of 31 July 1987 that this year a parliamentary committee had concluded that the Government should maintain the unimproved land valuation system. I now ask: will he give details of the people who were involved in conducting that inquiry, what were the terms of reference of the committee, and what issues were considered by the committee? Will he supply the addresses of properties investigated by the inquiry? When will he table in this House the report of that parliamentary committee?

Mr NEAL: I advise the honourable member that the committee to which he refers was an internal committee of the Government. As such, it deliberated and came to its various conclusions. The investigations that were undertaken are a matter for the committee. It carried out its duties in an extremely competent manner and came to the

conclusion that the direction in which the Valuer-General was heading, that is to progress quickly towards a system of annual valuations, was the correct one.

Education Coalition

Mr LITTLEPROUD: In asking a question of the Minister for Education, I refer to the fact that some members of this House have received a letter from a group called the Education Coalition. I now ask: is he able to tell the House where the Education Coalition was conceived?

Mr POWELL: As a result of the introduction in April of the Education Act Amendment Bill, a large number of people have decided—I suppose fortunately—to read the document and put forward submissions. Unfortunately, many of those people did not bother to stick to the facts and tried to disseminate misleading information.

One of the groups that attempted to do that styled itself as the Coalition for Education, or some similar name. It was conceived, I understand, at Liberal Party headquarters. The group was formed by a number of people who were interested in education. It is interesting to note that, as the consultative mode continued, various people who are important in education areas withdrew from the so-called coalition.

In fact, yesterday afternoon I met with that so-called coalition. I think it is fair to say that the person who was the chairman of the coalition did not have the foggiest clue what the Bill was about. He at least had the grace to sit and listen to what was said. The person who was with him representing the Independent Parents and Friends Association was a lady who was prepared to listen, and who asked quite intelligent questions and was very satisfied with the answers that she received. It appeared to me, after meeting with that group, that the only person who was not satisfied was a fellow by the name of Peter O'Brien, who is well known as the secretary of QATIS, the Queensland Association of Teachers in Independent Schools.

Mr White: A member of the National Party.

Mr POWELL: That would be one of the best jokes ever told in this Parliament.

In fact, I was told by one of my ministerial colleagues in another State—who is a member of the Labor Party—that that person is persona non grata within the Labor Party because of his extreme Left Wing tendencies. So honourable members can imagine how well he would be welcomed by the National Party.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The Minister!

Mr POWELL: I am advised that the coalition was conceived by the Liberal Party. People have woken up to the fact that it was a political ploy. They have pulled out of it. In fact, its teeth have been well and truly drawn as a result of the consultative process that took place and the Bill that was approved yesterday by the Government party and is to be introduced in this Parliament.

Queensland Police Union Criticism of Staffing Levels

Mr LITTLEPROUD: I direct a question to the Minister for Police. In view of the repeated criticism by the Queensland Police Union of police staffing levels, could the Minister advise the House whether such union action is part of a national campaign? Could he also inform the House of this Government's record in relation to police manpower and police funding over the last 10 years?

Mr GUNN: The Queensland Police Union is extremely vocal on a large range of issues. One wonders whether rank-and-file members would be far better served if the union concentrated on the prime role of looking after its members.

The present campaign in regard to police strength is not unique to Queensland. The union's recent calls need to be examined in conjunction with similar actions taken in other States. For example, the police union in Western Australia is seeking 1 000 additional officers and appears to be conducting itself in a manner similar to that of the

Queensland Police Union. The Western Australian Premier, Mr Burke, was recently reported as saying that the police union had become very political. He said that he would never allow that union to run the State.

The police union in Victoria is seeking an additional 2 000 officers, and the Federal police union wants an increase in detective strength of 1 200 over the next three years. Even the equivalent body in New Zealand is conducting a campaign to boost police strength.

The only problem is that the union campaign ignores any semblance of reality when it comes to the economic and financial constraints that have been imposed on State Governments throughout the nation. Overall, the cut-back in funding imposed on Queensland at the Premiers Conference was some \$400m. How the union expects the Police Department to be exempt from the same financial constraints as those that affect other departments escapes me and demonstrates a rather naive outlook on the part of that union.

The Queensland Government's record on funding and police manpower levels over the past decade reflects this Government's strong support for its police force. This will continue despite the unfounded criticisms of the Queensland Police Union. For the information of the honourable member, I point out that over the last decade police-funding in Queensland has increased by nearly 200 per cent, compared with the CPI increase over the same period of 107 per cent. Police strength over that period has risen by nearly 32 per cent, compared with a population growth of 21.5 per cent.

Port Petersen

Sir WILLIAM KNOX: I direct a question without notice to the Deputy Premier. In regard to the public statements that have been made that Port Petersen will be a port that will cater for goods other than coal, I ask: is it amongst the considerations for Port Petersen that it might well become a duty-free port?

Mr GUNN: I have a better memory than the honourable member for Nundah, because the Premier answered this question recently when he stated that Port Petersen would be used for cargo other than coal. As to its becoming a duty-free port—that matter will have to be looked into. It is a matter for the Federal Government and I cannot answer that part of the question, but the Premier has already answered the other part of the question.

Reporting of Private Companies to Corporate Affairs Commissioner's Office

Mr CAMPBELL: In directing a question without notice to the Minister for Justice, I refer to the record number of bankruptcies occurring in Queensland and the subsequent difficult financial consequences to small businesses, subcontractors, suppliers and the public who deal with those businesses which are in liquidation or are bankrupt. When the public endeavours to check the financial position of private companies that are registered in Queensland with the Corporate Affairs Commissioner's Office, the companies' financial reports are up to three years out of date and late in lodgment. I ask the Minister: what action will he take to ensure that private companies improve their reporting within the statutory requirements in order that the public can be protected in business dealings with Queensland-based private companies?

Mr CLAUSON: When companies fail to lodge their annual reports, a notice is put out by the Corporate Affairs Commissioner's Office to that company. Unfortunately, because of circumstances, on some occasions the personnel involved in those companies are not available and other exigencies arise. My staff are unable to force companies to lodge those returns in the normal course of their obligations. However, the Corporate Affairs Commissioner's Office is continually aware of this matter and is monitoring it very carefully in order to ensure that Queenslanders can check the necessary information. I note that, in his question, the honourable member referred to bankruptcies. I trust that he meant private companies as opposed to ordinary operating firms.

Interest Rate Concessions for Farmers

Mr CAMPBELL: I direct my second question to the Deputy Premier, Mr Gunn. It concerns interest rates charged to farmers by the QIDC. From December 1986 the standard interest rate charged was 17.75 per cent. It has now dropped to 15.75 per cent. However, the concessional interest rate charged to farmers has remained at 13.5 per cent. I ask: in view of the fact that other interest rates have reduced, could the Minister please review the situation and determine whether there could be a reduction in the concessional interest rate charged to farmers? Secondly, will an annual report be produced by the QIDC—similar to the one produced by the Rural Reconstruction Board—providing detailed information of lending to farmers?

Mr GUNN: For the information of the honourable member, I point out that 70 per cent of the loans in the rural sector have been provided at an interest rate of 13.5 per cent, the remaining 30 per cent of the loans being provided at 17.5 per cent. I think that the honourable member, in his question, referred to a figure of 17.75 per cent. The prime rate is 17.5 per cent and the rate that is used in 70 per cent of the loans is 13.5 per cent. So the Queensland Government is providing a great deal of assistance. In the future, the Queensland Government will be looking at interest rates that are charged on those loans.

As to rural reconstruction loans—funding from the Commonwealth has been cut back by 60 per cent. In effect, that means that this year only 200 Queenslanders will benefit under the Rural Adjustment Scheme, compared with 574 last year. The honourable member should be using all of his endeavours to convince his colleagues in Canberra that many areas of Queensland are suffering from drought. He should be helping as much as he can in that way. Already, 200 people have benefited from the Rural Adjustment Scheme. It means that, for the remainder of the financial year, owing to restraints imposed by the Commonwealth Government, it will not be possible to provide further help in that area.

I am prepared to table the QIDC report in this House.

Australian Bureau of Criminal Intelligence Briefing to Cabinet

Mr INNES: In directing a question to the Deputy Premier, Minister Assisting the Treasurer and Minister for Police, I point out that my question is in four parts and that they are fairly short.

I refer to the statement made yesterday by the Minister. I now ask—

- (1) Prior to August 1985, had the entire Queensland Cabinet ever been personally briefed by the Australian Bureau of Criminal Intelligence or any national crime-fighting organisation?
- (2) Has any other Australian Cabinet or State Cabinet been similarly briefed to date?
- (3) Why was the usual Cabinet procedure of briefing the Commissioner of Police and the Minister for Police not sufficient?
- (4) Has the Deputy Premier placed the information from that briefing before the Fitzgerald inquiry?

Mr GUNN: I met officers of the Australian Bureau of Criminal Intelligence. Certain requests were made by the Fitzgerald inquiry. John Avery, the Commissioner of Police in New South Wales, is the present chairman of the Australian Bureau of Criminal Intelligence. Any information that can be given to the Fitzgerald inquiry will be given to it by that particular body. The Queensland Cabinet has a very close liaison with the Australian Bureau of Criminal Intelligence. I refer the honourable member to the statement that I made yesterday in this Chamber.

Of course, it is common for the ABCI to move into every State and to provide information. I have the utmost respect for that body. It is in constant contact with the Queensland Cabinet. Naturally enough, Cabinet seeks its advice and acts on it.

On one occasion Cabinet had been given information relative to the workings of the ABCI. Generally, it is given only to me and to the Commissioner of Police. It is important that Cabinet members be aware of the role of the ABCI and the work that it does. An information paper was supplied on the last occasion. I am sure that everybody found it interesting.

I appreciate the co-operation that the Cabinet receives from the ABCI. I applaud it for that. I appreciate the fact that officers of the ABCI came to Brisbane yesterday. Members of the ABCI spoke to Mr Fitzgerald, and I am sure that he received information from them.

Australian Bureau of Criminal Intelligence Briefing to Cabinet

Mr INNES: In asking a second question of the Minister for Police, I repeat: has the Minister provided the Fitzgerald inquiry so far with full details of the briefing that he was given? Secondly, was the name "Bellino" used in that briefing that the Minister was given?

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Premier may refuse to answer that question on the grounds of sub judice.

Mr GUNN: I have no intention of relaying that information to this Chamber.

Resources Rent Tax

Mr HOBBS: In directing a question to the Minister for Northern Development and Community Services, I refer to the Resources Rent Tax Bill that is currently being rushed through the House of Representatives in a cognate debate. I ask: is the Minister in a position to describe the impact of this further tax on the price of fuel at the bowser? What is the likely impact of that scenario on the development of decentralisation in northern Australia?

Mr KATTER: During a time of troubled economic conditions in Australia, it is quite extraordinary that "Senator Bigglesworth", as he is known these days—Gareth Evans——

A Government member: The lighthouse thief.

Mr KATTER: Yes, the lighthouse thief.

Senator Evans has now dreamed up a magnificent proposal known as the resources rent tax. Because it imposes a 40 per cent tax on oil at the well-head, that tax is very serious indeed. There will be a dramatic change in the way in which the taxation will be levied, because the costs involved in exploration can only be offset against profits when the exploration takes place in that particular field. Unless explorations are confined to an area close to where oil is found, there is certainly no way that they will be tax deductible.

The obvious implications are that nobody will search for oil in Australia. There will be no tax deductibility whatsoever. Those people who are making profits at present will have no profits with which to finance further exploration. The result will be that we will be at the mercy of people such as the Middle East producers to whom we will have to turn for our source of oil.

The implications of the tax are that there will be an immediate 10 or 20 per cent rise in the cost of fuel in Australia. In some of the isolated parts of Queensland, such as Weipa and Burketown, people are now paying in excess of 70c per litre for fuel. Within the next two years, when the resources rent tax becomes a reality, even in Charleville people will be paying well over 70c per litre for fuel.

It must be impressed upon all honourable members in this House that it was Senator Evans who introduced the gold tax. He played around with that tax for three years. The net result was that only 250 000 ounces of gold were produced in north Queensland. Once the gold tax was removed, approximately 30 mines in north Queensland

went into production. I estimate that, by the end of next year, north Queensland will be producing in excess of 1 million ounces of gold. Senator Evans' tomfoolery cost the economy of Australia, just from north Queensland alone, some \$300m per year. Having managed to foul up the gold industry, Senator Evans is now turning his attentions to the oil industry. It is a very sad day for Australia.

Moneys Owing to Totalisator Administration Board

Mr GATELY: I direct a question to the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing. In view of allegations by Mr Malcolm Wallace-Mitchell and others, I ask: are there any moneys owing to the TAB as a result of any telephone or other betting activities by any person, whether from the general public, a TAB employee, a TAB board member or a former board member?

Mr HINZE: Other than normal sundry debtor accounts involved in the day-to-day running of the board's operation, the only amounts owing to the board are as follows—

\$12,164—**Mr B. J. Nicholson:** this amount is being repaid by monthly instalments. Mr Nicholson was the board's agent in Finch Hatton and was responsible for a cash deficiency of \$16,200 as a result of actions by a person working in his office. Mr Nicholson is no longer an agent and has since repaid \$4,100 of the debt. He is attempting to sell property to repay the balance of the debt. The board's solicitors are pursuing this matter.

\$1,164—**Mrs Fenech and Mrs Sigel:** this amount represents a balance of a cash deficiency in Hendra office some 10 years ago. Irregular payments are made and the debt has been reduced from \$5,000 over this period of time.

\$1,950—**Mrs S. Seaton, TAB agent, Dirranbandi:** this money represents the balance of a loss occasioned by this agent caused by cashing two cheques from a TAB customer which subsequently were dishonoured. The customer was well known to the agent, and she had no reason to suspect that he had insufficient funds to meet the cheque. The transaction took place on a Saturday when there were no banking facilities. Dirranbandi suffers from bank facilities only being available on two days per week.

No debts are otherwise owed by the general public or an employee. No board member is indebted to the board in any way or on any account whatsoever.

I thank the honourable member for the question. I went to the trouble of getting the response in detail because there were rumours circulating in the House yesterday that large sums of money were owing to the TAB.

Use of Central Business Area of Coolangatta by Heavy Transport Vehicles

Mr GATELY: I direct a second question to the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing. In view of the unreasonable burden placed on the central business area of Coolangatta by continuous use of Griffith Street, Coolangatta by heavy transport vehicles and the continued delay to development of that area and the New South Wales by-pass, I ask: is it possible for him, through the Main Roads Department and/or the Local Government Department, separately or in conjunction with the Gold Coast City Council, to direct immediately that all heavy transport vehicles use the appropriate route via the new by-pass from the Gold Coast Highway to Kennedy Drive, which was constructed by the Government, with Kennedy Drive being the temporary by-pass road as designated by the Newcastle/Sydney/Wollongong Labor Government, and cease forthwith travelling via Marine Parade, McLean Street and Griffith Street into New South Wales?

Mr HINZE: In view of transport requirements of business in the Coolangatta/Tweed—

Mr Burns: You had another set of notes in your pocket? Another rumour yesterday?

Mr HINZE: This is what people might refer to as "off the cuff".

Mr Burns: Well, you've got a big enough cuff.

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Mr HINZE: I am sure that the honourable member does not want to go out again, Mr Speaker.

In view of transport requirements of business in the Coolangatta/Tweed area, it is impractical to prohibit heavy vehicles from using the streets in the area. However, I am prepared to have the Main Roads Department engage in discussions with local authorities involved and the relevant New South Wales local authorities with a view to minimising the adverse effects of heavy vehicles using the streets of Coolangatta, as indicated by the honourable member.

Crime, Salisbury Electorate; Police Station, Mains Road, Sunnybank

Mr ARDILL: I ask the Deputy Premier and Minister for Police: is he being kept informed continually of the situation in the Salisbury electorate in relation to the unlawful acts of breaking and entering, arson and assault, which indicate that police are totally incapable of controlling the situation with present methods of operation and staffing levels? When will further consideration be given to the establishment of a police station in the vicinity of Mains Road, Sunnybank, as requested by many thousands of alarmed citizens and business people?

A Government member: Who is this bloke? Where did you come from?

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member for Salisbury.

Mr ARDILL: Mr Speaker, I spend more time in this House than the Minister does; I can assure you of that.

Government members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member for Salisbury.

Mr ARDILL: If funds are not presently available to build a police station, will action be taken to acquire land before options are closed?

Mr GUNN: Mr Speaker, I suggest that you get the honourable member a cushion, because I can hardly see him from here.

Having said that, however, I inform the House that I have had some reports from Salisbury but I have, as yet, never had a report from the honourable member for Salisbury. I would appreciate it, when he has any problems, if he would write a letter, put a stamp on it, and send it to me.

I appreciate that there are problems in some areas. The research and planning branch is looking after those matters. I suggest that on future occasions, if the honourable member does have special problems, he get in touch with me.

Mr ARDILL: I hope that the Minister to whom I address my next question will stick to the truth. I had drawn that matter to the Minister's attention.

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Mr ARDILL: I place on notice a question to the Minister for Works and Housing, and I am sure that I will get a truthful answer from him.

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Aboriginal Housing

Mr NEWTON: In directing a question to the Minister for Northern Development and Community Services, I refer to recent events at Brewarrina and Toomelah, and I ask: can the Minister advise the House what actions are being undertaken by the

Queensland Government in the field of housing? How does that action compare with the actions of the Commonwealth Government in the field of housing?

Mr KATTER: I assume that the honourable member is referring to Aboriginal housing. I must say that the Queensland Government is very proud of the design house that has been produced by Ralph Power and Associates for a number of the community councils in Queensland. The house was on display recently at Bundaberg. The member for Bundaberg, the Minister for Education, and members representing surrounding electorates—for example, Mr Slack—certainly inspected the house. They are thanked for their very fine comments about it.

The house contains static air-conditioning, without any moving parts, so that the house, because of its design, cools itself. Even though the design has been changed from two roofs to five roofs, effectively, and some 15.5 squares of space, it is expected that the price to build such a house this year will actually be less than the cost of the houses that were built previously.

The houses are very robust. They are designed to handle all conditions. Modifications on the design of the houses will be carried out so that people are able to build the houses themselves. In consequence of discussions with the Minister for Works and Housing and the Minister for Family Services, I think a house can be developed for people who are not rich so that they, too, can enjoy excellent housing models and very comfortable houses at a price that even the poorest people can afford, if in fact they are prepared to build them themselves.

I might also add that in the field of housing 130 jobs have been created—at one stage this year it was 195 jobs—for people of Aboriginal descent. That has been done by substituting second-hand houses that were produced earlier. It is felt that an excellent house has been produced. I have been unable to uncover—and I would invite any member of this House to bring to my attention—any situation similar to Brewarrina and Toomelah and other disgraceful settlements that exist across the border in New South Wales. If any member brings that to my attention, I will be only too happy to attend to it immediately. However, so far we have been unable to uncover any similar situation existing anywhere in Queensland. One hundred and thirty jobs have been created and, for the same cost, a house has been produced that is almost twice the size of the houses that were originally produced.

Proposed Sale of Shafston House

Mr NEWTON: I ask the Minister for Northern Development and Community Services: could he advise the House whether discussions have taken place with agents selling Shafston House? Has the Commonwealth Government, as owner of this valuable piece of Queensland heritage, moved to prevent purchase and heritage listing by the Queensland Government? I ask him further: has the Federal Government moved to put the building up for sale at open auction and is it possible that developers could completely destroy that house as well as the giant trees and the small park in the grounds of a property that has been known for 100 years as Shafston House?

Mr KATTER: Shafston House is a beautiful old house with about 3½ acres of rolling parkland around it which contains one of the biggest Moreton Bay fig trees, and also one of the oldest trees, in Queensland. Discussions were held with a view to bringing the matter to the attention of Cabinet. The figure of \$1m was raised with the agents for the Federal Government. They said that they would contact the Federal Government. Next week they came back with a figure of \$2m and news that the property was going to public auction, which was not indicated the week before.

It became obvious very rapidly to the Queensland Government when it moved to protect this house, which is a vital part of the State's heritage, that the Federal Government moved immediately to put the house out onto the open market, as a result of which developers could buy it for redevelopment. There is no way that anyone could justify \$2m except for redevelopment.

That is the very Government that has in the last few weeks proposed a monorail around Ayers Rock, has torn down Cape Bowling Green Lighthouse and has repainted all of the 16 000-year-old Wadjuna Aboriginal paintings in the Northern Territory with Berger Breeze. The Federal Government has introduced into the World Heritage area in Tasmania housing that consists of honan matting, blue tarps and old used car seats. It has introduced mining into Kakadu Park. In Queensland's national parks no mining is allowed. Only the Federal Government allows mining in national parks.

The Federal Government wants 12 000 square kilometres of Queensland to be under its jurisdiction, safety and security. Who in his right mind in Australia would put a Government with that sort of record in charge of anything? It would be similar to appointing Jumbo the circus elephant as manager of one's antique dealership.

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

COMMONWEALTH PARLIAMENTARY ASSOCIATION (QUEENSLAND BRANCH)

Annual General Meeting

Mr SPEAKER: I remind all honourable members that at 1 p.m. today an annual general meeting of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association (Queensland Branch) will be held in this Chamber.

At 11 a.m.,

In accordance with the provisions of the Sessional Order, the House went into Committee of Supply.

SUPPLY

Estimates—Tenth Allotted Day

Estimates-in-Chief, 1987-88

Tourism, National Parks and Sport

Department of the Arts, National Parks and Sport

Debate resumed from 28 October (see p. 3635).

Mr De LACY (Cairns) (11.01 a.m.): So far during debate on the Tourism Estimates all honourable members have been worshipping at the altar of tourism and saying what a great thing it is. Today I will strike a discordant note and commit a few heresies. However, let me begin with the disclaimer that I am speaking today simply as the member for Cairns, as a long-term resident of Cairns and as a person who was born there and lives there by choice. I am deeply concerned about the direction of development in far-north Queensland and where it is taking us.

Today I want to speak about the darker side of the tourism boom. The reason I began with the disclaimer is that, as I talk about the negatives associated with the tourism boom, I would not necessarily want the ALP in general to be associated with that negativity. To start with, that would not be fair. I think it is fair to say that at a national level John Brown has been the most successful Minister for Tourism and promoter of tourism that Australia has ever had. Even the most churlish and parochial National Party members would have to confess that the *Crocodile Dundee* promotional advertisements by Paul Hogan have been the most successful promotional exercise that has ever been conducted on the world stage. Of course, they were promoted by the Australian Tourism Commission and the Australian Labor Government.

Yesterday in this Chamber the Minister and most of those who spoke after him presumed to claim the credit for the tourism boom in Queensland. Let me say that the

tourism boom has nothing to do with the National Party Government and nothing to do with the National Party. The primary reason for the tourism boom is that Queensland has wonderful natural attractions. In the long run the kinds of artificial attractions that gain the attention of the National Party most of the time will not bring tourists to Queensland; in fact, they run the very real risk of killing the goose that laid the golden egg.

Another reason for the tourism boom, if Government members want to hear it, is the devaluation of the Australian dollar, which simply made it so much more attractive for Japanese, American and European people to come to Australia. It has certainly been a disincentive for Australians to travel overseas, so more are holidaying in Australia. Another reason is that Queensland is one of the last tropical places on earth with a stable political system—and I mean “stable” in the sense of having a western democratic system.

Mr Newton: A National Party Government.

Mr De LACY: It has nothing at all to do with the National Party Government. If Bjelke-Petersen has left any legacy in Australia, it is the creation of unstable government. Our political stability comes from the Constitution and the nation's whole history as a western democratic country.

Mr Simpson: Why are you trying to sell it off?

Mr De LACY: It is members of the Government who are selling it off. I will come to that in a minute.

Mr Muntz: Why haven't New South Wales and Victoria had the same growth as we have had here in Queensland?

Mr De LACY: The answer to that is that they were settled before Queensland. New South Wales and Victoria are much more developed than Queensland. As I said, Queensland is now being seen as the last tropical outpost with a stable democratic system. It has nothing to do with the National Party at all. I know that members of the Government like to claim credit for it, but they simply cannot sustain their claims.

The Labor Party supports tourism. It believes that tourism is absolutely essential to our economy. Tourism creates wealth and employment, and it helps to lessen the balance of trade deficit. However, at a local level there are mixed blessings. There are as many undesirable side-effects of the tourism boom as there are benefits, and it is about time that some of these were spelt out.

The problem is not so much tourism as the rapid development associated with it, particularly in boom areas such as Cairns. A development mentality is raging in this State, which I believe to be unhealthy. It is a mindless pursuit of growth mentality with no concern for the consequences; in fact, no real understanding that there may even be undesirable consequences.

A Government member interjected.

Mr De LACY: I wish members of the Government would listen. I am speaking as a resident of Cairns. I ask Government members to take into consideration the bad things that are happening in Cairns instead of making mindless and inane interjections that show no quota of intelligence at all.

I am not speaking lightly when I say that a development boom is taking place in Cairns. In fact, it is frightening. At present, more international hotel rooms are being constructed in Cairns than in Sydney.

I will examine the scene. The Pacific International Hotel, with 200 rooms, was constructed in 1983. It was the trail-blazer, the one that set the pace. After that came the deluge: the Rodeway Granada International, with 100 rooms, at a cost of \$11m; the Cairns Colonial Club, with 200 rooms, at a cost of \$12m, with a further 200 rooms now

being added; the Harbourside Quality Inn, with 100 rooms, at a cost of \$10m; the Tradewinds Outrigger, with 94 rooms, at a cost of \$5m; the Ramada Reef Resort, with 196 rooms, at a cost of \$15m; the Kewarra Beach Resort, for which I have no details; and the Tradewinds Esplanade, with 200 rooms, at a cost of \$24m.

Presently under construction in Cairns is the Hilton Hotel, with 250 rooms, at a cost of \$57m. It is due to be opened in November this year, and I understand that it is to be duplicated almost immediately with another 250 rooms. The Park Royal Cairns is due to be opened next year. It will have 300 rooms and it will cost \$65m. In addition, there is the Mirage Resort at Port Douglas, with 350 rooms, costing \$150m. Construction has commenced on the 14-storey twin tower high rise near the hospital and on the Cairns International Hotel on The Esplanade, which will have 190 rooms, costing \$24m.

Mr Gilmore interjected.

Mr De LACY: I will answer the honourable member's interjections later.

Recently, Martin Tenni announced plans for a \$50m pier project next to the Marlin Marina in Cairns, which will include a 200-room international-standard hotel.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I have repeatedly requested honourable members to refer to other honourable members by their correct parliamentary titles.

Mr De LACY: I apologise. I should have said the Honourable Minister for Water Resources and Maritime Services, Mr Tenni, recently announced plans for a \$50m pier project. That is on the Cairns Port Authority land. In addition, the \$10m Trinity Wharf Transit and Tourist Centre is being constructed at No. 1 wharf.

On the other side of Trinity Inlet is the False Cape Resort, with 250 rooms, worth \$30m, and The Queenslander, wherever that is—I came across it only recently in some literature—with 100 rooms, worth \$11m. The McKellar Corporation has a \$40m resort under construction at Palm Cove, and of course the Daikyo Kenko \$200m resort is still to be built at Palm Cove. Incidentally, that includes a marina that will be carved out of land and will cut the beach in half. Doug Tarca also has plans for a \$100m resort at Ellis Beach.

Concern is being expressed at present about the prospect of McKellar Corporation proceeding with a \$500m integrated resort development on 82 hectares of reclaimed mudflats, which is the equivalent of 24 city blocks, right in the centre of Trinity Bay, in the middle of Cairns. Judging by what is being said about the casino at Townsville, maybe there will be another push to establish a casino at Cairns, because that was the original proposal.

Twelve international flights per week now come into Cairns, and the new passenger cruise terminal that is being constructed at Trinity Wharf will be utilised by at least 14 ships in 1988. Those ships will disgorge up to 4 000 or 5 000 passengers.

Mr Newton: That is good.

Mr De LACY: All this boggles the imagination. I know that the honourable member for Glass House sees only the good, but I will tell him some of the bad.

All this assaults the senses. Imagine the situation facing a local person living in Cairns. He knows everybody. He is used to the free, easy, friendly and open life-style, the charm of the place, the luxuriant tropical landscape, the wide streets, the raised houses, the slow pace, and so on. What will he think?

Mr Simpson interjected.

Mr De LACY: If the honourable member for Cooroora had the capacity to think, and I am not sure that he has——

Mr Simpson: If your kids can't get a job?

Mr De LACY: I will come to jobs in a moment.

The locals are shell-shocked. They do not know what is going on, nor do I, and I wonder who does know. The wheeling and dealing that is occurring is incredible. It is like a Chinese market, except that it is all carried out behind closed doors, away from public scrutiny.

I will tell the Chamber what has occurred in relation to the Hilton Hotel that is being built by the Kern Corporation. It was sleazy enough to start off with, with the Minister for Local Government carrying out one of his infamous ministerial rezonings to Special Facilities in order to overcome objections, litigation and zoning problems. No-one knows at whose instigation this occurred—I believe I know, but it will not serve any purpose to mention it here—but it certainly was not on behalf of the people of Cairns. Could it be that the Kern Corporation has a close and cosy relationship with the Queensland Government?

Mr Newton: They still want to invest money there.

Mr De LACY: Yes, of course the corporation does.

Now that Stage 1 of the Hilton Hotel consisting of 240 rooms has been completed, the Kern Corporation wants to duplicate the exercise—or at least it did before the recent stock-market crash. It ought to have enough money to do that, because it has sold 50 per cent of the \$57m project to Daikyo Kenko for the sum of \$40m. The problem was that when the Kern Corporation wanted to duplicate the building, other people were using the wharf area in Cairns. Bodies such as Hayles Cairns Cruises and the yacht club were using the wharf for water-related activities. This is something that we have to come to grips with. Is the wharf to be used for water-related activities, or will hotels be built all over the wharf area and will the wharf and the yacht club be moved up onto the mountainside? That is not a major problem for someone who is in the know and has contacts.

Now the yacht club will get a brand new building on a piece of land that is still under the sea. It will be built by the Kern Corporation on reclaimed land excised from the McKellar option lease north of the new marina. Somehow this exercise will not be exposed to objections or possible litigation.

Hayles Cruises goes into new facilities close to the No. 1 wharf, which I understand will also be constructed by Kern. The Kern Corporation gets the desired piece of prime waterfront real estate next to the existing hotel. The Minister steps in once again and rezones it Special Facilities.

Everybody in the garden is happy. The Kern Corporation is happy because it gets the land. The yacht club and Hayles Cruises are happy because they get new premises. The port authority is happy because of substantially increased lease rental. The Government is happy because it has helped out its mates—nobody has missed out. The only casualty has been democracy, open government, the right of people to object and possibly any other developer who might have had an alternative submission or proposal to put forward. No other developer was consulted. All that is left now is for the Queensland Government to grant the developers freehold title to the lease, and everything will be hunky-dory. I am advised that this is in the pipeline because the Japanese are not too interested in leases; they like freehold land.

People are attracted to Cairns. They visit Cairns and live there because they like the life-style, the wonderful natural environment and the climate for the nine months of the year. But both the life-style and the environment are under grave threat from development.

Mr Newton: You are against the tourist going there, are you?

Mr De LACY: The honourable member should listen to what I have to say instead of making mindless interjections that I cannot pick up because they are too mindless. Maybe we are operating on a different wavelength.

The Pacific Area Travel Association (PATA) report in 1981 made the point that it takes a lot of time and money to get to places such as Cairns. If the natural attractions are allowed to become degraded and commonplace and indistinguishable from other Australian and American cities, then people will not bother going there; they will move on, seeking other places with that essential character—some other places that are unique.

That is why I am highly offended when I see advertisements such as the one I have in my hand, lodged in journals all round the world, depicting the faces of Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen and the Minister, Don Lane, who are flogging off a piece of important Cairns real estate—namely, the railway station——

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I have already asked the honourable member to refer to other honourable members by their correct titles.

Mr De LACY: The Honourable the Minister. In the heat of debate, I could not think of his correct title.

The document states, "The search is over". Cairns is one of Queensland's natural attractions. The document states——

"Cairns shares the same time zone as Japan and is set to become 'THE NEW HAWAII'."

I make the point that the people of Cairns do not want Cairns to become the new Hawaii. Do honourable members know what has happened in Hawaii? The Japanese have bought all the real estate there. They own all the hotels on Waikiki Beach. The Hawaiians do not live in Honolulu any more; they have had to move out to other islands. That is just what we do not want in Cairns.

Mr Borbidge: There's more in the Hawaiian islands than Waikiki.

Mr De LACY: Yes, but the Premier is talking about Honolulu and Waikiki. He is trying to turn Cairns into one of those places. I want to place on record that the average person in Cairns—the ordinary bloke—does not want Cairns to be the new Hawaii. I point out to Mr Borbidge that we do not want Cairns to be the new Surfers Paradise or the new Sydney. We want Cairns to remain as Cairns.

Mr Muntz interjected.

Mr De LACY: I know that we have to make compromises for tourism. I am putting forward the view that there are many down sides to the tourism boom, and I will deal with them later.

As I have said on countless occasions, it never ceases to amaze me that people come to Cairns fleeing the rat race of the big cities and the concrete jungles, yet as soon as they get to Cairns they seek to re-create the type of conditions from which they have just fled.

Over the years, it has been considered a heresy to question the benefits of tourism. I am about to commit that heresy. Let me say that the undesirable side-effects created by rapid development are starting to become obvious to everyone in Cairns, especially the locals. People in Cairns are apprehensive, not about any particular project or about tourism in particular, but about the pace of development or the prospect of overdevelopment.

It is becoming obvious in Cairns that the rapid development based on tourism tends to destroy the easy life-style, degrade the environment, create pollution, put pressure on scarce resources such as the beaches and the fish in the inlet, increase the social problems and crime rates, raise the cost of private accommodation, local government rates, services and goods, and create resentment and alienation amongst local people as their needs take second place to the needs of the tourists.

Mr Newton: So you don't like development?

Mr De LACY: I know that the honourable member is sitting there dumfounded. He has never heard these things said before. He speaks only to developers—the quick-quid merchants. He never sits down and talks to the ordinary person about the way in which tourism is affecting them.

Mr Simpson: What about the unemployed?

Mr De LACY: I point out to the honourable member for Cooroora that one of the great myths of tourism is that it solves the unemployment problem. If that is so, why is it that, with the exception of Aboriginal communities in Queensland, the regions with the highest unemployment rates in Queensland are the Gold Coast, the Sunshine Coast and Cairns? The State Government's own study into unemployment in Queensland made that point graphically.

The 1986 population census revealed that the Cairns City Council area has an unemployment rate of 16.27 per cent. The Mulgrave Shire Council area has an unemployment rate of 15.2 per cent—twice the State average.

Mr Simpson: And an employment growth twice that of anywhere else.

Mr De LACY: I am coming to that.

In the Cairns employment district as at 30 June 1987, 6 619 people were registered as unemployed. In the Westcourt employment district, which is the second largest employment district in Cairns, 3 206 people were listed as unemployed. That represents a total of 9 825 people registered as unemployed in an area with a statistical population of approximately 90 000. Therefore, just over 10 per cent of the population is unemployed. Taken as a percentage of the work-force, that represents approximately 20 per cent unemployment in that boom area. How can this Government claim that tourism solves the unemployment problem? Of course, it does create employment, but so do a variety of other things. What must be understood is that unemployment cannot be solved in microcosm.

Time expired.

Mr BORBIDGE (Surfers Paradise) (11.21 a.m.): In supporting the Estimates, I cannot help but remark on the exercise of bigotry that this Chamber has just witnessed from the honourable member for Cairns. It is quite incredible that a member who represents such an intensive tourist area as Cairns——

Mr Simpson: Is such a knocker.

Mr BORBIDGE: As the honourable member for Cooroora said, Mr De Lacy is such a knocker. I am sure that the hundreds and thousands of young people in Cairns who are being employed directly or indirectly as a result of tourism development in that region will not be impressed by their local economic guru, the honourable member who has just preceded me in this debate. Honourable members on the Government side of this Chamber should try to ensure that Mr De Lacy's speech is widely distributed amongst people who earn their incomes and livelihoods from the tourist industry in that great part of the State.

Just as I am proud of my electorate of Surfers Paradise and the tourism development that we have enjoyed in that region, the honourable member opposite should be as well.

It has been stated that tourism has saved the Australian economy. If that is so, the efforts of this Government through the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation assume even greater significance. Since its inception in 1979, the QTTC has established itself as an innovator, a pace-setter and the catalyst of this State's unrivalled economic growth.

Consider the facts. The corporation was given a charter to convert a low-key tourist industry and put it on the map to make Queensland Australia's leading holiday destination and to make our State a major force in the Pacific and Asian regions. That has been achieved by both conventional and unconventional means. At times, the corporation

has been aggressive and controversial. It has had to reflect the dynamism of the industry that it serves. Ultimately, it will become less reliant on the tax-payer. In the process, Queensland has led Australia in tourism growth. The QTTC is now the largest wholesaler and retailer of holidays in Australia.

Mr Palaszczuk: Shameful! Disgraceful! It's a gross socialistic attitude.

Mr BORBIDGE: During 1986-87 the QTTC had sales of approximately \$60m, which generated—for the benefit of the honourable member who interjected—an estimated \$6m in commission to flow back into the promotion of tourism in Queensland without cost to the tax-payers of this State.

This year, the corporation has a budget of \$26.944m, with \$15.135m being provided from consolidated revenue. Queensland now has an industry that is worth \$4.3 billion, with an indirect value to the Queensland economy of \$9 billion, which provides 145 000 jobs. The honourable member for Cairns did not seem to believe that those jobs were being created by the tourism and hospitality industries.

Queensland is accounting for 50 per cent of Australia's major tourist development projects and 80 per cent of all such investment in regional Australia. One would assume that such a record of achievement would result in at least grudging acknowledgement from the Opposition benches. But that just does not happen in this Parliament, as the Opposition champions of sacred-cow preservation, of anti-development, of opposition to greater flexibility in the labour market and of reluctance to accept the dangers of the politics of envy wallow uncomfortably in the face of reality. The simple fact is that the State Government, through the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation, has generated massive industry investment that is in turn leading visitors by the nose into Queensland.

There are, however, two areas of concern that impact in a negative manner on tourism in this State. Both relate directly to the failure of the Federal Government to resolve long-standing discrimination against Queensland by the mandarins of the Federal aviation bureaucracy who for too long in this country have been accountable to no-one but themselves. Those people have treated the tourism industry of this State with contempt.

I refer firstly to the immoral imbalance in international air services to Queensland and the incredible decision by the Hawke Government to defer a new international passenger terminal for Brisbane, even when private enterprise offered to build it without cost to the tax-payer, all for the reason that the Sydney/Melbourne axis can be preserved—a blatantly political decision by the Federal Government.

Mr Elliott: The golden triangle.

Mr BORBIDGE: The golden triangle, as the honourable member for Cunningham calls it.

Indeed, the lack of investment by the Commonwealth in new international terminal facilities is a major concern. Sydney's terminal is run down, congested and filthy. Brisbane's international air terminal is a joke, and most other gateways, with the exception of Cairns and Perth, are clearly inadequate.

In Queensland we currently have \$1.2 billion of tourism development under construction, with a further \$3 billion committed, representing 15 200 new rooms, or 54 per cent of the Australian total, being built or committed. Yet we have only 5 per cent of the North American seat capacity compared with 81 per cent of that capacity being allocated to New South Wales. Queensland produces 27 per cent of all bed nights for that market, compared with 32 per cent for New South Wales. But New South Wales has been given 16 times the seat capacity made available by the Federal Government for roughly the same number of visitor nights. When will we see anyone from the Opposition in this place make a stand for the people of Queensland? The jobs go where the planes land.

Mr Muntz: Would you agree that an open skies airline policy for 1987 is the only way to go, that Qantas has nothing to lose?

Mr BORBIDGE: I totally agree with the comments made by the Minister. We should have an open skies policy. Qantas is a great airline. It would be able to compete in that sort of environment. It is vital that we let in people who want to come in. At the moment there is a Federal Government policy that says that cannot happen. It amounts to an outrageous level of discrimination against Queensland tourism and Queensland jobs.

I notice that, having been dragged to the line, in the House of Representatives yesterday the Federal Minister for Tourism, Mr Brown, somewhat belatedly acknowledged that a review was necessary. I suggest to the Committee that Tourism Minister Brown's credibility is on the line. It is no good Mr Brown and the Federal Government crowing about what they have been doing for tourism if they continue to deny access to this State by airlines and by tourists and visitors who want to come here. The facts remain that for years the zealots in the self-centred bureaucracy in Canberra have betrayed Queensland tourism. Surely in any debate such as this members on both sides of the Chamber should be saying to the Hawke Government, "Let the planes in. Give us our just entitlement of international air services because, after all, it is tourism in Queensland that has saved the national economy."

Mr Vaughan: Did you say this to Fraser and Howard?

Mr BORBIDGE: I take the interjection made by the honourable member for Nudgee. The Queensland Government did. The airline policy has been a problem for a very long time. Previous Federal Governments are just as guilty as the existing Federal Government, but the point is that the Federal colleagues of the honourable member for Nudgee are the Government of the day. The Federal Government has it within its power to open up the skies tomorrow. I would suggest to the honourable member that if he is fair dinkum, he should be talking to his colleagues.

Let me turn now to examine the attitude of the honourable member's Federal colleagues. Let me examine the Federal Government's foul-ups in aviation and what they are costing the people of Queensland. I refer to a report in the *Sunday Sun* on 4 October which states—

"Setbacks at airport may cost a fortune

Brisbane may miss out on three international flights a week because of setbacks to the completion of the new airport.

And 900 passengers a week may be forced to pay for expensive stop-overs in Sydney or Melbourne before footing the bill for a domestic flight back to Brisbane.

New airline schedules, drawn-up on the assurance the airport would be operational this month, may now be defunct.

. . .

The postponement of the opening until February next year means certain flights in the new schedules will violate the existing curfew.

British Airways publicity officer Belinda Howell said carriers were told some months ago to submit new schedules but not worry about curfews.

'We had our schedule approved but now they tell us the airport won't be ready until February', Ms Howell said.

She said two suggestions had been put to Transport Minister Gareth Evans—use the new runway now since it is finished or use the old runway but have the curfew lifted.

'Both these proposals have been rejected,' she said."

The new airport is another example of bungling by the Federal Government when it comes to aviation policy as it affects Queensland.

Not long ago, the people of Queensland were treated to the amazing spectacle of the Minister for Finance, Senator Walsh, saying to a group of Labor lawyers in Perth that the Federal Government had sunk \$650m into an airport "for which there was no need". They were the words used by Senator Walsh, who is one of the senior members of the Labor Government. What have Opposition members done about that?

Anyone who uses Brisbane Airport knows how hopelessly inadequate it is. Now Brisbane will be left with its disgraceful international terminal—which sits on the land like a tin shed in a bush paddock—until 1991, in spite of the fact that private enterprise made it known to the Federal Government that it would be happy to build a new airport. The Federal Government said "No" as part of its deliberate policy to preserve the Sydney/Melbourne alliance.

It is the role and responsibility of government to create the essential environment to capture the entrepreneurial mood, and to provide confidence and political stability to encourage investment. Through a whole range of policies, the Queensland Government has been doing exactly that.

The Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation has been a great success story. It has been an example of a quango providing a bridge between private enterprise and government and has returned to this State many times the investment made in it on behalf of the tax-payer. I congratulate Sir Frank Moore—a great Australian—on his stewardship of the QTTC. I am sure that the story of tourism in Queensland is just beginning.

I noted in an article that appeared on my desk yesterday that in 1979 a mere 8 000 Japanese tourists found their way to Queensland, representing 19 per cent of all Japanese tourists who ventured to Australia in preference to their more traditional destinations of Hawaii, the United States or Europe. The article stated also that in 1988 the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation expects that up to 115 000 tourists will be seeking accommodation in Queensland tourist resorts and that that number of tourists will represent approximately one half of all Japanese tourists who arrive in Australia.

The Gold Coast continues to be an area of major significance—the area of major significance—in the growth of Australian tourism. As at 31 March 1987 the value of projects recently completed, under construction or firmly committed, totalled \$1.2 billion. Those projects include Jupiter's Casino, the Conrad International Hotel, Holiday Inn, Ramada, the Gold Coast International Hotel, the recently opened Sheraton-Mirage Resort on the Southport Spit, major extensions to Sea World, including a 228-room hotel, and a \$200m redevelopment of the Broadbeach International Hotel. Included also is the development of Sanctuary Cove, at a cost of some \$250m, which includes the Hyatt Regency Hotel.

Because it is a direct result of this Government's policy, I would also mention that De Laurentiis Entertainment Limited is establishing a major film studio complex at Coomera at a total cost of \$55m. Construction of the \$12m first stage is expected to be completed in December of this year, and a Universal Studios type theme park is being planned for a future stage of the complex.

The value of the Gold Coast Seaway, another major innovation of this Government, an investment of some \$40m plus, has provided an enormous economic boost to the Gold Coast. Many further developments have been committed, including a \$20m extension to Dreamworld, a \$200m resort and golfing complex at Ashmore, the \$200m 600-room Ocean Place international hotel, the \$120m 600-room Palm Avenue international hotel and the mooted redevelopment of the Chevron Hotel in Surfers Paradise.

Unlike the honourable member from the Opposition who preceded me in this debate, I am proud of that. I am proud to be a member of a Government that has encouraged and provided the right stewardship for that investment and the creation of those jobs and that wealth. I believe that all responsible members would also support these policies.

Mr Muntz: It has happened on the Gold Coast in these last few years. It is obvious there are no Liberal or Labor Party members down there.

Mr BORBIDGE: I take the Minister's interjection and I would suggest the fact that the Gold Coast has had members of Parliament who are all of the one political party and who are all working together as a team has certainly contributed to the great development that the Gold Coast has experienced in recent years.

I want to refer briefly to the Queensland Film Corporation, which, on 14 October last, in accordance with the provisions of the Queensland Film Industry Development Act, ceased to exist 10 years after its creation. It is important that we do not let certain events in the life of the corporation cloud what has been a very impressive record of achievement, arguably the finest of any of the State film bodies. Its most important single achievement is highly visible—I mentioned it before—namely, the De Laurentiis film studio complex just north of the Gold Coast. If not for the efforts of the Queensland Film Corporation and senior Treasury officers, that project would have gone to Sydney. It would have been lost to this State. But because of the QFC and Treasury, the focus of film production in Australia will now be on the Gold Coast.

Mr Newton: Another job-creating enterprise.

Mr BORBIDGE: As the member for Glass House says, it is another job-creating enterprise.

The Queensland Film Corporation has also provided assistance for the young and the little people of the industry. Many of the projects that were fostered came to fruition. Indeed, during the decade of the Queensland Film Corporation's existence, 168 film and television projects received financial support. Of those, 67 projects originated outside Queensland, but, as more local submissions were received, the total number of local applicants to receive assistance reached 99. In all, more than \$5m was committed towards the development of projects in Queensland, resulting in 51 projects totalling more than \$53m in production.

The implementation of the Queensland screen-training program and the young filmmakers' awards have provided valuable opportunities for many young Queenslanders. I express the hope that those very valuable schemes will continue into the future under the new structure within the department now that the Queensland Film Corporation has ceased to exist.

I congratulate the Minister on the handling of his portfolio. It is a diverse and challenging area of responsibility. He is dealing with the area of our economy that is the great growth area not only in this State but also across Australia. It will reap enormous benefits to this State and to its young people. In the advantages of the tourist industry the bottom line is its enormous ability to create jobs for young people where they happen to live.

I commend the Government on its initiatives. I congratulate the Minister on a job well done and I support the Estimates before the Committee.

Mr CASEY (Mackay) (11.40 a.m.): I am very pleased to be able to join in the debate today and to raise a couple of major issues that are of great significance to Queensland overall and of extreme importance to my electorate of Mackay and the entire Mackay region, which is one of Queensland's foremost tourist spots.

Just over 12 months ago, on 13 October 1986, two big announcements were made after a Cabinet meeting held in Mackay. The idea behind those announcements was that they were to be winning decisions for the National Party in Mackay. They were to be the things to get rid of Ed Casey, but over six or seven elections the people of Mackay had heard all this before and they knew full well which side their bread was buttered on and returned me as their member.

The first of the great announcements was about the relocation of the railway line at Mackay, an issue of contention for the 18 years that I have represented the area. The

announcement has now come before the Assembly in the form of a further relocation that will go right through the beautiful and magnificent southern approach to the city that has been enjoyed by tourists from throughout Australia, especially those who travel into Mackay by road. It is also known by the people of Mackay as the Lagoons area and is very much enjoyed by them. The Government intends to build a railway line right through the middle of that area, which will considerably spoil, if not destroy, that wonderful tourist aspect.

The Government had available to it other options that were acceptable to the local people, including the cane-growers, as a compromise, but apparently they were not acceptable to the Queensland Government. Consequently, as a result of that construction, the conflict between the people of Mackay and the Government will continue for a much longer period. The first and foremost reason for that is that the Government wretched on its first decision, which was made at that Cabinet meeting about a year ago. The railway line has not been relocated out of Mackay at all; it has simply been shifted, much like the deck-chairs on the Titanic. In many respects the new line will be just as bad as the old one.

The other announcement made on that day was a little bit more tragic for the region. It related to what has been called the mouth of the river project. On that day there was a major official opening of that project, which is one of the four that the QTTC had set aside as being the things that would really put Queensland on the tourism map. The first of those projects is now completed. I congratulate the QTTC, Qintex and the others involved in the new Sheraton Hotel at Port Douglas. It is a wonderful site and the development will be a great boost to tourism in this State.

The other three sites that were selected are also excellent, including the one at the mouth of the Pioneer River. It is a wonderful spot for a tourist project; I have never said anything other than that. However, it is a site that is fraught with technical and engineering problems, and I have said that from day one. Let me trace a little further what has happened. It took five years from the first announcement to get someone to the barrier. Perhaps I will say a little bit more about that later. I remind the Committee that after June, when the tenderer was supposedly selected, there were about six official announcements about a start being made on that project.

One month prior to the election the bulldozers, scrapers, graders and a few fellows with levels and so on moved in. They started marking out and pegging out hell, west and crooked.

By the next meeting of Cabinet, which was about a fortnight before the day of the State election, the site had been partly cleared. They had moved in and pushed over the mangrove. I did not object to that because, ecologically speaking, that mangrove had no great significance. However, the mangrove on the northern side of Bassett Basin across the river does have great significance to the mouth of the river, especially in regard to recreational fishing in the area. Nevertheless, that mangrove was cleared and the old sewerage pipeline and concrete sewerage tank were pushed over into a hole and part of the top of the site was levelled.

Subsequently, as in the days of the nomadic Arabs, tents were moved in. Tents were erected on the site, flags were flown, potted palms were put in place. A tower of Babel was built for viewing so that people could climb up and be shown that condominiums would go here, a hotel would go there, a marvellous resort over there, a boat marina here and so on. Then chicken and champagne was served from the Eskys.

You will be disappointed that you were not present at the official opening, Mr Chairman. I was not there because I was not invited to see the project, even though it is in the middle of my electorate and half a mile from where I live. However, I go for my early morning walk past that site, and I saw it all. Apart from that, I was busy helping the Labor Party to fight the election campaign.

As I said, the Arabs arrived, in the guise of National Party Cabinet Ministers, their staff, their friends and their cronies from around Mackay to eat chicken and champagne——

Mr MUNTZ: I rise to a point of order. I find quite offensive the remarks by the honourable member regarding State Cabinet Ministers, including myself, and other people who were involved and I ask that they be withdrawn.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I believe that it was an unreasonable comment. I ask the honourable member to withdraw it.

Mr CASEY: I take it from what the Minister said that the comment to which he objects is my comment associating him with the opening of the project. Is that correct?

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member will withdraw the statement about Ministers and their cronies.

Mr CASEY: Is it the word “cronies” that the Minister objects to?

Mr Muntz interjected.

Mr CASEY: I am a bit uncertain about what it is that the Minister objects to. However, I withdraw whatever it is that he objects to and simply say that National Party supporters, their friends and Ministers of the Crown descended just like the Arabs of old onto that Arab-like site with the tents, the potted plants, the flags flying and the tower of Babel. They arrived and ate the chicken and drank the champagne, which was nice and cold out of the Eskys.

The Premier got onto a big excavator and dug a couple of holes in the sand. Incidentally, those holes have since been filled in by the tides that wash in and out. The area has been neglected.

Mr Vaughan: Don't tell him that.

Mr CASEY: The honourable member for Nudgee should listen to the rest of the story.

The official opening was under way. Sir Joh said that he was glad to have been given the opportunity to launch the project. He said, “We will get Mackay moving. This is the ideal spot, without doubt or question, for such a great development. The Pioneer River development will mean a lot of jobs and a lot of tourists.”

The principal of the construction company said—

“The Pioneer River Resort is on schedule with reclamation work to start in March next year and stage one construction to be finished by December, 1989.”

Those were the comments that were made on opening day.

Two days before the State election the National Party candidate for the seat of Mackay made a statement that was interpreted by locals as having been prepared by the Minister for Tourism. He said—

“\$7 million will be spent on the project in the next 12 months.”

The bulldozers and the scrapers were still operating and the graders were still levelling. Blokes were still running around with levels, taking measurements and putting pegs all over the place.

The article continues—

“‘About \$1m will be spent during the next three months’”—

that is, from October through to January, a period of three months—

“‘on site preparation and formation, setting out and levelling of the high ground, the construction of the high spine road, and construction of services.’

When that work was completed, heavy work, including the dredging and excavating for the marina, would start.

It would begin in March and would take nine months to carry out, costing about \$6 million.

Work on the buildings would begin while preparation of the marina was taking place, he said."

There is the nigger in the woodpile, because even at that stage, just two days before the election, the chairman of Pioneer River Development Pty Limited, Mr Mel Wyeth said—

"... there were still some critical matters to be resolved."

The saga continues. That happened the day before the election. On election day itself the *Queensland Government Gazette* published a notice which effectively took control. The Government did not do this the week before the election or whilst Cabinet was meeting in Mackay, and it did not tell anybody. The Government might have told the Mayor of Mackay, because he appeared to be aware of it and was on the advisory board at the selection of this company in relation to the mouth of the river project. He must have known, but he did not tell his council. On the day of the election, control over the project was taken away from the Mackay City Council by an Order in Council issued by the Government and the planning and control of the project was placed entirely into the hands of the Minister for Local Government. On election day the people of Mackay returned me to this Parliament and gave the Government a great rebuff.

Just one week after the election the first machine started to leave the site and the scrapers stopped work and the levelling of sand ceased. One and a half weeks later there was a protest from another supporter of this Government, a Mr Zelenka, who is the president of the Mackay Regional Development Bureau. He stated—

"Mackay firms were still confident of being involved in the Pioneer River mouth project despite the controversy and delay surrounding the development."

On the very day he spoke a few more machines were taken off the site on a low-loader. Two weeks later more gear left and there was only one dozer levelling the mangrove swamps. By Christmas, only 1½ months after the big announcement was made and the official opening, no work at all was being done on the site. The site was completely deserted. It was like a sandy desert. That situation has prevailed since and absolutely nothing is happening on the site. The people of Mackay want to know now why no reasonable explanation has been given. One would think that a reasonable explanation should be given.

In the annual report of the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation presented in this Parliament in recent weeks, a five-line paragraph concerning the Pioneer River resort appears under the development section at the back of the report. That report still refers to the \$130m project, the 250-room hotel, the 400-berth marina, fisherman's wharf and the 50 resort condominiums. There is one word by way of explanation in that paragraph; it simply says "ultimately". That is the word that is used in reference to the whole of the project, and no explanation has been given to the people of Mackay as to why work has stopped on this project. There has been no explanation as to what efforts the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation and the Queensland Government are making to get this project under way to fulfil the aims, ambitions and desires of the people in the Mackay region. They want to get on the map so far as the tourist industry is concerned, and this project will provide such an opportunity for the people of the Mackay region.

During the remarks that he made when he officially opened the project—if one could call it that when looking in retrospect—the Premier said that it was not one of these phantom projects. It is a little bit hard to convince the people of Mackay that it is not a phantom project, when absolutely nothing has happened on that site for the last 12 months and no work whatsoever has been carried out.

I wish to make my own position quite clear, as I have done before in this Parliament and publicly in Mackay. Today I do it again. I am not an opponent of the development of a major tourist complex at the mouth of the Pioneer River. I am 100 per cent behind it.

Mr R. J. Gibbs: I said it, too.

Mr CASEY: When the honourable member for Wolston was the shadow Minister for Tourism, he inspected the site with me and shared that opinion with me at all times. The Labor Party has shared that opinion at all times. I have said at all times that any development as far as that project is concerned——

Mr Muntz: Why don't you put your money where your mouth is?

Mr CASEY: Perhaps I would do that if I was getting a deal as good as the one that Pioneer River Developments has been getting.

The project can become an excellent project, but the people of Mackay must be protected as well. The Pioneer River is fraught with engineering and technical problems. The mouth of the Pioneer River has a siltation problem, a major tidal problem, a flooding problem, a drainage problem and an ecological problem. All of those problems were not looked at properly before the Government allowed the project to be undertaken. All that the Government did was build up the hopes and expectations of the people in the area. Why was that done? For political expediency at the time! That is over and behind the company now, so it ought to be getting on with the job. I believe that the company was forced by the Government into an official opening because the Premier was going there. The Premier said, "I am glad that I was invited to participate in this project." My understanding of the situation is that one week before a Cabinet meeting, the main directors of the company had said that there was not going to be an official opening. I found out that at that particular time a few other bookings had been made. Sure enough, even members of the press had been briefed. I understand that the Minister may have been one person who briefed them that there was not going to be an official opening. All of a sudden, out of the blue, there was going to be an official opening. The Arabs came in; the tents were erected; the flags went up; the flowers and pot plants were put in place; and there was chicken and champagne.

The people of Mackay want action on the project. I have one great query: what has happened to the other tenderers? If Pioneer River Developments is the nigger in the woodpile and is not able to continue with this particular project, what has happened to the other tenderers that we were told were interested in the project? Why has the project not been offered instead to one of them? Were there really any other tenderers? I do not blame the present Minister, because at the time he did not have the Tourism portfolio. However, Mr McKechnie, who was the former Minister for Tourism, made heaps of announcements over a period of a couple of years about the large number of people who were interested in the project at the mouth of the river. Every time the people of Mackay said, "What is happening there?", the Minister would say, "We are examining the situation. We are examining all the tenders. We are looking at all the submissions. We have a heap of people interested." The development has not eventuated. The project has stopped. The Airlie Beach area has an effect on the economy of Mackay. At the time, Qintex made great announcements about the Boathaven Bay project. The Minister dug a hole with a shovel. Nothing has happened since then.

Mr Muntz: These projects don't happen overnight.

Mr CASEY: I know that they do not happen overnight. I have been involved in such projects during my life-time. I know that they do not happen overnight. However, the people should be informed about that at the time. At the time, if anyone picked up the *Whitsunday Times* or one of the other newspapers that are published in the region, he would have seen a photograph of the Minister, with a silver shovel, digging a hole in the mangrove swamp. One would have thought that by the next month all sorts of things would have been happening on the Qintex site at Boathaven Bay. Instead, what is happening is that Qintex is trying to sell off its Whitsunday Terraces Resort and the Whitsunday Village Resort, which are located in that particular area. It is not long since that company bought those resorts. It now wants to sell them. I do not know whether it wants to sell them to finance the Boathaven Bay project. I am not going into the

financial ramifications of that company at the moment. It is no good making announcements and building up people's hopes and expectations of what is going to happen without being fair dinkum about what is happening.

Those are the major points that I wanted to make. However, I would like to raise a couple of other small points. There is one matter on which I agree with the Minister. Earlier this month he referred to getting a better tourist wardrobe for Queensland. I agree that Queensland should have a better tourist wardrobe. I think that we ought to start in this Chamber. Queensland is a tropical and subtropical State. In many respects, this is a tropical Parliament. Members of this Assembly, including the Minister and myself, have lived almost all their lives in the tropical areas of this State. Why can we not enter this Chamber dressed in tropical dress instead of in European dress consisting of heavy dark suits and restrictive ties? Mr Temporary Chairman, you have seen the standard of dress in other Parliaments of the world. You would be familiar with the dress worn by delegates who have participated in conferences that you have attended. At the conferences that I have attended the delegates have dressed in tropical attire. That is their form of dress. They do not have the old-fogy conservative type of dress that is the standard in this Parliament.

I ask honourable members to consider what the ladies in this Chamber wear. They are able to come to work in clothes that have short sleeves. The women on the staff of Parliament House and women in the press gallery are able to come to work in shoulderless dresses, or perhaps dresses with straps. Clothes of that type are nice and cool in Queensland's tropical climate. That is what we need in this State. Let us be Queenslanders, live like Queenslanders and dress like Queenslanders.

Time expired.

Mrs NELSON (Aspley) (12.01 p.m.): It is a pleasure to join in the Estimates debate and to give my congratulations and support to the Minister for Tourism. He has done a tremendous job in the management of his portfolio. It gave me a great deal of pleasure to serve on his Tourism and Sport committee. I place on record my appreciation of the way in which he involves his committee in the work of his department, and the way in which he informs and educates his committee about tourism in Queensland.

I place on record also my enthusiastic support for the QTTC and its staff. I wish to rebut the comments that were made by the honourable member for Cairns, Mr De Lacy, who attempted in an imaginative sort of way to say that the reasons for the tourism boom in north Queensland are the rainforests, the railway and the reef. The railway has been there for a hundred years. The rainforests and the reef have been there for millions of years. This creative and imaginative Government has given QTTC private-sector powers to establish a basis for tourism in north Queensland that has created the tourist boom.

Mr Muntz: Do you realise that Mr De Lacy didn't mention World Heritage listing? Do you wonder why?

Mrs NELSON: No, but I am going to mention it. I think that Mr De Lacy is running away from that subject because he is scared of it and its political and social consequences.

It is indeed gratifying for me to be able to participate in this debate. I have had the opportunity of being directly involved in one of the very important matters that has now been touched upon by the Minister, namely, the Commonwealth Government's proposal to nominate some 877 700 hectares of north Queensland rainforest for World Heritage listing.

News of that unilateral decision by the Prime Minister came by way of a pre-election press release on 5 June 1987 when negotiations between the State and the Commonwealth in regard to a rainforest conservation package were all well under way. No official advice of that decision was received by the Queensland Government until 23 June 1987. On 20 August 1987, Senator Richardson—a junior Minister in the newly

elected Labor Government—without the benefit of negotiation or consultation with the people of the affected area, announced the proposed indicative boundaries for the World Heritage listing area.

The one message that the Commonwealth Government wanted to get across in that announcement was that logging in that area would be banned. That was the one catchcry to satisfy the radical conservation movement. All other aspects—and I repeat “all other aspects”—of that proposal were ignored. I will table photographs of the sawmill that operates on land that is owned by Rosemary Hill, Mike Berwick and three other people in that region.

Mr Eaton, the member for Mourilyan, and Mr Comben, the member for Windsor, have both misled the Committee on this matter. They have indicated that those people have a scavenging licence and that they log timber only for their own use. It is interesting to note that that particular lady spoke on *60 Minutes* about 1 000-year-old trees. However, I have in my possession photographs that were taken by private residents and citizens in the immediate vicinity—neighbours of the group of people who run the sawmill. Those photographs depict the sawmill and the timber that is collected on the site for logging, together with the refuse, faeces and filth that is left behind by their friends who are illegally camping and fishing in the area. I will table those photographs for the benefit of all honourable members.

I am sure that Mr Eaton was misled by his Labor Party colleagues into making the statements that he did in support of Rosemary Hill. I am quite sure that Mr Comben is totally aware of what those people are doing on that block of land, and the blatant hypocrisy of those five people, three of whom were intimately involved in the drawing up of the indicative boundaries for that World Heritage listing area.

At the time of the announcement of the proposed indicative boundaries, the Premier decided to appoint a back-bench committee to advise him on matters relating to natural resources and economic development. The members of that committee are: myself, as chairman; Russell Cooper, the member for Roma; Mark Stoneman, the member for Burdekin; Tony Elliott, the member for Cunningham; Craig Sherrin, the member for Mansfield; Ian Henderson, the member for Mount Gravatt; and Gordon Simpson, the member for Cooroorra. I wish to place on record in this Parliament my support for the work done by the members of that committee. They have involved themselves in a dedicated and professional manner to addressing a number of significant natural resources and economic development issues in this State.

So concerned was the Government about the irresponsible attitude taken by the Commonwealth regarding the wet tropics of north Queensland that the parliamentary committee was charged with investigating some of the likely effects that World Heritage listing would have on the area, and was asked to report on the matter directly to the Premier.

On 18, 19 and 20 September the committee travelled to Cairns and other rainforest centres in north Queensland. For the very first time since the senator's announcement a delegation of parliamentarians went to the area, not to tell the people what would happen but to listen to what the local people had to say. Meeting venues were set up and representations were received from a wide cross-section of people. The views and concerns of those people in the area were taken on board, collated and formed the basis of the committee's report. It was immediately apparent to me and the committee members during our trip through the tropical rainforest area that absolutely no consideration had been given by the Federal Government to the social consequences of its actions. The economic effects were acknowledged as being nothing but disastrous, and vague statements regarding compensation could only give cause for further concern. It was evident from the start that the effect of the unilateral listing of boundaries indicated by the Federal Labor Government would cause serious and permanent social disruption.

Our report was considered by the Government. I am very pleased to say that one of the consequences of the report is that NORMA was established, that is, the Northern Rainforest Management Agency. That agency has had appointed local people as both

chairman and deputy chairman. Sir Sydney Williams accepted the chairmanship, and Mr Scott Grimley, another local and well-respected businessman, accepted the position of deputy chairman.

Mr De Lacy: Just a political exercise.

Mrs NELSON: I take that interjection. What does the honourable member think the unilateral listing is? It is nothing but a political exercise to get power over 12 000 square miles of north Queensland. That is exactly what the honourable member's Federal colleagues are on about and it is exactly what will put the member for Cairns and the member for Mourilyan right out of office at the next State election.

The other representatives on the authority were to be officers of the Queensland National Party's Wildlife Service and the Forestry Department, which between them control in excess of 98 per cent of the land proposed to be listed.

To support NORMA, a consultative committee was formed with deputy chairman Grimley to act as chairman. The purpose of the consultative committee was to again hear the views of the people in the area and to ensure that local input continued. The consultative committee invited input from representatives of local government, business, conservation groups and many other sectors of the community who reasonably felt that they would be affected. Having the deputy chairman of NORMA as the chairman of the consultative committee guaranteed that the views of the consultative committee would get back to the authority and to the Government. Nor did the matter rest there. In order that NORMA could be well informed, a scientific advisory committee was formed with both full-time and associate members. The people invited to join that scientific committee represent a who's who of the scientific field of rainforest research. It has representatives from both State and Commonwealth agencies as well as consultative members from overseas. The professional integrity of the members is such that the scientific advice will in fact be just that—the best and most objective scientific information available in the world.

I might add at this point that the Commonwealth's record of accepting scientific advice on conservation issues could only be described as poor, as Tasmania and the Northern Territory are two experiences that spring immediately to mind. The Franklin Dam in Tasmania now has the reputation of being the most polluted river in Australia, and we have already had an answer to a question from another Minister this morning regarding the fallacious use of land—the facetious and ridiculous remarks made by John Brown and other Ministers at the Commonwealth level about proposed activities for Kakadu in the Northern Territory.

We also all recall the havoc created in western Queensland in 1984-85 when the kangaroo cull quota was unilaterally halved from its then present level of 1½ million. Ever so quietly that quota has once again been increased to over the 1½ million level; but, unfortunately, not until it has cost the graziers and grain-growers of this State millions and millions of dollars. Again, in 1987, the Federal Government repeated its effort and is already in an embarrassing situation because of that.

The problem with the Canberra Government is that it is not driven by science, logic or common sense but by cheap pandering to extremist groups in a blatant vote-catching exercise. That, in conjunction with a bureaucracy that is heavily centralist-oriented, spells a recipe for disaster for the States and for people in those States who are trying to make a living. After all, the productivity of Australia is the combined productivity of the States. The Commonwealth Government contributes nothing to this productivity, but in fact depletes the rewards by Commonwealth taxation burdens.

I wish to draw to the attention of the Committee some of the remarks made by the honourable members for Cook and Sandgate in this Parliament over the last few months. I have been reading and commenting on a number of their speeches on this subject. I can only say to the honourable member for Sandgate that I believe that a staff member of Senator Richardson wrote his speech for him. I have to tell the honourable member that that person clearly is not a supporter of the member for Sandgate because

he provided information that was so erroneous, so ignorant and so misleading that it could only damage the reputation of the Leader of the Opposition in this Parliament and in this State. If I were the Leader of the Opposition, I would take a long, hard look at Senator Richardson's staff because I would think that they are aiding and abetting his political opponents—even in his own party.

I also point out to the Committee that a number of Labor speakers—at Federal and State levels—have indicated to this Parliament and to other Parliaments that nobody will lose any rights out of this exercise. When referring to the Premier, the honourable member for Cook said in this Parliament, as follows—

“This is the man who is inciting local government people and residents and timber-workers of the north to oppose what will be a very good thing.”

I say: “a very good thing” for whom?

The honourable member for Cook went on to state—and I ask all honourable members to listen very carefully to this—

“Control of the area is most important; it will reside with Australians. In fact, it will reside with the local people up there, who will have representation on the management committee. The functions of State and local government will not be usurped by the Federal Government. The powers of local government will not be destroyed and local communities will not lose control over their future. These are great things from a far-sighted Government.”

Let me now turn to examine what Mr Warburton has had to say. In this Parliament, the Leader of the Opposition stated—

“The owners of that private land—let me put this on record—will not be affected unless they want to indulge in wholesale knocking down of prime rainforests.”

I put on record that many people have been so terrified about the impact of World Heritage listing that they have already done what the Leader of the Opposition refers to. That is the great tragedy of the whole exercise.

Mr De Lacy: That is because of your scaremongering.

Mrs NELSON: Long before that—the minute Hawke announced it—they started doing that, and the honourable member's political party is totally responsible.

Mr Warburton went on to say—

“Nobody is going to be forced off his land; he will still be able to live there, the local authority will get its rates . . . the traditional land use will continue. People wanting to build a house . . . will be able to clear a space for it.”

I am sure that the people of north Queensland are absolutely overwhelmed by that revelation.

A number of other things were said by the Leader of the Opposition in that address, but the most interesting point was as follows—

“A properly set up management authority will ensure proper controls, practices and freedoms.”

How does one control somebody's freedom? Only the Labor Party has any idea of wanting to control the freedom of people.

I quote from a United Nations document that governs the rules regarding World Heritage listing. I turn to page 1 of the report, part of which reads as follows—

“The World Heritage Committee . . . has three essential functions:

- (i) to determine in what and under what conditions the resources in the World Heritage Fund can most advantageously be used to assist State Parties”—

and that is the Commonwealth Government—

“as far as possible, in the protection of their properties of outstanding universal value.”

I must also inform honourable members that the Commonwealth Government's part in this proposed listing is to provide the committee with a list of its proposed applications for the next five to 10 years. It is also obliged to submit to the World Heritage committee a series of proposals for World Heritage listing. The state of preservation and conservation is one of the criteria that must be listed. The information submitted must include the name of the country, the name of the State, and the name of the property; maps and plans; legal status; category of ownership; details of legal and administrative protective measures—taken or envisaged for the conservation of the property; state of occupancy and accessibility to the general public. The state of "accessibility to the general public" is something that is denied by this Government, I might add. The Federal Government also has to submit the name of the agent responsible for preservation/conservation, including management plans or proposals for such plans and development plans for the region.

Then comes the crucial bit. The document refers to the establishment of a list of World Heritage in Danger. If the Australian Government does not do what the World Heritage committee says and run things the way it insists, the committee has the power to immediately delist the area. The committee reviews the listing annually. It can delist it.

The irony of this whole argument is that Mr Scott and Mr Warburton have gone on record in this Chamber as saying to us as citizens of Queensland, "Your rights won't be interfered with. Local authorities will still have their power." Through that committee the United Nations will have all the power over the management of that area. Those people who try to say otherwise are pulling the wool over our eyes.

I hope that before the day is through the Commonwealth Government will think about the enormity of its actions, or proposed actions, in north Queensland and allow common sense and science to rule the day.

Mr R. J. Gibbs interjected.

Mrs NELSON: The honourable member must be worried because he is interjecting. If I was not getting my message through, he would not be interjecting.

To propose to close down an industry for no good benefit and in the face of scientific reasoning is simply not a proposition. The United Nations up-to-date information is that the whole concept of World Heritage listing is already out of date. It is a failed conservation strategy. Its own reports now tell the world that. It was originally intended to induce countries, particularly Third World countries—and I am sure Australia is regarded as that now that Paul Keating has wrecked its economy—to enter into some meaningful form of nature conservation.

In short, it has failed. The only effect World Heritage listing in Australia will have is to exacerbate this failure in Third World countries. The modern concept of nature conservation is away from the listing of areas to what we have in north Queensland, namely an integrated multiple land-management system heavily weighted towards conservation. What World Heritage listing will do—and that is exactly the way the United Nations is heading, following what Queensland is doing—is interfere with this management system and depreciate the conservation effort in the area. It will put the area under remote control run by people from Canberra who neither know nor understand the area or its people. This lack of knowledge and understanding could not be better expressed than by the Commonwealth's failure to consult the people before making a move to propose the listing and the banning of logging. If one considers the proposal of the Federal Tourism Minister, Mr John Brown, to put a monorail at Ayers Rock, one will see the sort of decision-making the people of north Queensland would have to look forward to. In case honourable members opposite are thinking that I am making fanciful statements about the Honourable John Brown, I will quote the words of Mr Barry Cohen, the former Minister for the Environment, who told Parliament he hoped that

the Minister's idea was just a sick joke; another part of his quirky sense of humour—which, tragically, it was not. Mr Cohen said—

“I ask the Minister whether he is seriously contemplating such an action which would, I think in the view of most people in Australia, completely ruin the aesthetics of the Uluru National Park, which is part of the World Heritage area.”

Mr R. J. Gibbs interjected.

The **TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN** (Mr Booth): Order! The honourable member's remarks are not contributing much to the debate.

Mrs **NELSON**: Mr Cohen also asked if Mr Brown proposed to add a McDonalds restaurant at the top of the Olgas and also a waterslide. I thought that was appropriate, considering what Mr Brown wants to do.

In order to cover these blunders the Federal Government has now called for a consultant's report which simply cannot be credibly furnished in the time-frame set out. The whole exercise will ultimately be recalled as another failed Commonwealth adventure in conservation that will cost the tax-payers of this country millions of dollars with no gain at all for the people of Australia.

I wish to conclude my address today by again congratulating the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation on its far-sighted approach to the development of tourism facilities in this State. Unlike the Labor Party, which has what I call the back-pack and leather-sandal approach to tourism, which cannot see beyond the end of its nose and which, in the unfortunate event of its ever being elected in this State, would put us back 50 years, the National Party has an approach that covers the whole range of services that need to be provided for tourists coming to Australia. Whilst the National Party continues as a Government to support the types of projects and programs that it already supports, it will remain in office indefinitely. I support the Estimates and congratulate the Minister.

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

Mr **GYGAR** (Stafford) (12.21 p.m.): A bit of wishful thinking never goes astray.

After hearing the debates on tourism in this place, I feel it is a shame that the subject has not attracted a little more serious attention from the members of the Government who have so far participated. One would hope for more substantial contributions from those who are to follow.

I hope that all of the members of this Chamber would recognise that in tourism lies the future of this State. Whereas in the past primary industries, extractive industries, mineral exploration, etc., have boosted the Queensland economy and kept this State on the straight and narrow, it is obviously tourism that offers the greatest future potential for the expansion of employment and development and for new capital input into this State.

As such it deserves the most serious consideration and support from all sides of the Chamber. It deserves the most serious support from the Government of this State. It is a matter of great regret that it just is not receiving it. Tourism, despite all of the rhetoric, is very much a poor relation in the Government's handling of this portfolio. Instead of giving it the priority that it deserves, the Government assigns it to a junior Minister and gives it not even a fraction of the financial support that is given to other areas of the State's economy. The amount that the Government spends on tourism is miserable, especially when it is compared with the hundreds of millions of dollars that are poured into primary industry support and to infrastructural support for the mining industry.

Mr **Gilmore**: Schools——

Mr **GYGAR**: The honourable member opposite intrudes about schools and all the rest of it. Certainly, vast amounts of money are spent on such things, but I am speaking

about the relative importance of industries; and the relative importance, as perceived by this Government, is reflected in all cases by the amount of finance that it is prepared to put in from the State Budget.

By any analysis of the figures, this Government is neglecting tourism. Lest I be accused of calling for hand-outs to tourist operators, let me put paid to that for a start. Where this Government should be spending money on tourism is in the same area as it spends it, for example, in the mining industry—infrastructural development. With a great amount of hoop-la, over a period of about three years this Government has spent nearly a billion dollars on railway line electrification in support of the mining industry. Where have honourable members seen anything like that amount—even 10 per cent of that amount—spent on infrastructural support for the tourist industry, which is the industry in which the State's future is supposed to lie?

Mr Gilmore: We are a private-enterprise Government.

Mr GYGAR: The honourable member says that he is part of a private-enterprise Government. That is good.

If the Government is prepared to put money into infrastructural support for primary industries and for mining industries, where is the infrastructural support for tourism? That is the role of Government—not to run around giving out hand-outs and not to take the socialist course of action of having equity participation in these projects, which regrettably is a line that this Government is also following, but to provide the infrastructure from which the tourist industry can grow and develop.

The private-enterprise sector on which all of this development of industry rests relies upon the creation of the football-field on which its participants can play. That is what the tourist industry wants. It does not want hand-outs, prop-ups and all the rest of it; it wants the Government to organise the field on which the participants can play. Then turn them loose. Let the free-enterprise system take care of it. Let entrepreneurs rise and fall. Let those who offer the public what they want reap the benefit and those who pick the public mood wrongly wear the results.

But where is the infrastructural support that tourism needs? The Minister represents one of the greatest tourist areas of this State—Airlie Beach and Shute Harbour, the gateway to the Whitsundays—yet the road that leads to that area has to be one of the most abysmal, appalling pieces of bitumen to be found anywhere in this State.

Day after day, week after week, trucks roll down to Airlie Beach and to Shute Harbour with all of the supplies that keep the island resorts operating. They have to travel on a dreadful piece of road. It would not even rate as a suburban road in the outer suburbs of Brisbane. It is one of the major tourist roads in this State, and it is a shocker! It is literally unsafe to drive on it. The Minister must drive on it every day. Surely he can use some of his influence to have something done about that road, at least.

It is not only that road. That road is just one of the examples of the sort of infrastructural projects than this Government should be undertaking in support of tourism and it is not. The roads in north Queensland and central Queensland—the roads on which the future of our tourist industry lie—are appalling. If the Government wants to do something to help tourism, that is as good a place as any to start.

A great deal is heard in this Chamber and elsewhere about high-flying Japanese tourists. The jumbo-loads have not turned up yet. I will deal with that later. The bread and butter of the tourist industry in Queensland is, and will remain, Mum, Dad and the kids from the western suburbs of Sydney and the northern suburbs of Melbourne.

Frequently in this Chamber the Minister speaks about the importance to the tourist industry of road travel. A large number of people travel in hire cars, in their own vehicles or in coaches. Whether we like it or not, the domestic airline structure in this country is such that Mr Average just cannot afford to fly his family on a holiday. If the Government wants people from Sydney and Melbourne to continue coming up to

Queensland to see the great attractions of this State, it has to come to grips with the problem of our roads. Anybody who has travelled on the roads in this State once would never do so again. One would have too much respect for one's motor vehicle to do that.

The roads of Queensland need urgent attention. The support of this State Government is needed. It has to acknowledge that infrastructural work for the benefit of tourism should be its major priority if it really believes what it says about being interested in developing the tourist industry in the long term in this State. That is where our bread and butter lies, yet that is the area of greatest neglect.

I turn to some other infrastructural problems. One of them concerns the provision of electricity. That is an essential element of tourist development. A few months ago the manager of one resort came to me weeping and said that he was having dreadful trouble running the resort because of the total uncertainty of the power supply. The computer on which the reservations are entered kept crashing because the amount of power needed to run the number of cycles just was not available. It is appalling that a supposed major tourist development cannot get sufficient power down the line even to run a computer reservations service. What sort of fools do people look when they put up millions of dollars to build a resort and then they cannot run something as simple as a computer system at the front desk because the power is not available to run it?

Another problem concerns water. The Gold Coast seems to be in a state of perpetual drought. A great deal is heard in this Chamber from members of the National Party who represent the Gold Coast region, trumpeting about what a great place the Gold Coast is, that it is the premier tourist area and so on. It is, and it should be. However, what happens on the Gold Coast? It has chronic water shortages. The Gold Coast is the supposed shop window of tourism in this State, but the taps cannot even be turned on properly because the Government has not provided the water. That is a basic infrastructural element to the development of the region.

Mr FitzGerald: That is a local government responsibility. Come off it!

Mr GYGAR: The honourable member for Lockyer says that it is totally a local government responsibility. Obviously I have struck a nerve.

At last I have a real indication of the intentions of the back bench of this Government, anyway. I will be interested to hear it from the horse's mouth. I refer, of course, to the Minister. If the back-benchers of this Government speak the truth, apparently this Government has absolutely no interest in providing infrastructure for development.

As all honourable members realise, it is a very different matter when it comes to industry development. There is no doubt that the Government is quite happy to provide huge power stations to provide aluminium smelters and so on with plenty of cheap electricity. The Government is quite prepared to put in water lines so that nickel plants can operate. That is not a local government responsibility.

Perhaps the penny has not dropped for Government members yet that tourism is an industry. It is Queensland's second most important industry, and as an industry it deserves industrial support. If it is good enough to give power to aluminium smelters and water to nickel mines, why is it not good enough to give water, power and infrastructural support to the tourist industry? It is an industry just the same as the others. Funnily enough, it seems that the old Country Party concepts die hard. If it does not moo or if it cannot be put into a bail or on the back of a truck, it has nothing to do with industry. Perhaps all Queensland's tourists should put bags over their heads and write on the front of the bags "I am an industrial production unit. I create jobs". All of a sudden the industry would receive infrastructural support. That does not happen. Because they are people the Government cannot get the idea that tourism is an industry and, as such, industry-support mechanisms are necessary.

Even at the human level real disasters are occurring because of the failure to provide infrastructural support. It must be recognised that the police force in this State is an infrastructural support for the tourist industry. The crime statistics for this State show

that the two highest growth areas of crime by a long shot are Cairns and the Gold Coast—Queensland's two premier tourist districts. What is happening about this? Nothing.

This Chamber hears all kinds of interesting excuses from Government members. A few months ago Mr Gibbs, the Minister for Works and Housing, stated that this was not a problem and that it was all lies. Three weeks later one of his colleagues on the Gold Coast came out and said, "Yes, there are dreadful problems with the police down here, but it is all the fault of the Federal Government." This morning, the Chamber heard the latest version from the Minister for Police, who said that it was all the fault of the police union because it is whinging, it is lazy and it is trying to sabotage the police force. I wish the Government would make up its mind which story it is going to tell, because there would be a little less confusion. The bottom line is that Queensland has the lowest police ratio per head of population of any State or Territory in Australia. This is another infrastructural form of neglect on the part of this Government.

Government members should be screaming blue murder, because on the Gold Coast in 1985-86 there were 128 crimes committed per 1 000 of the population. In other words, 1.2 persons out of 10 were the victims of crime on the Gold Coast. For Heaven's sake, how long will Queensland be able to run its tourist industry if better than one in 10 people are being mugged, having their houses broken into or their cars stolen or being assaulted on the streets in Queensland's premier tourist destination? There was an increase of 64.1 per cent in the rate of crime on the Gold Coast in the period 1981-82 to 1985-86. A few questions are being asked about why the Commissioner of Police has not submitted his report this year. Perhaps it contains a few statistics that the Government will like even less than the statistics contained in last year's report.

Mr Mackenroth: He has had plenty of time to write it.

Mr GYGAR: The honourable member for Chatsworth has interjected. I understand that a few rewrites are occurring at the moment, given certain things that have happened a few thousand yards down the road from here. Even so, this Chamber should see those statistics, because year after year Queensland's tourist areas have seen a dramatic and devastating increase in crime statistics. If one American tourist is mugged in Cairns, by the time he finishes telling the story about it back home, 1 000 New Yorkers will never be seen in Australia.

Mrs Nelson: That is why the planes are so full. We can't get another tourist in the door. You are talking rubbish.

Mr GYGAR: I bow to the words of an expert in talking rubbish. If anyone knows about talking rubbish, the honourable member for Aspley does. As everyone knows, she is an honourable lady, and one should believe everything she says.

Mrs Nelson: More likely than the falsities that you just quoted about the Gold Coast.

Mr GYGAR: It is real desperation when Government members will not believe the annual report of the Commissioner of Police. Lately the Commissioner of Police has come in for a bit of a bagging, and I acknowledge that, but I do not think he deserves to be called a liar by Mrs Nelson because she does not like the statistics that appear in his annual report.

Mrs NELSON: I rise to a point of order. I find those remarks offensive and I ask that the honourable member withdraw them.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr Booth): Order! The honourable member for Aspley is upset by those remarks, and I ask the honourable member for Stafford to withdraw them.

Mr GYGAR: I will withdraw what she finds offensive, but I do not know what it is.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Order! That is not sufficient.

Mrs NELSON: I expect the honourable member to withdraw the remark that in this Chamber I would refer to anyone, particularly the person to whom he referred, as a liar. I ask him to specifically withdraw those remarks.

Mr GYGAR: I withdraw them specifically. I must note that I found offensive the honourable member's remarks that I was using false statistics. Nonetheless, if some people around here are not well, that is their problem. Let us forget about the lightweights and get down to the main business.

Tourism infrastructure is a problem that the Government has failed totally to tackle. I apologise for calling Mrs Nelson a lightweight. Any observer in this Chamber would realise that if there is one thing that the honourable member is not, it is a lightweight.

Let me refer to a matter that was raised earlier by honourable members, namely, airline flights.

Mr Sherrin interjected.

Mr GYGAR: If honourable members want to dish it out, they have to cop it.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member should know that Standing Order 120 states that personal reflections are not permitted in this Chamber. I ask him to withdraw his statement.

Mr GYGAR: I withdraw.

I turn now to Qantas. I agree totally with the Minister on one matter. I urge him and his colleagues to greater heights in dealing with the nonsense that is going on about airline flights to this country. It is a national disgrace that tourists cannot obtain flights to Australia when they want to. In some instances, tourists wanting to come to Australia have encountered delays of three months because they cannot obtain a seat on an airline. Qantas has maintained a stranglehold on airline operations by demanding that there be reciprocal inbound and outbound flights. That Qantas will not grant rights on routes on which it does not wish to fly is a total load of nonsense. That must be sheeted home day after day, week after week, to the Federal Government until it is prepared to bite the bullet and do something about it. I applaud the Minister for his statements during the last couple of days. I urge him to repeat them from every soap-box, on every stage, through every microphone and in front of every camera that he can find.

I urge members of the Labor Party in this Chamber to get off their tails and do a few things about it, too. All the time they plead about their wonderful special relationship with the Federal Government. Let them deliver the goods for Queensland and for the tourist industry. Why can Queensland not have an open-skies policy? Why are charter operators not allowed to fly into this State and elsewhere when tourists are begging to come to Australia and turning up at tourist bureaus, only to be told, "I am sorry, you cannot obtain a ticket because all the flights are booked solid for many months in advance."? Surely every member in this Chamber would acknowledge that that is just a load of nonsense. The power to change the present policy lies squarely in the hands of the infamous Mr Brown, who would be better off spending a bit more time thinking about airline flights and less time thinking about monorails and koalas. He should do something firm for the people of Australia and for the tourist industry. Unless that problem is tackled, all of the high-falutin words that have been spoken about thousands of tourists coming to Australia from overseas and about the jobs that will be created will fall as flat as a house of cards.

We must be concerned also about the developments that will be tagged on to the so-called boom, because people cannot get here. For how much longer can Australian or international companies be expected to pour hundreds of millions of dollars into resort developments if they know that people cannot get to them and stay at them.

Most of the high-flying resorts are designed for international tourists. If anyone has ever examined the scale of charges at those resorts, he would realise that not many Australians could afford to pay for one night's accommodation, let alone accommodation

for seven nights and all the rest thrown in. A person is up for a fortune if he wants to stay at such a resort. The resort-operators need overseas tourists so that the resorts are filled to the occupancy rate that is necessary for a satisfactory return on the capital investment. The resort-operators will not be able to do that unless somebody talks sense to Canberra. Besides infrastructure, I suggest that that is the most urgent medium to long-term problem that the tourism industry faces in Queensland. If those problems can be tackled head on and solved, a reasonable future can be expected. It is pointless to think that Queensland or Australia will have any sort of international tourist future if people simply cannot get here.

In the final couple of minutes remaining to me, I would be remiss if I did not refer to the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation. The QTTC exemplifies all of the best and all of the worst in the present Government. The members of the QTTC are energetic and free enterprise. They are out there, gung-ho, every day of the week. They are also rude, arrogant, deceptive, petty and secretive. They must have learned those traits from their political masters. Someone in the QTTC has to learn that that organisation is not a branch office of the National Party. It is a department of State in Queensland, and it is there for all Queenslanders. The arrogant disregard that is displayed by the QTTC and the rudeness that it shows towards members of this Chamber need to be tackled. Mr Casey outlined some examples of that rudeness, but I do not have time to go into all of the other examples of it. The QTTC seems to think that, if a person is not a member of the National Party in Queensland, he does not exist; he is persona non grata and should be thrown out of the door. That attitude does the QTTC no good whatsoever. It costs little for it to be co-operative with and polite to this Assembly. One lesson that the QTTC should remember is that Governments come and go. If that organisation continues to behave in that way, it too will go. Overall, the QTTC has tried manfully to succeed in this State.

Time expired.

Mr SIMPSON (Cooroola) (12.41 p.m.): I am pleased to support the Minister in the presentation of his Estimates. Opposition spokesmen have claimed that the outstanding performance in tourism growth in Queensland has had nothing to do with the State Government. The Liberal opposition member claimed that this Government is doing nothing for infrastructure. He seems to have forgotten that the major infrastructure for bringing international tourists into Queensland and Brisbane is the Brisbane airport. The Federal Liberal Party did absolutely nothing to get that airport on line in the time that it should have taken. It stands condemned for that, just as it stands condemned for increasing fuel taxes, which has made the transportation of tourists more costly. I remind the Committee that approximately 85 per cent of tourists in Queensland travel from other States or overseas. The Liberal Party has demonstrated its hypocrisy.

Opposition spokesmen have joined in a singular cry of knocking the performance of the State Government. Tourism in Queensland is growing at a faster rate than it is in any of the other States of Australia. We have the runs on the board in terms of tourist visitor nights in this State.

When builders and project-managers of major undertakings in other States come to Queensland for their holidays, they are astounded by our ability to complete projects on time. When in coalition, the Liberal Party did nothing to assist the labour relations sector to bring about sensible working arrangements. Of course, I would expect the Labor Party to knock those arrangements and to promote the unions, because the Labor Party is controlled by the unions. The ACTU controls the Labor Party. Unions will attempt to prevent a project from finishing; they will try to stop a concrete pour on a project; and they will attempt to delay a project.

I am in possession of a newspaper clipping relating to a \$1 billion project in New South Wales, headed "Darling Harbour Deadline Scrapped". That highlights a typical example of the hundreds of episodes such as that which take place in other States. That is why the development of tourist resorts in this State far outshines that in all the other States of Australia by almost 50 per cent.

Sydney is the destination of the majority of international flights into Australia, even though most tourists do not want to stop there. International tourists want to visit Queensland because of its natural features, its ideal climate and its beauty. Of course, that in itself is not enough.

A few Opposition members grudgingly gave support to the QTTC. A consideration of the performance of the Labor Party in this State during the last 30 years reveals that it has done nothing. During that time, Queensland had the very same climate and the very same beauty, but the Labor Party did nothing to assist tourism in this State.

The Federal Labor Party stands condemned, as do the Labor Governments of the other States of Australia. They do not know how to put it together. For tourists to enjoy the beautiful features and climate of Queensland, we need to provide the facilities for visitors from within the State, interstate and overseas.

In this debate the Opposition has attempted to play down the importance of creating jobs for young people. The Opposition did not bother to mention that the growth in the number of jobs in Queensland is double that of any other State in Australia. Opposition members only referred to the number of people who are unemployed. More people are crossing the border into Queensland to try to obtain a job. The Government would like to provide more employment, and it will if it keeps promoting tourism, which is a labour-intensive industry. In turn, tourism provides opportunities for overseas visitors to enjoy the State.

Reference was made to the promotion of international-standard resorts in Queensland. I agree that the prices charged by some of the resorts in Queensland are high. As a member said earlier, most Queenslanders could not afford to enjoy one night there, let alone seven. Honourable members are forgetting that Hawke has done one sad thing that has, in fact, helped the tourism industry. He has ruined the value of the Australian dollar as against overseas currencies. The Australian dollar is now worth a third of its previous value against the Japanese yen. In other words, its value against the yen has fallen by two-thirds. People think that the cost per night in an international resort is rather excessive. If they realised how cheap the rates are for overseas tourists as a result of the Australian dollar falling to one third of its previous value, they would understand why there is a waiting-list of tourists wanting to fly to Queensland.

A similar position has been created with the United States dollar. Over a period of 10 years, the value of the Australian dollar to the United States dollar has been halved. Because of the consequent very good value that a visit to Queensland represents, North American tourists are knocking on our door. Favourable exchange rates are why people are wanting to visit Queensland and why top-quality facilities should be provided. If the quality of accommodation and services is good, overseas people will have a wonderful holiday and receive good value for money—even though to Queenslanders the rates in some places may appear to be high.

Having studied tourism overseas, I point out to honourable members the tremendous potential for international tourism that exists in Australia. I also point out that Australia is receiving only a fraction of the potential market. I would be guessing if I estimated the number of international tourists in the world. The figure used depends on many variables. If it means anyone who stays away for two or three nights, that could be a bedouin tribe, a Sherpa guide or a person who travels from the Sunshine Coast to Brisbane for a few days.

Mr Mackenroth: If he went from the Sunshine Coast to Brisbane, he couldn't be classified as an international tourist, could he?

Mr SIMPSON: No. One of the definitions refers to the period that the person is away.

Mr Mackenroth: The other definition is that he would have to be overseas.

Mr SIMPSON: I ask the honourable member to be patient. I will explain it to him.

International tourists, as distinct from Australians who travel within Australia, are people who cross a border into another country. Honourable members will see how the figures vary when they consider that to move through some of the countries in Europe does not entail much more travel than moving from one suburb of Brisbane to another. A person in Europe making that journey, moving from one country to another, would be classified as an international tourist. In the context of international tourism, the figures are generated within the European area and they give a false representation because it is possible to travel through five different countries in one day. I have explained that to the honourable member so that he might better understand it.

Mr Mackenroth: Only because I brought to your notice what you are saying.

Mr SIMPSON: No. I was comparing the distance between the Sunshine Coast and Brisbane to distances in Europe and pointing out that a tourist could travel through several nations in Europe in one day. That is the relevance of what I was saying.

The interesting point is that the international tourism figures can vary between 500 million and 1 500 million. However, whatever the figure is—even if one were to take a conservative figure of 600 million people—the point I make is that Australia's share of international tourists is only a third of one per cent. If Australia could lift that figure to a very conservative level of only 2 per cent, that would represent a sixfold increase in the number of international visitors to this country. I repeat that formula: if Australia's share of the international tourist market were to increase from 0.33 per cent to 2 per cent, that would represent a sixfold increase in the number of international tourists who would visit this country. I point out to the Committee that, if that were possible, Australia has not got a hope—no hope whatsoever—of giving those tourists a bed.

Several forecasts about tourism have been made in the Boeing reports. I remind the Committee that the recent Boeing report is the second one. The first one was scoffed at. When the first Boeing report became available, people said that there was no way, in any shape or form, that Queensland could be a major tourist destination in Australia; but it is. The Boeing forecast was correct. It was also correct in stating that Queensland was headed to becoming the major international tourist destination in this country, which is clearly now the case. People have to realise that the Boeing report should be looked at very carefully.

Thankfully, the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation is doing a wonderful job. In common with the Boeing report, reports furnished by the QTTC contain a great deal of research. In addition, the QTTC has a track record that backs up the forecasts that have been made. That is why more and more investment is coming into Queensland. An investment of approximately \$5 billion is involved in development that has either been recently completed or is in the pipeline.

Figures on Queensland tourism have been queried by the New South Wales Government, which has begun to quote figures in an attempt to show that New South Wales might be a little better off than Queensland. To boost figures for New South Wales, the New South Wales Government included projects such as the Darling Harbour development—the stop/start project that the unions will not let the developers finish.

The New South Wales Minister for Tourism, Mr Cleary, queried Queensland's performance. In figures for New South Wales tourism development, he included many projects that would not usually be among the categories that were included in Queensland's figures. The Queensland figures were derived from an unbiased Federal Government survey. If projects in this State which are similar to those included by the New South Wales Government were added to the \$5 billion worth of development that is taking place in Queensland, the figure would greatly exceed \$5 billion. Tremendous investment has been undertaken in this State. That can only come about if the Government ensures that projects are completed on time. Governments have to make sure that projects such as Darling Harbour do not slump or become unprofitable because of the associated delays and costs.

Queensland is also fortunate because people in this State are prepared to get on with development and put their money where their mouth is to provide facilities for tourists. There are various ways to go out and try to get a share of the market. I believe that the QTTC has gone in the right direction. Its policy is to provide accommodation. Queensland has all the natural attractions that tourists are interested in. Tourism in Queensland cannot succeed in the future unless facilities are provided. The QTTC encourages development and the provision of facilities to avoid having international tourists arrive only to find that there are no beds for them to sleep in, after saying in other parts of the world, "Come to Queensland—it is the place to be! Come and spend all your money."

If major hotel chains are encouraged to come to this State and provide facilities, their clientele in other parts of the world will also be encouraged to come to Australia. More visitations will be guaranteed and more beds will be filled. That makes a lot of sense. People engage in promotions and advertising according to where their money is invested. It is better that the QTTC, as it has done, encourages the big entrepreneurs and hotel chains to establish in this State. When they come here, they see that a product is available that will make people happy and bring them back. That is the way it has been pursued. We should stand back and let the entrepreneurs do their thing—provide the beds—keep the beauty in this State and provide the services. The number of flights into this country will thus be increased. Earlier speakers have mentioned that aspect.

I was rather disappointed to hear one of the Liberal members speaking about the two-airline system, which his guru, Mr Fraser, prevented the Queensland Government from getting any sense out of. However, I am pleased to hear that Qantas has announced that it will provide an extra 137 flights.

Mr Borbidge: During the recent Federal election, the Federal Leader of the Liberal Party wanted to cut back payments to the States by an extra \$1 billion.

Mr SIMPSON: Honourable members realise what effect that would have. That is an example of the knocking sorts of attitudes that have been displayed.

Mr Borbidge: Hypocritical.

Mr SIMPSON: Absolutely hypocritical.

I know that 137 flights sounds a lot; but, when the present backlog is considered, I do not believe that that is enough flights. Already Qantas is booked out during the Christmas period. With Expo on our doorstep, more people will be wishing to travel to Australia. Expo presents a tremendous opportunity for people to write to their relations or connections in other parts of the world and invite them to visit this country and attend Expo. The surface has been barely scratched. It will get better and better. There will be a great number of runs on the board.

The promotion of *Crocodile Dundee* has given Queensland a tremendous amount of free advertising. Expo will do the same. Many people do not realise that members opposite—those wimps in the Labor Party who will not do anything to help this State get its fair share of Federal assistance—have colleagues in New South Wales and Victoria who were offered the opportunity to stage Expo but who would not have a bar of it. It was the Premier of this State who said, "Terrific. We will run it. We will take the opportunity to put on this tremendous Expo. We will conduct it as a private enterprise. It will be the only Expo to run at a profit." That is another thing that the Government feels very strongly about.

Yesterday Malaysia accepted the invitation to exhibit at Expo. A total of 41 countries and States will now be participating. When one considers Australia's location, that is a tremendous result. The devaluation of the poor old Australian dollar will also help. There will be 24 corporate participants. Expo is a \$600m investment in Brisbane. As I said before, Expo is self-funding. It will impose no cost on the rate-payers of this city or the tax-payers of this State. The opening of Expo is six months away. Today the pavilions were officially handed over to the participants so that they could start fitting

them out. It is great to see that the Christian-run Pavilion of Promise will be part of Expo.

The landscaping is well under way. I remind people that today and tomorrow are the last days that adult season passes can be purchased for \$120. The price then rises to \$135. Passes for pensioners and children will rise from \$72 to \$80 as from next Monday. People should realise, if they have friends who will be attending Expo, that next year the cost of a season pass will be \$160. Many people do not realise that an evening ticket will also be available. The cost of that ticket will be \$14 for adults and \$10 for children and it will be available to those people wanting to attend Expo after 5 p.m. for night performances.

Expo will provide another tremendous increase in tourism in this State. Queensland is the State that is making it happen. It will give our kids jobs. I believe that tourism will be the saviour of the future economy of this State and of Australia as a whole. Certainly that would be the case if it were not for the way that the industry, particularly in Queensland, has been held back by the Federal Government. Brisbane still has a tin shed that serves as an international airport. How disgraceful that is.

Time expired.

Sitting suspended from 1.01 to 2.30 p.m.

Mr EATON (Mourilyan) (2.30 p.m.): I wish to compliment the Minister's officers in the Division of Sport for the help that they have been in the past in trying to get a small amount of assistance for some of the sporting organisations in my electorate. I can assure the Minister that that is appreciated by the people. I know that he would like to be able to provide more assistance. Many people hope that the financial assistance to sport can continue. Young people who do not live in the city have to make many sacrifices to enable them to compete with their city brothers. Here in the city, for the price of a bus or train fare, they can train on tracks of Commonwealth Games standard; but for those in north Queensland to get the same experience on first-class facilities places quite a financial burden on parents, particularly those parents who have more than one child who is sports minded. Many families in north Queensland have both boys and girls chosen to represent north Queensland at school sports and at other community sports. Often the community is saddled with the responsibility of running functions to raise the money to allow these young people to come to Brisbane to compete with others from around the State.

I realise that schoolchildren cannot be included in support from the Minister's portfolio because they come under the Minister for Education; but, in the future, assistance to these young people could be considered. When many young people are at the delicate age of leaving school, they do not know whether to continue with their sporting ambitions. There are a few dedicated ones who have parents who can afford to help them; but, simply because many people are so far away from the facilities that are available to city people, a lot of talent is lost to sport in Australia. Particularly now with the current state of the economy, when jobs are hard to get, more young people will choose a career in the work-force rather than take up an opportunity with sport.

It is sad but true that many people who work and make sacrifices to educate their children through to university find that, upon graduation, their children cannot find a job. On the other hand, they see sportsmen who, because of their natural abilities, command very high figures in the sporting world and sign big-money contracts. The other day I saw in the paper that a transfer fee on a soccer-player was in excess of \$100,000. In my day in sport nobody dreamt that any player, or even a team, was worth \$100,000.

Mr R. J. Gibbs: You were worth it.

Mr EATON: We reckoned we were, but we could not convince anybody else of that. That was our problem.

Mr R. J. Gibbs: The honourable member for Southport certainly wasn't. What an overrated footballer he was.

Mr EATON: They sent him to Sydney. They took him down there.

I move now to tourism in the north. As the member for Cairns and other north Queensland members from both sides of the Chamber have already mentioned in the debate, the development in north Queensland at the moment is truly amazing. If a person were to drive up the coastal route he would see that development is occurring in nearly every town. Although I am pleased to see that development, which brings a certain amount of prosperity and the creation of jobs, the community must look further down the track to try to maintain a balance. Huge amounts of money must not be expended simply to satisfy a seasonal demand. With the way things are going, the tourism industry is becoming fairly competitive. Because of the way travel is today, a town can find itself with either too many beds or not enough.

I can remember what happened when the wilderness society had its meeting in Cairns at the time that the Cape York Peninsula was declared a wilderness area. Just to find accommodation, people had to go to Kuranda, Malanda and down to Innisfail. Because the motels had guaranteed people accommodation, those who had booked through Flag Motels and various other motel groups were being taken by taxi to other towns.

Despite what the member for Cairns said about the huge increase in the amount of accommodation in Cairns, I am sure that, in the near future, if the airlines are given the right to bring in more people and if the economy improves, those rooms will be full. Hopefully the tourists will not simply stay in Cairns and do day trips to the Great Barrier Reef and the other nearby attractions. Hopefully they will not spend all their money in Cairns. The Atherton Tableland, the Cooktown area and towns to the south have everything that a tourist wants. I just hope that the industry gets its act together and everyone works in together.

One of my complaints is that tourists do not get the service to which they are entitled in a place such as Cairns. On three different occasions I have had to drive along the length of Sheridan Street, which has plenty of motels, to the waterfront and all around Cairns looking for accommodation for people who decided, on returning to Cairns late at night after a trip up to the cape or out west, to catch the early morning plane. I just could not get accommodation for them anywhere. Some motel-owners just said, "Sorry, no accommodation", and turned their backs. Others would ring around and try to find accommodation elsewhere.

Co-operation is what is needed in the tourist industry. People have to learn to work together. As I said, on three occasions I have not been able to get accommodation for people and I have had to take them to stay with my relatives so that they could get away a day early.

For much of the time tourists are not given the recognition that they deserve. Today a tourist has to be a fairly astute businessman. Many people involved in the tourist industry want to buy a motel for \$20,000 or \$30,000, add on a couple of rooms and sell the motel 12 months later for \$300,000 or \$400,000. It is just not on. They are trying to rip off the tourist.

I say again that the tourist today is a very astute businessman. That is why he is a tourist. If he is not a very astute businessman with a bit of common sense, he cannot afford to go on holidays. It is as simple as that. Many people involved in the tourist industry can see its potential but they have not got the ability to tap that potential. It is the responsibility of the Government to give the lead and offer advice.

I turn to tourist facilities. I mentioned in particular national parks. In the presentation of his Estimates, the Minister mentioned Lake Eacham and Josephine Falls. Both of those areas are just outside my electorate. On many occasions I have had the pleasure of visiting those areas. I have had a great deal of enjoyment from taking friends and relatives on trips there.

The Minister mentioned that Lake Eacham has a mobile kiosk. I think that that is a disgrace. I remember the time when a big old hut with a verandah around it served as a kiosk at Lake Eacham. It was run as a family concern. The husband worked as a ranger for the National Parks and Wildlife Service, and the wife ran the kiosk. On any day of the week a person could buy a three-course lunch. That kiosk catered for busloads of tourists. The lady who ran the kiosk could throw a boomerang. She used to entertain busloads of tourists by showing them how to throw a boomerang. Morning and afternoon teas, as well as lunches, were served. The kiosk was kept very clean. That kiosk created jobs.

Josephine Falls has a ranger. I cannot see why it could not have a kiosk. It could be run by the ranger's wife or perhaps it could be leased out. Something is needed to cater for tourists. The public expect certain facilities to be provided. In my experience, children love to have an ice cream, a soft drink or a packet of Minties. If refreshments can be obtained in an area, tourists will return. The children will want to go back again. This is something that the Government should consider. I realise that it would be a fairly costly job——

Mr Ardill: They don't support family tourism. That is the trouble.

Mr EATON: That is right. What is needed is a little bit of initiative. Sometimes a bit of courage is needed to take the initiative. I would certainly support any moves that the Government might make to upgrade the facilities available in tourist areas.

In that regard, I mention also the Tully Falls region. Many years ago, twice a day, buses would take people to Ravenshoe for morning or afternoon tea and then go on to Koombooloomba Dam and Tully Falls. Two families out there kept the tracks cleared. A big shed was built there. Firewood was chopped and water was laid on. Tourists could go for walks and have a meal. However, as soon as the hydroelectric scheme was finished and the water stopped flowing, those two families were moved and the place just went to pieces. The lantana took over and the tracks became overgrown. People stopped going there because there were no facilities. If attractive facilities were once again provided, it would create employment and tourists would return.

A major cause for concern is that facilities have not been provided in outlying rural areas or, if they have, they are not maintained to a sufficient standard to attract tourists. People spend money when they are touring. They stop and buy soft drinks, ice creams and so on. People might go home a little bit tired at the end of the day but at least they will have had a great day out. Because people are living in the fast lane, they are not spending time with their families and enjoying life and the natural attractions of this State. If the Government can supplement Queensland's natural attractions with a few good artificial facilities, it will be a great benefit to the tourist industry.

I turn to national parks. I have great respect for the people employed by the National Parks and Wildlife Service. That service is probably the most understaffed section of the Government. I know that the position has improved. A few years ago things were even worse. I can remember going on a trip to Cape York. I think that the member for Wolston also went on the trip. There were three rangers in that Cape York area and they had only one vehicle. Each of them used the vehicle for two days to empty the drums and to carry out other tasks.

At that time many people were going in and out of the parks because it was school holiday time. One ranger would drive 20 miles to deliver the vehicle to another ranger, who would then have to drive 20 miles back with the first ranger, and 20 miles back to his camp. They were covering 60 miles. Eventually that situation was rectified.

We saw at first hand the conditions that those men had to work under. They were working flat out all the time, with one vehicle between three different camps. In spite of that, the park was a credit to them. There are other areas with the similar conditions, but perhaps not as bad. Many people working in the national parks are doing a great job. Not only do they do a good job in looking after and catering for the public, but also they have the knowledge to be able to answer any questions they are asked.

Mr R. J. Gibbs: We thought the greatest ones were the ones who gave us that excellent feed of fresh barramundi.

Mr EATON: That is right.

The rangers can answer questions on the birdlife and wildlife. The golden-shouldered parrot can be found in that area. It is a very rare bird which bird enthusiasts would love to see. They would have to stay in the area for months to see it, but there are a few of those parrots in the area. The people working at the park could answer all our questions, and the chap who was in charge at the time got some of his information out a big book. It was a most interesting exercise for us. We knew a little about bush craft, and the rangers could answer our questions about the wildlife, fauna and flora. A chap named David, who works in the Palmerston national park, in my electorate, is very good at that.

The service that the rangers provide cannot be measured in money. The rangers take visitors from overseas and from other parts of Australia around the parks and tell them about a certain possum, or bird or some other form of wildlife that lives in the area. Those rangers go out at night-time with spotlights to find the wildlife. They know the areas, and their service to the department cannot be measured in money. I recognise the value of these people, and I am sure that the Minister does, too.

Turning to another aspect—plans have to be made to bring the money into the country. Australia is too small a nation to carry its current debt. Australians are trying to live beyond their means. Although tourism is one activity that can bring money into Australia, it will not be the be all and end all as many people think it will. Too much emphasis is placed on tourism as a means of getting Australia out of its financial problems. A tourist is a very astute businessman; he knows what is going on and will not be duped by us or anybody else. He wants value for money. If Australia does not try to give tourists value for money, that will be the rock that Australia will perish on.

In today's *Courier-Mail* on page 10 the Minister referred to the World Heritage committee. Previous speakers have referred to this. I have been involved in World Heritage discussions in my area. The World Heritage rules are not as tough as the national park rules. The Minister has given an assurance that projects can go ahead, power lines can be put through and essential services will not be interfered with.

Mr FitzGerald: Do you believe him?

Mr EATON: Yes, I do believe him.

The Minister stated—

“Democracy is certainly not a strong feature of the lifestyles of at least one-third of the countries on the committee. In addition, civil war and other military and civil conflicts unhappily upset the lifestyle of the people of some of the other countries on the committee.”

The Government is trying to have it both ways and wants to split straws. It is not worried about selling sugar to the Russians, or anything like that. I am in favour of that, and I am not trying to be a hypocrite. If the Government is fair dinkum, and if the Russians are so bad, why does it not say that it will not sell them anything?

I live in the middle of the area that will be affected by the World Heritage listing, and I have taken a stand on it. I have opposed my own Federal Government on some matters and the Minister knows that. I have made certain submissions in an attempt to have those matters——

Mr FitzGerald: A courageous decision, I thought.

Mr EATON: I made the decision because I believed that it was right. I make all my decisions on that basis and if I cannot go public and tell a person to his face, I will not go behind his back.

If the Minister or the Premier had taken up the Federal Minister's offer of consultation, the problem could have been solved within two or three weeks and this controversy would not have occurred. It does not matter which way the Federal Government goes now, it will get its teeth kicked in. If it does not alter its line, the people will kick its teeth in; if it does, the conservationists will kick its teeth in. This State Government has created a no-win situation and Queensland will be left to live with it.

I have supported World Heritage listing publicly and still support it to a certain extent. I will not back off; but when I am trying to help solve a problem and be of service to those who elected me, I will not be used. That has been my concern right through, and I have tried to play it that way. I have even gone against my own party on occasions when I felt that it was necessary. I am disappointed that the Government is trying to have two bob each way by picking out issues and, at times, by using me when it suits the Government.

As to the World Heritage area—I went through exactly the same thing when reference was made to the establishment of the Great Barrier Reef marine park.

Mr Muntz: One is at sea; the other is on the mainland.

Mr EATON: That is so, but a similar principle is involved.

I can remember several old fishermen very well. They came to me and said, "I have been a fisherman all my life. All my life I have wanted a boat. I have just got one that I can handle, and you are going to take my living away from me." I attended several of the meetings that were held, and they were pretty rough. If honourable members want to hear people talk straight from the shoulder, they ought to attend a meeting at which a lot of fishermen are present.

Since the establishment of the Great Barrier Reef marine park, I have not received one complaint from the committee. Later I shall table the documents that Senator Richardson has circulated. They refer to the dos and don'ts of World Heritage listing. Senator Richardson stated—

"Management of the area will be administered by an organisation based in north Queensland and not Commonwealth Government Ministers or officials in Canberra."

Senator Richardson wants the area to be administered by the Queensland Government because not only is it an economic proposition, it is also a wise decision.

As I said, that is what has been done with the Great Barrier Reef marine park. Not one complaint has been received from fishermen or anyone else since the marine park was created and the management and running of it handed over to the marine park authority. In fact, several marine parks have been opened and closed. The areas have been monitored properly. The areas are being farmed, not mined. The same attitude should be adopted in other areas.

Mr Muntz: The National Parks and Forestry people are professionals and doing a tremendous job. Why duplicate their activities and waste public funds?

Mr EATON: The Federal Government will get those people to do the work and cost-savings will be made. The Federal Government contributes money towards the Great Barrier Reef marine park. The same will apply to the rainforests.

The comments I have to make apply not only to Mr Muntz or his department but also to the State Forestry Department. For a long time I have battled with one matter that has put me offside with many conservationists. However, they are beginning to realise, particularly the wildlife people, the importance of what I have said. I shall table an extract from a magazine that is headed "Conservation by experience". Reference is made in it to Mr Bob Hill, of Millaa Millaa, whom I have known for many years. He has been a timber-cutter, a miner and he has followed many other trades. Nobody knows

the bush better than Bob Hill. He has provided a solution to the problem of the cassowary becoming extinct.

The article states—

“Last month he wrote to the Prime Minister saying:

‘The cassowary, a very endangered species, will be extinct by the year 2000 if we don’t find a method to breed them in captivity, or if we don’t pig-proof fence a fair area of rainforest scrub and hand feed them.

‘The few remaining cassowaries are where the farmers have kept the pigs away. This is fact.

‘Decimation of the cassowary in other areas: Blame the National Parks and Wildlife administrators.

‘They have a guide-line they won’t change.

‘Timber cutters like the late Mick Coleman and Paul Mansfield—Mick had a pig dog, Paul still has pig dogs. They were going to protect their livelihood and promote logging into the future by stopping feral pigs from breeding and spreading the cinnamon fungus which destroys trees.

‘They got caught a couple of times and were warned. Once more and they would be prosecuted and have their vehicles and firearms confiscated and a hefty fine’.”

That is something that the Government needs to examine. Wild pigs are prolific in north Queensland, particularly during the present dry season. They go to the waterholes and move into the rainforest——

Mr Lee: What about if foot-and-mouth disease came in? They would be worst carriers of the lot.

Mr EATON: The honourable member is correct.

A farmer who lives adjacent to a national park or a State forest can obtain permission to shoot feral pigs. However, many responsible young pig-shooters could be organised by the National Parks and Wildlife Service or the Department of Forestry to shoot those pigs on an organised basis. If the cassowary and other ground-nesting birds are not to become extinct, the wild pigs will need to be extinguished. The Government can set an example by organising its officers. I know that there are competent officers in both the Forestry Department and in the National Parks and Wildlife Service. They could organise expeditions to shoot the wild pigs. People have said that the pigs should be poisoned. I think that that is the wrong way to go about it because, besides pigs, other animals would be poisoned. That is not the answer. There are plenty of pig-shooters in north Queensland.

Time expired.

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

Mr VEIVERS (Southport) (2.50 p.m.): It gives me a great deal of pleasure to be able to contribute to the debate on the Estimates of the Department of the Arts, National Parks and Sport. I will be addressing my comments and observations to the sport component of the Estimates.

The Honourable the Minister, Mr Muntz, is held in very high regard by sports organisations throughout this State. Queensland is very lucky to have a man who holds sport so very close to his heart. He administers his portfolio with plenty of professionalism.

Sport has always held a special place in my life, having been an active sportsperson for many long years and having had the privilege and pleasure of representing our nation on the international sporting field, which is something that Opposition members have not done.

All Australians, and particularly Queenslanders, have a healthy interest in sport, whether it be as competitors, administrators, coaches or even as dedicated spectators

and supporters, such as Mr Gibbs, who attends the State of Origin matches. Australians' involvement in sport goes back to the days of the First Settlement. Australians were pitting their prowess against the mother country back in the 1870s in sports such as cricket, boxing, rowing and Rugby. Many of those sports at that time were in their infancy, with crude and ill-defined rules. As this country grew and prospered, so did the inhabitants' love of sport and competition. The 1880s and onwards saw the development of the sports of tennis, golf and swimming.

Sport developed in Australia as almost an obsession, because historically the Australian climate proved fertile ground for sporting involvement. Sport became a channel for national self-esteem where Australians who were not influential in world affairs could compete as equals. They were able to develop a national identity if they excelled, as they so often did. Some of our sporting heroes who are in that category are Jack Brabham, Don Bradman, Clarke, Elliott, Fraser, Laver and Rosewall—to mention but a few who, in the 1960s, won world acclaim.

Mr Lee: I thought you were in that category, too.

Mr VEIVERS: I am not quite as old as those persons.

The Olympics in Melbourne in 1956 saw Australia win 36 medals—13 of them gold. However, in the following Olympics, the gold medal count was down—Rome 8, Tokyo 6 and Mexico 5. By the mid-1970s there were no gold medals for the Australian public to delight in. Montreal was a disaster for Australia, and Australians wanted to know why. The traditional sports system was not at fault. The club system of Australian sport still existed and operated as a self-funding, volunteer body with kitchen-table administration, mainly untrained coaches and chook-raffle funding.

Mr Milliner interjected.

Mr VEIVERS: Sport at all levels realised that it had to become more professional in its outlook, whether it was in administration, coaching, umpiring, refereeing or fund-raising.

Mr Milliner: Get your hands out of your pockets.

Mr VEIVERS: Governments overseas had already taken up the sports challenge and were providing financial assistance to their sporting bodies. If the honourable member for Everton were to listen to what I am saying, he might learn something and become internationally famous.

I am proud to say that the Queensland Government was the first Government in Australia to establish a meaningful sports assistance scheme. This Government—the same one of which I have the privilege to be a member—established the first effective Ministry of Sport, department of sport and funding scheme in Australia, which has remained ongoing since 1972. Of course, the other Governments in Australia followed soon after in creating their own departments of sport and developing their own sports schemes.

The scheme here in Queensland has been developed in conjunction with the State sporting associations and provides funding support in the areas of greatest need. In line with Government policy of small government, the staff levels in the Division of Sport have been kept to the minimum required to service the scheme. That is sound thinking, because it means that the moneys appropriated by Parliament go to where they will do the most good—to the sporting bodies themselves—and are not eroded by paying salaries to an army of bureaucrats, as is the case with the other States, and particularly the Commonwealth.

I point out that figures I have show that recurrent funding to sport on a per capita basis in Australia is at its highest in this State because of the Government policy of small government and the policy that the funds appropriated be distributed on the basis

of the greatest good for the greatest number in all areas of the State. The 1982-83 per capita funding for recurrent funds is as follows—

Queensland	85c
South Australia	29c
New South Wales	22c
Western Australia	44c
Tasmania	62c
Victoria	25c

That is firm evidence that the funds allocated are going where they should—to sport.

I am a strong advocate of supporting the youth of today and in assisting them to grow and develop into our respected senior citizens of tomorrow.

Mr Milliner: I tell you what—for a front-row forward, you can read all right.

Mr VEIVERS: I take umbrage at that remark. I am reading from copious notes, and that is all.

Involvement in active competitive sport is one avenue which can do much in the development stage. I can recall vividly the skills developed at an early age through sport involvement in such areas as respect for oneself and others, confidence, communication, the desire to compete at the highest level and an ability to accept losses—not too often in this Chamber, I might add. All of this is in addition to fitness and the resultant healthier life-style gained through sport. Honourable members only have to look at me to see the result of that.

Many members of this Parliament have a background of active competitive sport and well know from first-hand experience the benefits which come from an involvement in sport. Because of this I know that they are supportive of the Government's scheme. The scheme has as its corner-stone the subsidy assistance package for junior coaching programs covering the 81 recognised sports in this State. Since 1972, sports have actively sought participation in this all important area. The department's annual report shows that the sports involved have received over \$9.7m subsidy assistance under the junior coaching subsidy scheme. Using the applicable percentage at the time, this means that in excess of \$23m has been spent by clubs on junior coaching programs.

In addition, funding assistance is provided to help clubs develop their playing facilities. Since 1972, over \$15.9m—Opposition members should listen to this—in subsidy payments have been made. The Government has therefore helped fund projects with a total value of almost \$60m.

Mr Campbell interjected.

Mr VEIVERS: I might say that the honourable member should get into sport, because he could not upturn a damn Sao biscuit.

These two measures help sport at the grassroots level and really represent bread and butter funding assistance. They also have an impact on the economy by creating many man-hours of employment.

By assisting sporting clubs to afford the services of qualified coaches, there is a higher level of coaching given to the participants, particularly if the coach has obtained his sports accreditation. This, of course, leads to better attitudes and behaviour, and if the other States were to assist their sports at the club level for coaching programs, that would lead to a reduction in violent conduct in sport, as has been achieved here. I believe that the junior coaching scheme has had this effect in Queensland.

Like other members of this Parliament, I can see the tangible benefits of the encouragement to sport scheme in my electorate and pay tribute to the Government and the Honourable Minister for the provision of the funds to sport at the grassroots level. In fact, all of the measures which make up the scheme assist sport in meaningful and important ways, whether it be in coaching, facilities, travel, administration, staging

of events, employment of directors of coaching or assisting our high-performance sportspeople. This funding assistance at all levels of Government has seen a rejuvenation of our performance at international level. The Commonwealth Games in 1982 and the Olympic Games in 1984 again saw Australians on the winner's rostrum. When looking at medal-winners at the Los Angeles Olympic Games from Queensland's point of view, there were Jon Sieben, Mark Stockwell, Glen Buchanan, Justin Lemberg, Ian Edmunds and Grant Kenny—all of whom have received funding under this Government's magnificent scheme. The Queensland scheme has been developed to prop up the volunteer army of sportspeople to enable sport to become more proficient in all aspects. The 10 measures of assistance which make up the scheme have done just that.

Sport will always have its highs and lows. However, funding support from Government is vital to the future of sport. The Government's contribution of over \$39m under the scheme has gone a long way towards providing a more stable and secure future for sport in this State.

Some measures that directly affect the administration of sport are subsidies for administration costs, directors and regional directors of coaching, and courses and seminars run by the State body. This is another example of the provision of funding support for yet another very important area of sport which, as all honourable members would acknowledge, is the engine room of any sporting body. Good administration is the basis of success in any venture—even more so when it involves a system largely dependent upon volunteer support.

Sport obviously considers these measures positive, popular and of benefit to it. In the administration costs area, which can cover staff salaries, printing, stationery, office rental, audit fees and car allowances, some 58 State sporting associations have applied for and received ongoing assistance. Expenditure under this measure has amounted to \$2,952,592 since it was introduced in 1977.

The assistance package applies to directors of coaching and, in the major sports, regional directors of coaching receive a similar subsidy package. We all would understand the need for and benefits to be derived from having better and more highly trained coaches in the sport system. Broadly, a director of sport would be responsible for—

- encouraging participation in the sport concerned;
- development of coaching programs;
- promotion of the sport to the general public, schools, etc.; and
- implementation of any development plan the sport may have.

Presently, 31 sports receive assistance under this measure, which covers some 80 positions for either full-time or part-time directors or regional directors. The funding support given by the Government since this measure was introduced in 1977 has amounted to \$2,797,239.

Another very important area of funding support are the grants that are made available each year to help send the State team of the sport concerned interstate to contest the national or Australian championships. These funds assist the individual sportsperson to afford to represent this State.

Grants are also provided on those occasions when the State body of a sport takes on the challenge of staging the national titles in Queensland or, for that matter, an international event in Queensland. Under this measure of assistance, funds were made available to Queensland swimming to assist with the administrative costs of staging the highly successful Pan Pacific Swimming Championships held at Chandler this year.

Mr Lee: The crowds were disappointing though, weren't they?

Mr VEIVERS: The honourable member did not even attend.

As the scheme was introduced to provide assistance to sport, to become more proficient in all areas, it is appropriate that there also be incorporated in the scheme a means of providing funds to sport when courses and seminars are run to upgrade

officials, whether they be administrators, treasurers, umpires, coaches or referees. Sport realises the need to become more expert in these areas. It is pleasing that this form of assistance can be made available.

Of course, sport has always had its stars and its heroes. Every young person involved in sport has his own idol—the one he hopes to emulate in his own field of activity.

In the lead-up to the 1982 Commonwealth Games, approximately \$500,000 was injected into the scheme in an endeavour to have as many Queenslanders, from the 10 Commonwealth Games sports to be contested, represent their State at the national level, and compete on their home soil. This adjunct to the scheme proved most successful because the eventual team reflected more Queenslanders per capita than any other State.

Mr Davis: Did you write this?

Mr VEIVERS: I did.

Following the games, the Government very wisely decided to continue the funding but extended it so that all high-performance sportspeople from all of the sports recognised might be considered for assistance under the scheme. This measure not only covers the individual gifted sportsperson but also allows for funding to go towards the coaching and training of the sports talent development squads.

Queensland has produced many talented sportspeople from funds provided under this measure, together with the sports' own funds and sports' sponsorships, to make up a partnership of funding to assist more Queensland sportspeople to represent Australia on the international sports-fields.

So that encouragement of our young talented athletes might continue, funds have been made available to assist those sportspeople outside of the greater Brisbane area. That is done through the regional sports talent assistance scheme, which provides funding support to enable them to receive additional coaching and training. These young talented sportspersons could well become our medal-winners of the future. The final measure of the scheme provides funds to assist with the costs of conducting State championships outside of the Greater Brisbane area.

Because of the decentralised nature of this State, that can become a very costly exercise. However, the benefits to a sport of exposing its top-level event in the provincial areas of the State can do much to promote that sport and sell its own message.

Queenslanders have played a major role in the successes of Australian teams at international level. Rugby League, Rugby Union, women's water polo and Australian men's and women's hockey teams have all had more than their fair share of Queenslanders as members.

Perhaps last year saw a record as far as captaincies of Australian teams are concerned, with Queenslanders holding such positions in Rugby League with Wally Lewis; Rugby Union with Andrew Slack; cricket with Allan Border—who, even though he has been imported, is a Queenslander now—women's water polo with Debbie Hanley-Cummins and surf life-saving with Mark Raeburn.

I, like all members of this Parliament, know the value of the scheme in my own electorate. Since 1972, approvals for junior coaching subsidies have amounted to \$283,215, involving coaching programs in excess of \$1.1m to be undertaken, and capital facilities subsidies of \$317,898 have been approved to assist with the construction of sporting facilities costing in excess of \$1.5m. I emphasise that that relates to my electorate of Southport. Funding support has gone to a wide range of sporting clubs covering Rugby League, Australian football, soccer, touch football, fencing, golf, netball, gymnastics, basketball, tennis, swimming, pony clubs, the martial arts of judo, ju jitsu, karate and tae kwon do, and volleyball, to mention some of the sports involved.

Mr Milliner: Did you ever run into a stiff-arm when you were playing football?

Mr VEIVERS: Of course, funding support can only be given if the club applies to the department at the correct time and in the correct way.

I usually avoided stiff-arms, just as I avoided that.

The encouragement to sport scheme with its broad base of grassroots level support to sport, its assistance in administration and coaching direction, and still providing funds to the high performance area, stands out in sports-funding schemes in Australia as a model of what can be done if Governments provide the dollars where they will be most effective.

I fully support the provision of sports funding and the philosophies behind the scheme and commend the appropriation of funds for the purposes as outlined by the Minister.

Mr McELLIGOTT (Thuringowa) (3.09 p.m.): I take pleasure in rising to take part in this debate because of the long involvement that I have had with sport. At the outset, I join with the Opposition spokesman on Tourism, National Parks and Sport in congratulating the Queensland Government on its being the first State Government to implement an encouragement to sport scheme back in 1972. In some of the areas that are covered by that scheme the Government remains the leader.

However, over the years I have been disappointed, and remain disappointed today, that the Queensland Government has not shown more of a lead in the area of innovation by amending its policies and the types of assistance that it gives to keep pace with the changes that have occurred in sport.

I was equally disappointed that the member for Southport simply read a brief that outlined the department's concept of the advantages of the scheme as it presently exists. I can recall that when Mr Veivers was on television he suggested a whole range of changes that ought to be made to the administration of sport and Government support of sport. I thought that he would have introduced some of those comments into the debate today.

The extent to which Governments become involved in sport is a very, very interesting subject of discussion. As I have said, it is one that I have been involved in over a long period of time. There is no doubt that, if Governments adopt a greater financial interest in sport, there will be greater Government control. In his speech the Minister used the old line that sporting bodies do not want to be controlled by Government. I accept that some people adopt that attitude. On the other hand, anybody who entered the magnificent facilities at the State sports centre at Homebush, Sydney, that was provided by the New South Wales Government would find that the competitors and the spectators who have the advantages of those excellent facilities do not mind the involvement of Governments in sport at that level. How to find the balance between those two points of view is a very, very interesting exercise and one that I thought might have been developed today.

Traditionally in Australia and Queensland the attitude has been that sport is best administered by volunteer administrators who, as Mr Veivers said, sit around the kitchen table to conduct their affairs and raise their finance by conducting chook raffles and so on. In addition, I do not think there is any doubt at all that some sports have become much more complex in their administration. If Australia and Queensland are to keep pace with the world, they have to react accordingly. That is my criticism of the Government today; I do not think it has done that.

Where that is most obvious is in the provision of facilities. Unfortunately facilities continue to be developed on a somewhat ad hoc basis. Recently I read in the *Courier-Mail* concern expressed at the way that sporting facilities are being developed in Brisbane, where some major facilities that were built at considerable cost are underused while other sporting bodies need upgraded facilities but certainly cannot obtain the requisite finance. So at a State level Governments have a role to try to create a master plan for the development of facilities that takes into account the current and future demands of sport. They ought to be giving some sort of lead in that direction. Of course, local authorities should be involved and, at appropriate levels, so too should the Commonwealth Government. That applies in country areas even more than in Brisbane. In the country,

facilities for some sports, at least, are still not of a sufficiently high standard to encourage the improvement of players' skills and their involvement at the highest level.

Arguments over sport can be in two stages. Many people in the community believe that the pursuit of elitism in sport is bad and that the concept of sport should be participation by the masses. I think that there is growing acceptance that both of those levels of sport are achievable and that in their own way they both serve a very useful purpose. Again, Governments need to cater for both structures of sport. There is nothing wrong with elitism. The country will still have its champions. The fact that an area may have the best cricket team or the best Rugby League team in the country will always attract community attention and, in its own way, that provides a release for the pressures in society. People enjoy watching the best teams play; I do not believe there is anything wrong with that.

A long time ago I predicted that in Australia sport would gradually develop into two levels, one which would be fully professional and would almost enter into the entertainment category and the other below that would be a level that would see a return to the days of the amateur sport that honourable members used to know. That is clearly developing. There is no comparison between the standard of play and the professionalism that is associated with the Brisbane Bullets and the standard of play and the level of professionalism attached to the local basketball competition. Now that the Broncos are entering the Sydney competition on a totally professional basis, that will prove to be the case with Rugby League. Obviously the Brisbane Rugby League competition will come back in status somewhat and will return to that almost amateur level that I have been speaking about.

I do not see anything wrong with that. However, I believe that Governments have to react to those sorts of changes. There is a role for Government to play even in the professional game. The types of facilities that people are demanding these days are, of course, very, very expensive. It is part of the Government's responsibility to ensure that those facilities and the opportunities to participate in sport at the highest level are spread right around the State.

I think that the Queensland Recreation Council has a role to play but that it is not playing that role at present. It has been long-standing Labor Party policy that it would take the Queensland Recreation Council out of the welfare area, include it under the Division of Sport and establish it as the Queensland sports council. With its network of area committees and area offices already established, that organisation has a unique opportunity to assist not only in community recreation but also in elite and higher-standard sport in the respective communities.

I commend that approach to the Government. I believe that it should be given consideration. It has been raised on many occasions in the past and ignored. If the Government is to play a meaningful role in the provision of sporting facilities, services, coaching and so on, it does need to be co-ordinated, and the co-ordinator best placed to do that, of course, is the existing Queensland Recreation Council.

Another matter that is the subject of long-standing Labor Party policy is the vexed question of whether or not to allow the introduction of poker machines. The cost of administering sport and providing the types of facilities that people are demanding today is getting beyond the capabilities of volunteer fund-raisers. Today in Queensland volunteers spend an enormous number of hours in administering sport. An enormous debt of gratitude is owed to those men and women who, for reasons best known to themselves, devote many hours to providing the funds and the facilities necessary to enable people to play sport. However, it cannot continue for ever. To allow the introduction of poker machines is one way in which the Government can assist sporting bodies.

I am not suggesting the indiscriminate use of poker machines. The delineation is fairly clear. In my opinion, poker machines ought to be permitted in duly registered and licensed clubs. Allowing that avenue of fund-raising for the larger clubs and organisations will leave the chook raffles and the 20c ticket sales to the smaller organisations. Giving

simple approval to the introduction of poker machines in Queensland would go a long way towards assisting sporting organisations.

Having spoken about the Government's role in sport, I must acknowledge that in some ways sport has been its own worst enemy. My experience at the local government level and at other levels has been that it is almost impossible to get sporting organisations to work together. If first-class facilities are to be provided for sport, multipurpose facilities will be essential. I have been associated with five or six multipurpose developments. I can assure honourable members that there is no more selfish group in the community than sporting organisations because, although they appreciate good facilities, they appreciate them for their own use and they get very, very toey indeed about other organisations using their facilities.

I acknowledge that that is a difficult problem to overcome. Many times I have been convinced that I could persuade sporting organisations to co-operate in the development and use of multipurpose facilities. I can assure honourable members that it is not easy. I repeat that the Government has a big role to play through the introduction of the Queensland sports council that I suggested.

While I am on the topic of sport I want to mention hockey, because that is the sport in which I have a particular personal interest at present. I refer in particular to the provision of artificial surfaces. I raise that matter today not only because I have a personal interest in it but also because it is a finite example of the type of modern development that sport needs. Perhaps the Queensland Government has not come to grips with this matter.

At present the Townsville Hockey Association is attempting to finance and construct a synthetic surface. The Government has just approved a subsidy of \$86,000 for that surface. However, when one considers the fact that the total development is of the order of half a million dollars, one understands that much more money needs to be raised by a local organisation.

Even at a cost of a half a million dollars, that synthetic surface is not the best available. It is the cheapest variety available. Over the years a city such as Townsville has provided a number of international hockey representatives and, if it is to continue to provide players at that level, it needs modern facilities. Although it does appear very likely that that result will be achieved, it is a great impost on that volunteer group of people. Townsville is not unique in that regard. Bundaberg is trying to get such a facility, and that development will continue throughout the State.

It is interesting to note the way in which Olympic swimming-pools have been constructed throughout the State. I think the reason for that goes back to some special financial arrangements that were made after World War II. Almost every city and town of any reasonable size in Queensland today has at least one Olympic standard swimming-pool, and that gives the sport of swimming a tremendous advantage over other sports. Of course, swimming-pools have a recreational as well as sporting use, but nevertheless it is an indication that with goodwill and planning by the State Government, those kinds of facilities can be provided for other sports as well.

Although the State Government is playing its part, it is doing so on the basis of a program that was introduced some 15 years ago. If this Government is serious about promoting and supporting sport—as I believe it should be—there is much more that it can do. I do not think that it ought to be put off by arguments about sporting organisations not wanting Government interference. As long as that Government interference and control is constructive and results in better facilities, better coaching and the better administration of sport, those organisations will accept that Government control.

I move now to tourism. Townsville is a relative newcomer to the area of tourism. Townsville is fortunate as a city in that its economy has been so widely based that it has not depended on any particular industry. As a result, over the years Townsville has gone through the lows in the economy better than most cities and towns have. To some extent, tourism is the icing on the cake for Townsville. In recent times there have been

many developments in the tourist area, such as the development of the Great Barrier Reef Wonderland; the casino, which appears to be having troubles at the moment; and the Breakwater Marina, which was opened recently. All of those developments are catering for tourists. I am sure that the reason why the casino is having difficulties and the reason why the Great Barrier Reef Wonderland is not getting the anticipated patronage is that not enough people are coming to Townsville. It is a fallacy to say that large numbers of local people will use those facilities. There are only 400 000 people in the whole of north Queensland, which is simply not enough to sustain the sorts of numbers needed to go through those tourist outlets. Townsville needs more tourists and a greater promotional effort. Money is a problem. I know that the local tourist organisation is trying its hardest and is coming up with many excellent promotional ideas, but it really needs money. Today I am asking the Government to indicate its continuing support for that level of promotion.

In referring to tourism, I turn briefly to the fire that occurred on the Reef Link II. Because of what happened in that disaster, this matter should be of concern to everyone. It is of concern to tourists and tourist operators. I wonder about the political wisdom of the Minister for Water Resources. I have already clashed with him on the subject of the Townsville/Thuringowa Water Board, but he appears to be hell-bent on destroying the credibility of this Government again in regard to this fire. There is no doubt at all that the skipper of that boat has been made the scapegoat for the deficiencies in the design and construction of the vessel and, in addition, for some very obvious inefficiencies in the surveying requirements of the Minister's own department. I will not reflect on the Marine Board of Queensland itself, but I cannot accept a situation in which that board, after a somewhat restricted inquiry, has laid the blame on the skipper and, on the basis of five grounds which are difficult to sustain, has asked the skipper to voluntarily surrender his master's licence for a period of three months or subject himself to an open inquiry at his own cost. Clearly, that was not justice.

There are considerable doubts about the reasons for that fire. If there are such doubts, the Government has a responsibility to hold a full and open inquiry not only to ensure that the difficulties I have mentioned are rectified on future occasions but also to put the stamp of approval on the whole north Queensland tourist industry. When people use the services provided in north Queensland, particularly the vessels, they want to be assured that they are safe.

Today, I would have liked to read into *Hansard* a very long list of deficiencies on Reef Link II that have been reported to me as being present when the vessel was delivered to Doug Tarca's organisation. The list is too lengthy. I will simply indicate to the Committee that 20 individual faults were found in Reef Link II after it was supposedly surveyed and after it had just completed sea trials. Some of the more serious faults have been mentioned already by my colleague the member for Townsville East.

One fault that strikes me as significant is that the wrong signs appeared on the pumps. Because of that, when salt water was supposed to be pumped to fight a fire, the chances were that the person involved would be pumping distillate out of the bilges—which, of course, would cause disastrous results. There is sufficient in this whole matter for me to raise very serious doubts about the report of the inquiry. As I said, the master was found guilty on five counts, none of which can be fully sustained.

For example, the master was accused of not being familiar with the fire-fighting equipment and not agreeing to familiarise himself with the fire-fighting facilities on Reef Link II when it was delivered to Townsville. The fact is that the skipper was out on the Barrier Reef on another vessel on the day that the Reef Link II was delivered to Townsville, so obviously he was not available for any sort of briefing. No briefing was offered to him.

Reference was made to the master's failure to conduct any form of crew-training. The master himself was an ex-RAAF air/sea rescue officer. There was no loss of life on the Reef Link II. At the time, the Minister himself said that the crew deserved a medal

for their efforts. I do not believe that the allegation made about crew-training can be substantiated.

The question of the possible cause of the fire has been dealt with by my colleague the member for Townsville East. Reference is made in the letter of show cause to an earlier reported grounding of the vessel in the vicinity of Magnetic Island. The report of the inquiry does not mention that, other than to state that the grounding has no possible connection with and certainly was not the cause of the fire.

The last allegation in the report was that there was a failure to make effective use of the fire-fighting equipment. Again that is laughable. There was no automatic extinguishing equipment in the bridge. The fire-extinguishers that were provided were less than useless.

I conclude by saying that this whole incident needs to be reviewed by an open inquiry so that the people using vessels in north Queensland can be satisfied in the future that they are perfectly safe. The two sister ships of Reef Link II are currently operating in north Queensland, so the potential is there for those vessels to have the same types of deficiencies as those found in Reef Link II. Today I ask why the Minister for Water Resources phoned Doug Tarca, the owner of Reef Link II and employer of the crew, to ask the master to accept the Marine Board's decision rather than face an open inquiry.

Time expired.

Mr SHERRIN (Mansfield) (3.29 p.m.): Today I wish to address the issue of tourism. I am very pleased to rise in this Chamber and to support the Minister for Tourism, National Parks and Sport and to praise him for his capable and highly efficient administration of his portfolio. Before I touch on elements such as the effect of tourism on the Queensland and national economy, provide a brief overview of some relevant tourist statistics and devote the major part of my address to Expo and its effects on the State's economy particularly through tourism, I wish to look closely at the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation. I shall examine briefly the charter of that highly efficient organisation, and I shall detail how, in the brief time that it has been operating, it has achieved its aims.

When the QTTC was established, it was given two main briefs. One of them was to develop the Queensland tourism industry, which, at that time, was highly fragmented and lacked co-ordination, a common goal or purpose. The other brief was to make Queensland the leading tourist destination in Australia. The important thing to remember is that, unlike so many other Government quangos, particularly those at the Federal level, the QTTC was able to do that by using a minimum amount of Government money.

During the last financial year, the QTTC earned commission of \$6m on holiday sales, which totalled \$60m. Together with funds provided by the Government, that commission contributes towards making up QTTC's revenue of \$24m, which is very well spent.

The annual report of the QTTC for the year ended 30 June 1986 reveals that, under the heading "Marketing Queensland", the QTTC's main brief is to maximise the economic benefit of tourism to Queensland. Compared with other tourism-marketing authorities, the QTTC stands alone, because it has been able to achieve that objective by taking a global view of tourism. The QTTC has looked outwards as well as inwards, whereas many of the other tourist authorities in the nation have tended to look inwards at a very restricted market of only 15 million people. The QTTC has been very aggressive in going after the market share that Queensland so rightly deserves. By looking outwards as well as inwards, it has created a market of more than one billion people around the Pacific rim. The QTTC has created a world-class product to appeal to those people whom it regards as Queensland's potential visitors from the northern hemisphere and elsewhere in the world.

During the past few years the QTTC has been at great pains to establish a world-class product. The promotions that have been undertaken by the QTTC reveal that it

has been able to achieve that goal. Unlike other tourism authorities in this nation, the QTTC has not concentrated heavily on promotions, advertising, hoo-ha and so on. The corporation's driving philosophy has been to create a basic infrastructure of tourism in order to establish the destinations and the international-class products that have placed Queensland among the leaders in Pacific tourism.

Tourism development in Queensland accounts for almost 80 per cent of Australia's total tourism development outside capital cities. It is interesting to note that Queensland's tourism development has grown at twice the rate of that of the other States. The highly popular Sunlover package holiday program is the country's pace-setter. Many other States and tourist-marketing organisations use that program as a bench-mark for their own wholesaling of tourist destinations.

Mr Davis: Who asked you to make this speech?

Mr SHERRIN: I asked the Minister for permission to make this speech, because tourism is very important.

All honourable members would agree that the economies of Australia and our State are undergoing profound structural changes. Since Federation in 1901, the Australian and Queensland economies have been based almost exclusively on the twin pillars of exports of our mineral wealth and primary production.

In recent times honourable members have witnessed the way in which our nation's economic health can be so easily affected by overseas influence over which we, as a State and a nation, have almost no control. I refer to the dramatic changes that have occurred in the exchange rate of the Australian dollar during the past year; the wildly fluctuating world commodity prices of our main exports, such as coal, wool, wheat, sugar, copper and zinc; and the increasing protectionism that is practised by other nations—many of which are our so-called friends—to the detriment of our own exports and economic health.

More recently, we witnessed our own vulnerability to overseas changes. That was brought home very graphically to us by the recent events in our own stock-markets that were brought about by a fall on Wall Street stock exchange in New York.

Mr Davis interjected.

Mr SHERRIN: I hope that child endowment does not go too far down the drain on the stock-market.

I wish to look at some of the basic relationships between tourism and the national and Queensland economies. In 1987, the annual direct value of tourism to the State's economy has been estimated at \$4.3 billion, but when one takes in the multiplier effects of other service industries providing facilities and services to the tourism industry, the \$4.3 billion escalates to \$9 billion as a direct economic effect to Queensland's economy. It is a very important facet of the State's economic development.

During 1986, approximately 70 million visitor nights were recorded in Queensland—32 million from intrastate, 27 million from interstate and 9 million international visitors. Honourable members will remember my earlier remark that as a State we needed to look outwards and not inwards. Queensland accounts for between one quarter and one third of all the tourist action in Australia. With our three international airports—which far exceeds the number in any other State—and our 11 international hotel chains, we report 50 per cent of the Australian major tourist development, and 80 per cent of that is looked at on a regional basis, excluding the major cities.

The much-quoted Boeing report says that by the year 2000 tourism will account for \$21 billion a year for the Queensland economy. As a job-provider, it provides almost 6 per cent of Australia's Gross Domestic Product and provides 145 000 jobs in Queensland—half of them employed directly in the industry itself. To return to my major theme—it is important that, as a nation of 16 million, we look further afield to the billions of people living on our own doorstep.

With regard to travel trends—the Domestic Tourist Monitor, which is a State-by-State comparison, has revealed that over the last seven years Queensland has been growing at twice the rate of the rest of Australia, that is, 6.4 per cent compared with 3.2 per cent. Some of the main highlights for the year to 30 June 1987 include a national increase of total domestic visitor nights of 1.9 per cent, compared with that of Queensland of 9.8 per cent. Queensland was certainly the trend-setter for the whole of the nation. Queensland's share of the domestic market increased from 23.4 per cent to 25.2 per cent, a trend that has been continuing over the years. New South Wales and the Australian Capital Territory, I might add, suffered a decline in interstate visitor nights, to receive only 28 per cent, whereas Queensland's share increased to 31 per cent. With intrastate visitor nights, Queensland again increased by 14.2 per cent compared with a national average of just 1.8 per cent.

An interesting report was carried in the *Financial Review* of Wednesday, 28 October under the headline "Queensland's tourism schemes reach \$5bn". I bring to the notice of the Chamber some of the points raised by that article. It stated—

"If all tourism projects mooted for central and North Queensland proceed, the market will be flooded with 12,000 rooms and projects valued at more than \$5,000 million, according to a report by a property agency.

Hillier Parker's *Queensland Property Report* for September 30, 1987 says the bulk of schemes that make up the list of projects recently completed, under construction or proposed are very much in planning stages.

It said a total of 21 major tourism projects valued at about \$500 million had been completed between Bundaberg and Port Douglas . . ."

That is excluding the tremendous tourism development that is going on in the south-east corner of the State. The article continued—

"They included 17 projects with tourist accommodation providing almost 2,000 rooms, including eight projects in or near Cairns with a total of 1,100 rooms. Projects completed on the Barrier Reef island have provided a further 350 rooms.

. . .

There are a further 21 projects valued at \$750 million under construction in the region."

There are six in Cairns and on the adjacent Barrier Reef islands.

The report continues—

"According to the Hillier Parker report, the estimated value of the 81 proposed developments is considerably more than \$5,000 million. They include tourist accommodation totalling well over 12,000 rooms."

Where else in the nation would honourable members find 81 large tourism projects going on at the same time?

That is an insight into the tremendous tourism development that is being carried out in Queensland at this time.

For the last half of my speech, I wish to devote my time to the tourism potential associated with World Expo 88. As all honourable members would know, World Expo 88 will provide Australia with this country's major focal point during its bicentennial celebrations for the six months from 30 April next year until the closing ceremony on 30 October 1988. During those six months, visitors to World Expo 88 could experience at first hand the culture of at least 30 countries. That figure is increasing daily. Twenty corporate pavilions have also been set up, and people will experience a continuous cavalcade of entertainment, day-and-night parades, laser exhibitions, fireworks exhibitions, a fun park and so on.

The closing ceremony on 30 October 1988 will be the culmination of approximately six years of planning and construction. During that period, approximately \$500m would have been spent on reclamation of land for the exposition site, construction, fitting out

and operation of the pavilions, and the payment of salaries and services that will be provided for the benefit of the people of Queensland.

It is interesting to note the tremendous expenditure on creation of jobs and training that is associated with the exposition. All of that will not stop at the end of the expenditure of \$500m. It has been estimated that redevelopment of the site, following the closure of Expo next year, will also generate expenditure of the same magnitude—that is, another \$500m. In the space of months, this one event—a significant event—will provide an injection of \$1 billion into the State's economy.

As all honourable members would know, the theme of the exposition is "Leisure in the Age of Technology". Some of the key features of Expo 88 will be the major pavilions that I have already mentioned, including the corporate display areas and the international exhibitions. In addition, there will be a monorail, an amphitheatre, plazas, the artificial lagoon and the artificial mountain. The major capital investment associated with that entertainment—such as the amusement park—has already been mentioned.

I turn now to examine the primary employment impacts. It has been estimated that, through direct employment created by Expo 88, 7 073 man-years of employment will be generated. Attendance levels indicated by ticket sales will exceed the authority's wildest expectations and indicate that Expo 88 will be a bumper event—one of the great events of this century for this State and this nation. It is estimated that 7.8 million visitors will attend the exposition.

Mr Davis: Have you bought tickets?

Mr SHERRIN: Yes. I have bought tickets for all my family. It will be great fun.

Mr Davis: Your wife will not be able to use your gold pass.

Mr SHERRIN: The honourable member should not be like that.

Forty-one per cent of those 7.8 million visitors will come from the resident market—that is, those who live in and around Brisbane. Five per cent will come from the regional market, which includes those who live in areas up to 300 kilometres away. Seven per cent will come from the remaining areas of Queensland—for example, provincial cities. Thirty-four per cent of visitors will come from interstate destinations and 13 per cent will be international visitors. Presently, it is expected that each visitor to World Expo will spend on average, on the site alone, approximately \$15. I think that that is a very low estimate. In addition to the benefits derived directly from World Expo 88, Queensland will benefit enormously in the long term also from planned redevelopment of the site.

The World Expo 88 authority has issued its own forecast for attendance levels. It is expected that, from the Brisbane region alone, 5.1 million visits will be made, which includes repeat visits; 2.6 million visits will be made by people who live in other areas of Australia; and an additional 600 000 visits will be made by international visitors.

It is important to note that Expo 88 will continue to lead the way in Queensland's tourism boom. It is already topping up a buoyant tourism industry in Queensland. For 1987, the Expo authority has estimated that Expo trade commissioners, delegates and suppliers from interstate and overseas are already filling 9 per cent of Brisbane's hotel accommodation. Even at this stage—months before Expo 88 commences—9 per cent of Brisbane's hotel and tourist accommodation is being occupied by people who are associated with Expo. That figure is estimated to increase to approximately 18 per cent for the whole of 1988—that is, the three months before and after Expo as well as the six months for which Expo will operate. During the six-month operation of Expo 88, it is estimated that between 25 and 30 per cent of all visitors who stay in Brisbane will be associated in some way with Expo 88.

As many speakers on this side of the Chamber have already demonstrated so capably, that Expo boom comes on top of holiday growth that has now led to Queensland's becoming the top Australian domestic holiday destination; so, on top of the already phenomenal growth in tourism, Expo will add another 10 per cent or 20 per cent.

It is important to note that the tremendous development associated with Expo has really confounded the critics. When the southern States did not have the wisdom or the courage to grab hold of Expo, Queensland took the initiative and decided to stage it. When the Government made the decision to apply to host Expo, it had many expectations. It appears that already those expectations have been far exceeded.

In what is seen as a rally of support for Expo, more than 300 000 season tickets have already been purchased by the people of Brisbane and south-east Queensland alone. In the past month in Melbourne and Sydney, when the three-day passes were available, the sales of those tickets alone exceeded expectations by a factor of five, which moved Sir Llewellyn Edwards to comment that he expected World Expo to return a profit just on the basis of the income derived from the sales so far.

The combined sales of three-day and season passes, on the basis of people with season passes going through the turnstiles for an average of 12 visits, have enabled the organisers to claim that already Expo is more than half way towards achieving its target of 7.8 million visitors. It was anticipated that 43 000 season passes would be sold in the first three months and that no more than 200 000 would be sold over the whole period of Expo. In the first three-month period, 291 844 tickets were sold; so, instead of ticket sales raising an expected \$4.5m, they have now raised \$26m. I emphasise that.

In closing, I also want to draw attention to another facet of tourism associated with World Expo, that is, the international business links that will be forged between Australia—in particular, Queensland—and overseas countries. World Expo is staging a World Expo business program in conjunction with Expo, and it has been estimated that between 50 000 and 60 000 international businessmen will visit Brisbane during the six-month exposition. A local, Queensland-trained international businessman, Mr Peter Watson, has been appointed to head a program to foster the development of those business links during the staging of Expo. That program will be operated via computer. It will put international businessmen in touch with Queensland industry. The businessmen will have available to them a computer data bank that will link their company and industry, itineraries and other details with local Queensland businessmen.

Those 30 000 to 50 000 businessmen will be provided with personalised invitations to attend World Expo 88 during the time when the visitors' business program is being staged in co-operation with the Queensland Government. It is modelled on a very similar program to that run by Canadian industry in association with its World Expo in 1986.

In closing, I commend the Minister and his officers for their highly efficient and conscientious administration of the Tourism portfolio to the obvious benefit of all Queenslanders.

Mr INNES (Sherwood—Deputy Leader of the Liberal Party) (3.49 p.m.): I propose to cover briefly four topics—two in relation to national parks, that is, southern Moreton Bay and the whole question of landscape preservation in Queensland; the predicament of sporting clubs; and the tourist aspects of things that are happening currently at Mooloolaba.

I will first deal with national parks. This year's annual report of the National Parks and Wildlife Service mentions a proposal for the southern Moreton Bay area. That is a response that is long overdue and certainly requires a commitment of resources that is difficult to find in the service, which has a vast job to do with limited resources, particularly in these stringent economic times. May one say that the Minister's professional staff do a valiant job in carrying out the intent of the Act and in doing so much to attempt to preserve for the enjoyment of everybody the natural parts of Queensland.

There has been produced by the National Parks and Wildlife Service a superb brochure titled *Jumpinpin for nature and recreation*. The intent is magnificent. No doubt the superb production is an attempt to counteract what people for good reason believe has been going on in southern Moreton Bay, that is, the almost untrammelled, almost uncontrolled development of anything and everything that can be grabbed or inveigled from private or public resources. One of the passages states that the strategy seeks to

permanently conserve the many islands of southern Moreton Bay and some adjacent land as environmental parks. Those are sentiments with which most of us would have absolutely no argument. The passage also states that these lands include Coomera, Woogoompah and several other islands.

Coomera Island is a subject that I have raised in this Chamber in recent times. I have done that because of its proximity to Sanctuary Cove. Let me say at the outset that one hopes that the actual development of Sanctuary Cove is the roaring success that would befit the amount of money that has apparently been poured into it. My consistent argument around the edges of Sanctuary Cove is that, because it is the subject of enormous investment and because it is intended for those very few people who can afford astronomical sums of money, it should at least compete on the market according to the terms and conditions that apply to other developments. As one has in mind the long-term strategy of the conservation of certain parts of southern Moreton Bay for all Queenslanders for all time balanced against the short-term interests of the development over the next few months of Sanctuary Cove, one finds extraordinary the placement of a dredging pipeline across a wetland reserve and through an area of scientific research that had been going on for years and that involved a significant public purpose only for the private purposes of Sanctuary Cove.

Yesterday in this House the Minister for Primary Industries made a ministerial statement in which I think he tried to deal with a certain amount of the publicity that had been attended upon my statements and the statements of people associated with the research. However, interestingly, the most significant part of the statement was his admission that he gave permission for the pipeline to go across the wetland reserve. I deal with this matter in terms of the intention of the purpose of national parks, which become part of the permanent reserve. What happens in the hands of other departments is significant to the long-term interests of the National Parks and Wildlife Service.

One finds that a wetland reserve is declared under the Fisheries Act, which provides the mechanics for setting apart reserves, which can include wetland reserves. The broad purpose of the reserves that can be set apart under the Act are for the protection and management of the fisheries resource. Section 52 of the Act is the only provision that relates specifically to what can happen in reserves. It states—

“The Minister or person authorized in writing . . . may, within a reserve, sanctuary or ground set apart and declared under and for the purposes of this Act,”—

of course, the purpose of the Act is to protect the fishery—

“undertake and do such works and acts as he considers necessary or desirable for the preservation and proper management and, in an applicable case, the public enjoyment of that reserve, sanctuary or ground.”

According to my at least partially informed statutory interpretation, there is not a single provision that would allow the Minister to grant any permission.

Under the regulations, wetland reserves are specifically referred to. The regulations state, “A person shall not in respect of a wetland reserve save in accordance with a permit granted by the Minister”—and that could only be under the Act—remove any substance or cause damage which would be deleterious to fish marine products, mangroves or marine plants within a reserve. It seems to me that there is a *prima facie* case that the Minister for Primary Industries has acted unlawfully and in excess of his powers under the Act by allowing the entrance for the purposes of laying this pipeline. That was an enormous discourtesy, considering that a letter was sent to him and his various departments as well as to Mr Gore only two months earlier, saying that because of previous depredations which resulted in adverse effects on the research area the people involved in the research reserved their rights to sue for damages as a consequence of that and that they sought an undertaking that no further action would be taken which would affect the research area without consultation with them. So a special situation applies to certain people in Queensland, apparently against the provisions of an Act, to cater for the short-term interest of a single private person or a company. With total

discourtesy to a public body carrying out public research, and contrary to their requests, the pipeline goes through. What is worse, the vehicles that were used in the process wandered hundreds of metres from the tracks necessary for the laying of this pipe, which was 80 centimetres in diameter. The vehicles just trundled through the whole research area all around the island, this place that is to be set aside for the future.

Is there a special set of rules for some people? I suppose that it amounts to buccaneering. To ignore the law would be sheer piracy. Buccaneering is claiming the protection of the law for one's own private purposes. That is what is happening. Even Ministers get sucked into breaches of the Act provided that the private interest is backed by a sufficient number of zeros. It is not good enough. It is not in accordance with the public interest, which is supposed to be protected by these Acts and the services involved—the fisheries service or the national parks service—it simply is the complete obliteration of the public interest in favour of very private interests.

One can talk about so many things in relation to the national parks portfolio. I will leave aside the northern rainforests, which can be dealt with on another occasion. There is one matter that I want to touch upon briefly. Two weeks ago the title of Queensland Business Executive of the Year went to Mr Christopher Skase. Mr Skase spoke about why he came to Queensland. Among his paramount reasons for coming to Queensland—bearing in mind his particular interest in tourism—were the superb climate and the unique landscape.

Landscape is a reason why areas can be set aside as national parks. Those of us who have had the benefit—I will not say the privilege; the privilege is to live in Queensland—of living in Queensland after having lived in other parts of the world, feel, perhaps more than native Queenslanders, the tremendous attraction and uniqueness of Queensland. It has now been recognised not in biological and environmental terms but in purely commercial terms as a magnificent attraction and a magnificent back-drop for the tourist industry, which everyone accepts is a very important addition to our economic base—a rather fragile economic base that in the past has depended on limited areas of operation. While I am on the topic of landscape, I want to raise perhaps a broader issue than just those parts of the landscape that have been preserved in national parks. All sorts of conflict is occurring because of the leap-frogging nature of development. There are always people who will be inevitably attracted by unspoilt coastline or unspoilt and attractive regions and who will want to go to those places for their recreation. The unspoilt nature of the landscape adds a dimension to the quality of recreation that is sought at holiday-time in contrast to other times of the year. There will be those people who are attracted by the flesh-pots of the world or will go to cities for their recreation, but most people have a tremendous interest in getting away from it all by going to the beach or other relaxing places.

There are some clear conflicts, and we have leap-frogged up and down the coast—from Surfers Paradise to the Sunshine Coast, which is becoming a new focus, and Noosa is the prime spot; to Rainbow Beach and Hervey Bay—in an attempt to fit everything in between. For many people Surfers Paradise is becoming a recreational place of a special type; it is for those people who like a lot of urbanisation. There is not so much fishing left or the relaxed old-time holiday atmosphere. One has to have a bundle of money before going there—unless one is like Mick Veivers and can bludge off somebody down on the beach.

Mr Veivers: That is terrible.

Mr INNES: I withdraw that. It was not intended as a reflection on him. I know that he puts pensioners up and that, if they write to him, he will find a cheap place for them on the coast.

Many people, including myself, choose to go to the north coast, where the complete urbanisation of the lower Mooloolah River has been seen. I will refer to that in a moment. There are no longer the mangroves, fish or pelicans on the river, but instead there are marinas and 24-perch blocks right down to the waterfront. There will always

be people who wish to blend holiday accommodation with a sense of something that is natural and unspoilt. The northern side of the Maroochy River is under attack, but more importantly the northern side of the Noosa River is under attack. One of the essential attractions of those areas is that, when one looks across the river, one can see a piece of Queensland that is beautiful, unspoilt and as ancient as time itself. This is the kind of place that not only has the benefits of aesthetic attraction, but also provides a breeding-ground for fish, etc.

This problem has to be looked at. Other parts of the world are getting smart, and a strategy should be set up in Queensland to preserve what is an essential attraction of the area or is a component of the natural part of these holiday destinations.

I take issue at times with the view held by a person whom I claim as a friend, Bert Wansley, the Chairman of the Noosa Shire Council, because I do not agree at all with the proposal to build a bridge across the Noosa River or to build a massive major development across on the northern side of the Noosa River. The superb attraction of the Noosa River is that there is the backdrop of the national park on the southern side and the vista over to Cooloola on the other. Cooloola is a fragile sand mass area and, if any developer gets permission to build an airport and a massive international development over there, it will be, "Bye, bye, north shore." This beautiful vista towards Cooloola is of enormous economic importance to Hastings Street and this development on the south side will go. And for what reason? Will it be for more of the same? The next attack will be further up the coast towards Rainbow Beach and Fraser Island, and it will continue. We have to get smart and stop this repetition. Often the springboard for development is the acquisition of bargain-basement land in vast tracts, because no-one ever believed that it would be used in that way. This land is then converted into instant riches by the appropriate rezoning. People who buy stuff at bargain-basement prices do not lose much if the zoning stays the same.

We have to be serious about the long-term future of Queensland's tourist base. People do not fly across the world or from Victoria to see suburbia on the water. The essential thing that they will find constantly refreshing and diverting, and which will be a constant attraction, will be a part of natural Queensland. A strategy must be established. I have talked to tourist operators in Port Douglas and they have the same fear, that as the land is being gobbled up on the south side of the river which enters the ocean at Port Douglas, the mangroves and the natural part, which goes as far as the eye can see on the north shore, will be alienated.

If we are smart, we will hold the line on one side of the rivers, because the conjunction of a river and an ocean beach is a magnificent natural focus point of attraction. If we hold one side, we hold its natural attraction. Inevitably, that will enhance the value of the land on the other side of the river and will provide something for everybody.

The pensioner who drives to Noosa for the week-end or goes into the caravan park or the camping ground, as well as the person who pays \$1,000 a week, obtains the benefit of the view by sitting on the south side of the Noosa River. He can look across to the mangroves, the tea-trees and the natural attractions on the other side. It is not possible to achieve that benefit by dividing the land into 24-perch blocks, so that people are corraled in little barbecue areas that have a view across the river to other suburban blocks and other little barbecue areas.

I said that I would speak briefly about sport. Sporting clubs are in crisis. I am not talking about commercial clubs and night clubs; I am referring to sporting clubs. The crisis has been caused by the combined effects of the RID campaign and the encouragement, in the early eighties, to expand. Tremendous pressure has been applied by the Institute of Sport, which has a concept of excellence, on clubs to improve fields, change rooms, training rooms and facilities generally. In many cases, expansion presupposed the continued profitability of the club's bar, not because the clubs wanted to turn out drunks but because that was a legitimate part of structuring a club and the only significant continuing source of income. Clubs are in crisis.

Two clubs in my area have between them a debt of \$500,000. They cannot meet their monthly interest payments. Rugby League and Rugby Union clubs, and to some extent Aussie Rules clubs, are finding themselves in a similar situation. It is happening in significant clubs throughout the community. Little people were required to act as guarantors because the banks required guarantees for loans to clubs. The amounts guaranteed range from \$2,000 to \$30,000. The people who gave those guarantees are now under threat of those guarantees being called up. The people never intended to make a buck; they wanted only to help their kids or their favourite sport. They put themselves in the firing-line.

Although I am saying that there is a crisis, I am not saying that the Government has to bail the clubs out entirely. Because clubs provide a vital public service, the Government has an obligation to them. Their existence keeps kids off the streets. They do something that is supported by the Division of Sport. There is a need for some sort of summit or meeting between the Division of Sport and the licensing people. The hotel industry and the organised sporting clubs also have an interest in attending such a meeting to see what can be done. There are a variety of solutions to the problem, such as the introduction of poker machines or some other types of minor changes in the law that would relieve the financial predicament of the clubs. The matter of licensing fees is something that could be considered. Through the Division of Sport there is the possibility of the Government's compelling sporting clubs to get together so that their facilities can be rationalised. As there is a crisis in sporting clubs, it would be a tragedy if little people are forced to bear the brunt of it. Something can be done about the problem. The matter should at least be explored by the Government.

The Division of Sport does a great job. It has particular knowledge of the predicament facing many sporting codes. I urge the Minister to be at the centre of a task force to organise a summit of Government agencies and the interested people outside, in an attempt to achieve a reorganisation, a saving or a bail-out to assist our sporting clubs.

Time expired.

Hon. G. H. MUNTZ (Whitsunday—Minister for Tourism, National Parks and Sport) (4.09 p.m.): It is with a great deal of pride that I rise and thank all honourable members for their contributions to the debate. I appreciate their comments, one and all. Some comments were more positive than others. I will touch on the positive matters now and refer to the negative ones later.

I thank the member for Surfers Paradise and the member for Condamine, who led the debate on each day that the Estimates have been debated, for their commitment to the portfolio. I thank the members of my committee. They have endeavoured to talk to as many people as possible at the grassroots level. They have endeavoured to ensure that there is a partnership between tourism, national parks and sport, as it is a partnership within this Chamber, to ensure that we provide the best service in all areas to the greatest number of people.

That partnership is supported by officers of my department, who were unanimously applauded for their dedication and professionalism within their fields of responsibility. Those people are Mr Stan Wilcox, Mr Pat Smith, Mr Pat King, Dr Graham Saunders, Gary Gilbert and also Mr Herb Bonney, who has relieved for Dr Graham Saunders.

Only one member of this Assembly made unnecessary and disgusting comments about one member of the staff and a particular staff within the tourist industry. I believe that all honourable members in this Chamber condemn the honourable member for his comments. I do not believe that they would be accepted by any member of this Committee. The honourable member should apologise to those people whom he criticised. They are professional in their approach and do their best to serve this State and the people who approach them from time to time.

I appreciated the constructive words of the honourable member for Chatsworth. Mr Mackenroth sought an explanation about funding. Funding figures on page 16 of the annual report of the Division of Sport reveal that \$4,500,900 was expended from the

Sport and Youth Trust Fund. That fund is administered by the department, and funds go towards sports assistance, youth assistance and the Australian Sports Medicine Federation. That is, this Government administers the trust fund where dollars go to two departments. The sports dollars from the trust fund totalled \$2,357,900, and the sport consolidated revenue figure on page 15 of the report was \$2,614,700. The grand total of those figures is \$4,972,600, which represents the total dollars that were expended on sport last year together with the projected dollars for this year.

I turn now to the other major point that was raised by the member for Chatsworth. Many great minds have addressed the fair way of spreading the sports dollars from the Government at both Federal and State levels. This Government believes that it has achieved that objective, but I assure honourable members that constant reviews are being undertaken within my department. The obvious difficulty is that three levels of Government are giving dollars. Approximately 80 sports need funding, and there will be even more sports needing funding in the future. Fifteen million Australians love sport. For starters, Australia has an incredible range of sports experts. Added to that are indoor and outdoor sports, summer and winter sports. Olympic and others—the list is endless. That shows how difficult it must be to please all sports. However, this Government tries to do its best for the greatest number of people in every sporting arena across the board.

In the various comments that were made about tourism there was one very common thread. I am sure that all honourable members would agree with that. They are aware that tourism in this State is booming. It is also booming in Australia, but more so in Queensland. It is booming and progressing to everybody's advantage. Much of its prominence has come about in the past decade through its ability to generate economic growth in jobs, income, standard of living and the stimulation of other productive sections of the economy.

Various speakers touched upon a significant number of points, and I should highlight the thoughts that they prompted in my mind. The first point that was mentioned was the significance of tourism to the economy. In 1986 it accounted for 6 per cent of the nation's Gross Domestic Product. In 1986 in Australia, expenditure by domestic and overseas tourists was slightly in excess of \$20 billion; international tourists contributed 15 per cent and domestic tourists contributed 85 per cent. Over 5 per cent of Australia's total work-force is in some way relying on the tourism industry for a weekly wage. The Bureau of Industry Economics estimates that it takes only 32 overseas visitors to create one job, compared with 250 visitors travelling internally. That reflects the higher spending and longer average holiday of overseas tourists. Domestic tourists travelled 75 per cent by motor vehicle; 8 per cent by plane; 5 per cent by bus and coach; 4 per cent by train; 0.4 per cent by ship, boat or ferry; and 4.4 per cent was unspecified.

About half of the tourism projects in Australia—that is, \$5m and over—under construction or firmly committed to 30 June 1987 are in Queensland.

In 1986 there were about 300 million visitor nights in Australia, with Queensland accounting for 75 million of these—in other words, a quarter of Australia's tourist action. The 75 million visitor nights reflect about a 90 per cent domestic to 10 per cent international tourist ratio. Australia has a population of about 15 million people, so domestic tourism and any growth is controlled by our restricted population figure.

Australia receives under one-half of a per cent of international arrivals worldwide. Our potential for growth is enormous. That growth will be from New Zealand, from the USA, from the UK and from Japan. Obviously, New Zealand will be overtaken as our first overseas customer, simply by virtue of the population of the USA and Japan.

The Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation will spend about \$27m during 1987-88. About \$15m of it will come from consolidated revenue; QTTC will generate \$12m itself. Within Australia and overseas, it has just under 300 staff as ambassadors for Queensland tourism. They do a terrific job at the grassroots level at which they come in contact with the public. I commend them for that. Salaries, administration and computerisation are expected to account for \$17m. Domestic marketing and regional

grants will amount to about \$4.5m and overseas marketing, \$2m. Capital expenditure and market research take up the balance.

I will always give credit where I believe it is due, and the member for Archerfield met the criteria with his comments, but I remain unconvinced that he did not borrow much of his tourism words of wisdom from my press releases. I am totally pro Australian-made tourist souvenirs. I promoted that in recent weeks and months. Sadly, though, he is a little thinker when he makes the statement that this National Party Government is preoccupied with overseas tourists.

The member for Cairns set about trying to knock off the member for Mackay as the knocker of the north. They both knocked jobs, tourism, jobs, investment, jobs and their own electorates. It is not surprising that the member for Cairns backs Senator Richardson and the Federal Labor Government in knocking out jobs by World Heritage listing. Tourism is booming in Queensland but it is stagnant in the Labor States. Why is this so? The answer is simple. Our policies are right and theirs are wrong.

I was appalled at the contribution by the knocker of the north. He knocked the relocation of the railway line and he knocked the Pioneer River development. When the rail relocation debate was in progress, Mr Casey was travelling the world. He was not then and never has been interested in development in Mackay. He should have been in this Parliament representing the people he was elected to represent. He is only interested in trying to score cheap political points in conjunction with one or two of his Left Wing aldermanic mates on the Mackay City Council. It is no coincidence that a local authority election is coming up. Speaking of elections—Mr Casey's majority in his own seat has shrunk from 57 per cent a couple of elections ago to 51 per cent at the last State election. He has been a failure in business and in politics.

Mr Casey: Have you had a look at your own?

Mr MUNTZ: In fact, they have increased.

Mr Casey has never really supported the Pioneer River development, even though he says he has, and he is determined to see that it does not proceed. For that reason, politics intrudes again. At least the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation has recognised the potential of the land——

Mr CASEY: I rise to a point of order. The Minister is deliberately misleading the Chamber. He is stating untruths. I have clearly said in this Parliament, not only today but on numerous other occasions, that I am 100 per cent behind the development of the resort at the mouth of the Pioneer River. The words that he has said are offensive. I ask that they be withdrawn.

Mr MUNTZ: I withdraw them.

At least the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation has recognised the potential of the land and took positive steps to create an interest in the project. It found a developer who was prepared to commit himself to spending his hard-earned dollars. This developer has done much on behalf of the people of Mackay, and he will succeed. Ko Huna resort and other major resorts north of Mackay are up and away. The Pioneer River project will follow.

As Mr Sherrin, the member for Mansfield, said, Expo 88 will be a great success. Because of the work that has been put into it, it deserves to be. It will be a great success not only for Queensland but also for Australia. Combine this with the international tourism flavour leading into the year 2000—that is, northern Australia, the Gold Coast, the Barrier Reef, the Last Frontier, etc.—think about Qantas—the airline of which I am proud and for which I have unlimited support but which cannot handle the trade into the year 2000—then you will see a Labor Government totally anti-Queensland that is not allowing a fair go to our international airports. It is no wonder that I am calling for at least a trial open-skies policy for international tourism during Expo 88.

In terms of international flights to Australia, Queensland has 12 per cent of direct seats and 24 per cent of visitor nights; New South Wales has 51 per cent of direct seats and 34 per cent of visitor nights; and Victoria has 22 per cent of direct seats and 19 per cent of visitor nights.

I acknowledge the support of the honourable member for Surfers Paradise and congratulate him on the part he played in attracting the De Laurentiis film group to Queensland. His outstanding drive and effort, as a member of one of Queensland's leading tourist areas and as a member of the Queensland Film Corporation, ensured that the De Laurentiis project came to Queensland and did not go to a southern State.

With regard to that part of the portfolio dealing with national parks, I would again thank members for their contributions. As the member for Condamine mentioned, conservation is an ongoing process. This Government will continue to improve what is already an enviable record in a diverse State. The central Queensland coast is one of those areas targeted for improvement. It is the intention of the Government to declare the Deepwater national park shortly. However, I would add that any land-use proposal, including land set aside for conservation purposes, will have to form part of an integrated land-use program. The same applies to the conservation of Queensland's fauna. It requires a balanced approach and a commonsense approach; and, as has been mentioned by so many members, it is a pity the Commonwealth Government cannot take the same approach.

There is of course no time to mention innovations in the wildlife field, such as population assessments, even though these matters were properly and appropriately raised by the honourable member for Mount Gravatt, and particularly by the member for Warrego.

I was pleased to hear the comments of the honourable member for Moggill. I can only applaud his approach. I would request, however, that he get his message across to his Canberra counterparts before it is too late. Somehow, the great injustice and hypocrisy of Canberra action has to be brought to the minds of the people of the southern States. The problem is much the same as the Australia Card saga. Once the community was made aware of it, it was quickly abandoned; so also should it be with the case of World Heritage.

The honourable member for Burnett also mentioned some of the more obvious defects of the World Heritage listing proposal, but I was not surprised to hear the honourable member for Windsor support the listing and state further that compensation would be generous. He obviously has a lot to learn about Commonwealth finances, and he could start by finding out how many dollars the Commonwealth Government has put into the Great Barrier Reef listed area as a consequence of its being declared a World Heritage area.

As was stated at other times during this debate, a north Queensland rainforest proposal amounts to nothing more than a land-grab. The honourable member for Windsor and his colleagues would be well advised to pick up their act before events overtake them.

World Heritage listing is, as the honourable member for Aspley stated, a failed conservation concept. Although I do not doubt the sincerity of the member for Mourilyan, he and the member for Windsor have to realise that they are being taken for a ride. The member for Aspley and the member for Broadsound mentioned the concept of multiple land-use strategies. Clearly, that is the way to go. It can be done, and is in fact being done in north Queensland rainforests at this time. In fact, various types of habitat have been recreated at Fleays Fauna Centre, as mentioned by the honourable member for Nerang. The rebuilt and reopened centre is a credit to the service and a substantial tourist attraction. It must no doubt give great satisfaction to its founder, Dr David Fleay.

The member for Mourilyan is a little Labor throw-away fish in a big pool—a pool dirtied by Senator Richardson and his Left Wing, bumbling mates and their greenie bedfellows. What I cannot understand is why the honourable member does not live up

to the convictions that I believe he holds, and totally oppose his Federal colleagues in relation to World Heritage listing.

Again, I thank the honourable member for Southport, Mr Veivers, for his contribution. He has been a great international sportsman in Rugby League. I believe that the honourable member will rise to the same elite level as the previous member for Southport. The honourable member's contribution to sport is an enviable record.

The only reminder I want to put to honourable members about sport is that Queensland is a State of sports achievers. Names, such as Wally Lewis, Greg Norman, Wendy Turnbull, Grant Kenny, Glenys Nunn and Jon Sieben quickly spring to mind. To have the high performance sportspeople, the seed-bed of juniors properly coached in all the fundamentals of the code of their sport is needed.

The Government assists with dollars so that sport can be more proficient in all aspects—such as administration, coaching, refereeing, etc. With great pride, this Government has been doing that since 1972.

In Queensland, sport has enormous distances to cover. Cape York to Brisbane is the same distance as Brisbane to Melbourne and back to Sydney. Fortunately, Queensland's population is spread along its eastern seaboard to give sport at competition level some comparative comfort, but the costs are quite real. At Government level, we must never be tempted to sacrifice the seed-bed dollars for juniors at the expense of high performers. I give that firm assurance to this Committee.

Finally, wearing both ministerial caps—Tourism and Sport—I have issued an instruction to the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation that we now progress the matter of bidding for a future Commonwealth Games in Queensland. After all, Edinburgh has done it, so why can't Queensland? I know I have the support of all colleagues in this regard because after Expo it would be a wonderful record if this State hosted another Commonwealth Games.

I thank Mr McElligott, the member for Thuringowa, for his comments. They were an example that sport does not stop at an electoral boundary. The department was very happy to provide a subsidy to the Townsville people for hockey. It serves the whole district. It will succeed, as the Gympie sports centre and others have succeeded.

Mr McElligott: Thuringowa—it is in my electorate.

Mr MUNTZ: Yes, but the honourable member did not make too many representations. I believe that all of the representations were made by my colleague Tony Burreket. From time to time the honourable member did mention it to me, but the initial representation was made by Mr Burreket.

I thank Mr Innes for his contribution. I take on board his remarks about young people in sport. I remind him that recently Mr Skase said that the climate he talked about at that time was good Government and the magnificent attraction was the Premier of this State. He told me that himself. He said that the landscape was, fortunately, the lack of Labor wreckers such as he experienced in Victoria and New South Wales.

The contribution that all members made is commendable and I thank them for it. Together with my committee members, I will continue to serve those three areas of my portfolio, and the partnership will take it from strength to strength.

At 4.28 p.m.,

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr Campbell): Order! Under the provisions of the Sessional Order agreed to by the House on 16 September, I shall now put the questions for the Vote under consideration and the balance remaining unvoted for Tourism, National Parks and Sport.

The questions for the following Votes were put, and agreed to—

Tourism, National Parks and Sport—

	\$
Department of the Arts, National Parks and Sport	19,867,000
Balance of Vote (Consolidated Revenue, Trust and Special Funds, and Loan Fund)	33,358,000

Progress reported.

SUPERANNUATION ACTS AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Hon. W. A. M. GUNN (Somerset—Deputy Premier, Minister Assisting the Treasurer and Minister for Police) (4.29 p.m.), by leave, without notice: I move—

“That leave be granted to bring in a Bill to amend the State Service Superannuation Act 1972-1987 and the Public Service Superannuation Act 1958-1987 each in certain particulars.”

Motion agreed to.

First Reading

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

Second Reading

Hon. W. A. M. GUNN (Somerset—Deputy Premier, Minister Assisting the Treasurer and Minister for Police) (4.30 p.m.): I move—

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

The primary purpose of this Bill is to lower the age from which voluntary retirement benefits are payable under the State Service Superannuation Scheme from 60 years to 55 years as from 1 January 1988. The legislation covered by the Bill honours the Government's commitment in this regard, as announced in the Budget Speech. The earlier retirement age will apply to public servants, teachers and other Government employees of the railways, of hospitals boards and of other major statutory authorities, including colleges of advanced education.

Honourable members will recall that the Government had indicated in April last that a feasibility study into the lowering of the retiring age under the State Service Superannuation Scheme would be undertaken during the winter recess of Parliament. The Bill is the result of that review, which revealed that early retirement benefits could be introduced without affecting the financial viability of the scheme. This initiative, which has been welcomed by Government employees, will create further job opportunities—particularly for school-leavers and graduates.

The early retirement benefit is payable, at the member's option, as an indexed pension or as a lump-sum benefit. The levels of benefit, as prescribed in the Bill, have been determined actuarially on a cost-neutral basis—that is, they can be met within the current funding arrangements of the scheme.

The level of the lump-sum annuity benefit for a person with the maximum possible period of membership to age 55—that is, 35 years of membership—is 79 per cent of the level to which that person would have been entitled upon retirement at age 60. The rate of benefit increases linearly from age 55 through to age 60 to ensure complete equity in the determination of the level of benefit payable. In effect, persons retiring at age 55 will be entitled to a lump-sum benefit under the percentage scheme equal to 19 per cent of annual final average salary for each year of scheme membership—to a maximum level of 667 per cent—or 6.67 times annual final average salary—after 35 or more years of membership.

A further provision of the Bill alters the structure of the State Service Superannuation Board. The alteration is consequent upon the abolition of the Department of the Public Service Board and the transfer of the office of the State Service Superannuation Board as a subdepartment of the Treasury. The Bill provides for the Under Treasurer, as departmental permanent head, to be, ex officio, a member of the board and the chairman thereof.

The Bill also provides for the definition of "final average salary", upon which benefits are calculated, to be amended to ensure the consistent treatment of all members. This amendment is a tightening of the provisions relating to the calculation of "final average salary" and ensures that the wording of the legislative provision reflects the policy whereby an increase in salary received by a member in consequence of a promotion in the final two years of service is averaged over the full two year period.

As honourable members would be aware, the Government is committed to the provision of an equitable and appropriate range of superannuation benefits for its employees. The introduction of voluntary retirement from age 55 continues and extends that policy. As I have pointed out, the actuarially determined levels of benefit payable upon early retirement ensure that no additional costs are imposed on either the members of the scheme or the tax-payers of the State.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate, on motion of Mr Davis, adjourned.

INDUSTRIAL CONCILIATION AND ARBITRATION ACT AND ANOTHER ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from 14 October (see p. 3238).

Mr WHITE (Redcliffe) (4.34 p.m.): The Liberal Party is happy to join in this debate and to support the Government in its changes to the legislation as outlined by the Minister. I take the opportunity to congratulate the Minister on adopting Liberal Party policy and on the insertion of it into his legislation. I also congratulate the Minister on once again getting the Government out of trouble. As I have said on previous occasions, it is becoming a regular occurrence for the Honourable Minister to be taking action to get his fellow Cabinet colleagues out of political difficulty. I understand that in the political stakes he has dropped from 100 to 1 to 40 to 1. So the Minister should keep it up.

On behalf of the Liberal Party, I will outline briefly the major reasons why members of that party see the need for changes in industrial legislation and, more importantly, changes of attitude in respect of relationships between employers and employees. The first matter that comes to mind, which is abundantly clear, is that something has to be done about the irresponsible behaviour of some trade unions and, in particular, some trade union officials.

Acts of political sabotage—industrial sabotage is probably the right way to describe it—have occurred over the years. They simply have to stop. In recent years the standard of living in this country has markedly declined because of a loss of productivity. If those people involved in public life are going to do anything about raising the standard of living in this country, they should, as a central part of the economic strategy for this nation and this State, do everything possible to bring about changes to encourage increases in productivity by developing far more effective relationships between employers and employees.

The second thing that the Liberal Party feels is needed in our industrial relations structure is greater flexibility to cope with the many changes in the economy and the capacity of many industries to pay. Two aspects should be highlighted briefly in that regard. One, of course, is the change in our industrial base, the fact that Australia is an integral part of the global economy and that whether we like it or not, we can no longer isolate ourselves from what is happening in the rest of the world. Nowhere is that more clear than in the area of manufacturing. Australia once proudly exported large numbers of motor cars, machine tools, white goods and so on, yet it is now a major importer of those goods.

Another aspect of flexibility in industrial relations is the capacity of industries to pay. Honourable members have seen the impact of flow-ons that have been initiated over the years by the metal trades union. Those decisions have flowed right down the line, covering all industries, many of which did not have the capacity to pay. Over the years honourable members have also seen, chapter and verse, companies that have gone out of business in this State as a direct consequence of flow-ons from Federal awards. Industries in many parts of Australia have not had the capacity to pay.

My third point relates to the need for this nation to become more competitive so that it can not only increase exports but also, more particularly, raise the standard of living.

The fourth matter that the Liberals feel very strongly about is the integral right of individuals—be they individual employees, contractors, subcontractors or whoever—to determine whether or not they wish to join a union. I have said previously in this Chamber that I have no objection to the legitimate role of trade unions. Indeed, unions have a significant role to play in society. Over the years the difficulty has arisen when unions have become far too powerful in many industries, to the detriment of those industries and of the economy.

I suppose that at some time all honourable members have received approaches from individuals who have not wanted to join a union but who have been coerced and forced into joining a union against their will. For that reason, the Liberal Party feels very strongly that individuals should have freedom of choice.

Mr Eaton: But they accept the conditions won by the unions.

Mr Vaughan: They all hold their hands out.

Mr WHITE: It is a fact of life that we live in a democracy. If one really believes in a liberal democracy, one must accept that an individual has a right to determine whether or not to join an organisation.

For a number of years I had the privilege of being the president of an employers' organisation that is registered under the provisions of the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act. That organisation had to go out and get its members to join voluntarily. The majority of members—not all of them—retained their membership because they wished to join the organisation and receive the benefits. I will not accept the argument that has been put forward on many occasions by the members of the Labor Party that people must be forced to join a union.

Mr Vaughan: Do you believe in common rule awards?

Mr WHITE: I heard the honourable member for Nudgee speak in this House the other week, and I am glad that he has interrupted my speech. At the time of his speech he made allegations about the business community, and in particular the small-business community. His party's attitude to the business and small-business communities should be put on record this afternoon. Amongst many things that he said, he stated that employers were exploiters and were ripping people off and that the Labor Party was opposed to those people. According to my notes, he referred in particular to those people in the tourist industry. Everybody knows there is always a small minority of people who will do the wrong thing, but why should anybody condemn the business community as a whole because of the actions of an individual? It is a lot of rubbish, but unfortunately it is typical of the anti-business and anti-small business attitude taken by many—not all—of the members of the Labor Party.

I will give the Chamber an example of a personal experience that I had of the attitude of the Labor Party and the trade union movement. I can remember some five or six years ago an occasion when a company legitimately sacked an employee because he was found guilty in the courts of stealing from the company. When he had served his term in gaol and was released, the union insisted that he be reinstated in a job.

Mr Lee: Shocking!

Mr WHITE: As the honourable member for Yeronga has said, that is absolutely disgusting. I will name the union: it was the Federated Storemen and Packers Union. What a nice lot of gentlemen they are! What did the union do? It went and called a strike and, after a fortnight, the management found that it could run the company quite successfully without the union. The end result was that 60 members of that union lost their jobs because of the stupidity of a union official.

I can go on. Only the other week in the liquor industry an employee was found drunk on the job—not for the first time, but for the third or fourth time, as I was advised—and he was dismissed. The union came along and insisted that that person be reinstated, otherwise the hotel would be blackballed. That kind of attitude taken by some union leadership simply has to stop. It is all very well for the members of the Labor Party to get up in this House and tout the story of the trade union movement. Nobody in the Liberal Party argues about the legitimate role of trade unions, because in many respects trade unions have played a significant role in the development of this country.

The Liberal Party feels very strongly about the gradual centralisation of awards. Often a segment of a particular industry award is transferred into the Federal arena. What inevitably happens is that flow-on effects occur which many industries in this State cannot cope with.

The honourable member for Roma, who is not in the House today, referred at length to excessive rigidities and archaic work practices. Some of the extreme work practices were brought to everyone's attention some time ago by Senator Parer from the Liberal Party's waste-watch committee.

The other matter of principle is that members of the Liberal Party believe that there is a lack of incentive for employers and employees to work together. Some sections of the trade union movement seem to have a vested interest in promoting confrontation and an anti-business, anti-productivity and anti-profit attitude. That attitude simply has to be stopped. The Liberal Party is pleased that by this legislation the Government is making some move to bring greater flexibility into the workplace.

As I said earlier, the reason for this legislation is largely to get the Government out of an embarrassing political situation. I do not think that this legislation will have a marked impact. It will have the advantage of providing some degree of new flexibility. The Liberal Party welcomes that. It must be remembered that the legislation could well provoke greater trade union membership. Members of the Labor Party may be surprised to hear me make that statement. In one sense, I am worried that people may be encouraged to move out of State awards and into Federal awards. As I said, it could well provoke an increase in trade union membership as a consequence of the activities of trade union officials who, quite wrongfully in my view, will see this legislation as some sort of threat.

Mr Lee: The State loses the control.

Mr WHITE: Exactly.

Queensland enjoys a position in which it has a large percentage of employers and employees covered by State awards. Any State Government should be very careful about bringing in any new legislation that could encourage unions to transfer to Federal awards. Perhaps the Minister may like to make some comment on that matter. The view that has been expressed by significant employer groups is that they have some reservations. Some employer groups have grave reservations about the impact of this legislation.

The Liberal Party believes that the future direction of industrial relations is a key factor in the economic growth of this State and, indeed, our country. As I said, members of the Liberal Party believe that there should be greater flexibility, not simply on the institutional framework in which industrial relations are conducted; rather, more incentive must be given to both unions and employers, employees and employers, to work together in a spirit of co-operation and harmony.

For too long the syndrome of "them and us", and the continuation of confrontation, have been unproductive. There comes a time when there has to be confrontation, as

occurred in the recent electricity industry dispute in this State. As I said on a previous occasion in this House, the unions got everything they deserved. I think that at that stage Mr Vaughan did not agree with me. There is no doubt that the unions provoked that strike. Inevitably, the Government had to act. The Liberal Party salutes the Government for taking the initiative in that regard.

Whenever there is any discussion in this place concerning industrial relations, it usually gets down to having arguments about legislation and the institutional framework. But there is a critical need to bring about a change in entrenched attitudes within the workplace. I have always been a great advocate of employees being offered the opportunity to take up share-holdings in a company.

Some years ago Professor Kelso wrote a book on industrial relations. The Kelso theory or policy has been successfully developed and adopted by many industries in the United States of America. It has a twofold advantage. It creates an atmosphere of greater harmony and understanding between employees and employers. It gives employees the opportunity to share in the productivity, wealth and profits of a particular company. From an employer's point of view, it provides another reason why employees should have greater commitment and loyalty to that particular firm.

Those sorts of things are not widely discussed in this House. I hope that the Minister and the officers of his department will give consideration to that sort of thing. If better attitudes, communication and understanding can be created between employers and employees, firms' profits will rise, productivity will rise and jobs will be created. As I said earlier this afternoon, during the last couple of years Australia's standard of living has dropped. Unless something is done to increase productivity, it is unlikely that the traditional standard of living that we have become accustomed to in this country will prevail.

I turn now to the Kelty/Carmichael package, which is commonly known as *Australia Reconstructed*. Mr Kelty and Mr Carmichael made a recent visit to Europe. For those honourable members who do not know, Mr Carmichael is a leading communist ideologue. Mr Kelty and Mr Carmichael have virtually adopted the Swedish model of co-determination. If ever there was a recipe for industrial disaster, it is the Kelty/Carmichael package.

The policy statement was issued in the presence of State and Federal Government Ministers. The first item contained therein which concerns me is the push by the Federal Government for the Swedish form of co-determination. Basically, that involves the corporate state taking over, namely, the ACTU, the Federal Government and perhaps big business.

Many honourable members have raised concerns about what is happening in this country, but that is the way that we are going at the moment. Not only is that a move towards a corporate state, but it is also a move towards centralisation of business and industrial agreements, which is very bad for a country with a Federal structure such as Australia's, with diverse geographical states and different industrial bases.

The second point that was made in that document was an intention to secure union acceptance of plans for a major centralisation of power in the union movement. That would mean that many unions would also be under threat. Its policy recommendations, while being superficially based on the notions of consensus, justice and equity, envisage a major expansion of Government activity, conducted largely at the direction of the ACTU. Once again, that is a move away from what are regarded as normal democratic practices. It also envisages the establishment of a National Development Fund that would be funded through compulsory levies from all superannuation funds. That would mean that people who have invested their money—as many people in our society have; whether they be in the private sector or the public sector—could have their funds invested at the whim of somebody in the trade union movement—maybe even Mr Carmichael. Those are the sorts of things that greatly concern people.

Mr Lee: He is Mr Halfpenny's mate, is he?

Mr WHITE: Yes, that is right.

It is also proposed to impose a comprehensive, visible and effective policy of price restraint. Recently in this House, I made some comments about the activities of Mrs Darling. It is interesting that nothing is mentioned in the document about any policy on the restraint of wages or costs. It has very clearly spelt out the policy on price restraint, with an immediate six months' price freeze. If that was supposed to be a document of any form of equity, one would think that there would be a two-sided approach to the matter. If one is going to advocate price restraint, what about restraint on the costs of production?

The other matter that is quite worrying is the proposal for the development of a tripartite industrial plan in which the Government would provide incentive to industries that maximise growth potential and have a capacity to provide a net benefit to the Australian community, but agrees to a series of policies including disputes-settling procedures, industrial democracy structures, equal opportunities for women—and so one could go on. What that really means is the union takeover of business itself.

The proposals are quite far-reaching; they are quite frightening; they strike at the heart of the federal nature of our country; they strike at the heart of private enterprise and they strike at the heart of what I regard as industrial democracy. The proposals could only be adopted through a massive expansion of the public sector. Of course, what I am really also talking about is another reallocation of resources into the public sector, which means larger government, higher taxation, more red tape and more interference—all the things that everybody has had a gutful of, particularly over the last decade or so.

As I said earlier, the Liberal Party supports the legislation. It has reservations about some aspects. Amendments will be moved by my colleague the member for Mount Isa. I hope that the Government will give serious consideration to them. They are meant as constructive amendments to the legislation.

Mr GATELY (Currumbin) (4.57 p.m.): It gives me much pleasure to be able to speak in support of the legislation dealing with voluntary employment agreements, for the Minister has, in my opinion, made a tremendous effort——

Mr Scott: It is the dumb leading the blind here.

Mr GATELY: Which one is the honourable member—dumb or blind?

The Minister has, without any doubt at all, sought opinions, ideas and input from many people both in industry, his parliamentary committee and other people outside the Parliament. I commend him for his approach.

Mr Lester: You, too, I must say, have played a magnificent role.

Mr GATELY: Thank you, Mr Minister.

Mr Beard: There will be a packet of chocolates on your table at 9 o'clock tomorrow morning, Vince.

Mr GATELY: I will talk about the sweets later, because I have something to say about that as well.

I turn to some misinformation that was provided via the *Brisbane Courier-Mail*. On Monday, 5 October, it carried a very interesting but terribly useless article in regard to the disinformation that it provided on the contract labour Bill, stating that it will spark a litigation war. What nonsense! Essentially, the article draws upon comments made by Mr Howard Guille, an academic, in a paper he presented at the Industrial Relations Society conference at the Gold Coast the previous week. Obviously the article is aimed at generating fear in the minds of employers who might be contemplating using voluntary employment agreements; however, the criticism levelled at the proposal generally, and specifically at the Bill, is misdirected and ill-founded.

It is interesting to note that the paper presented by Mr Guille closely mirrors many of the alleged concerns that have been promoted by the union movement, and adopts

a similar negative and ideological stand to that maintained by the unions and the Trades and Labor Council. It was asserted in the article that the Bill is so deeply flawed that employers and employees will be involved in extensive litigation. Again, I say that that is nonsense.

This fresh Bill is initially consistent and will provide a sound framework within which employers and employees—and, if they accept the challenge, the unions—will be able to make voluntary employment agreements. The Honourable Minister has indicated in various forums that a need exists for a professional approach in drafting such agreements. Accordingly, in anticipation of this new voluntary employment agreement initiative, many persons and organisations in the industrial relations sector, and also the legal fraternity, have been gearing themselves to provide expert professional advice to interested parties. If members of the union movement can tell me that that is not the right way to go, they are obviously burying their heads in the sand—and that is where they ought to keep them!

Obviously, this legislation will assist in ensuring that formulated agreements will meet the requirements of this Bill. One of the new features built into the legislation—

Mr Davis interjected.

Mr GATELY: If the honourable member for Brisbane Central would speak loudly enough I would be able to hear him.

One of the features that has been built into this Bill relates to the expanded role of the State Industrial Commission. This new role will have an important bearing on allegations that are made. The Industrial Commission will now be required to ensure that voluntary employment agreements, which are lodged for registration, meet the requirements of the Bill. In other words, if the commission were of the opinion that an agreement contravened any provision of the Bill, then the commission could refuse to approve the agreement. This provision will obviously set up an additional protective and safeguarding mechanism. In the initial registration phase, the commission has been afforded additional jurisdiction to refuse to approve agreements if it is satisfied that it is not in the public interest. Accordingly, in light——

Mr Davis interjected.

Mr GATELY: What did the honourable member say about a puppy? The honourable member is yapping like one.

Accordingly, in the light of these measures, voluntary employment agreements place the same onus on parties to the agreements as those that currently exist for industrial agreements made pursuant to section 89 of the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act.

Mr Davis: You wouldn't know what a VEA was.

Mr GATELY: Yes, I would.

When industrial agreements and voluntary employment agreements are submitted to the commission, the respective parties should ensure that the agreements accurately and thoroughly represent the intentions of the parties. However, it is completely wrong to suggest, as Mr Guille has, that VEAs will be the catalyst for an extensive litigation war and that employers will be pursued by employees for thousands of dollars. It was also suggested in the article to which I refer that, without specialist or legal advice, employers and employees would not be able to determine who was covered by these awards and industrial agreements, or which establishments and undertakings were covered.

Unfortunately, Mr Guille does not appear to appreciate the nature of the State award system that operates in Queensland. The existing structure will be maintained, with merely a new element being introduced in the form of VEAs, which can vary those awards or industrial agreements in whole or in part. Mr Guille was apparently searching

for problems that do not exist. That is not unusual. It happens all the time with people who have an attitude of negativism. In any case, decisions as to who is covered by an award are being made every day by employers and union officials.

The final matter I should briefly comment upon at this stage was also raised in the article. It relates to protection for employees who are being forced into voluntary employment agreements. Clause 12 of the Bill amends section 101 of the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act and makes it an offence for an employer to dismiss an employee or to refuse to employ an employee or to injure an employee in terms of his employment, or otherwise to prejudice an employee because the employee has refused to enter into a VEA. Contrary to what was stated by Mr Guille, protection is provided in the Bill to head off such situations.

It is interesting to note that provision in the Bill, especially because previous Labor Party speakers have spoken about the ACTU/ALP accord and the arbitration commission's being able to make agreements that the unions accept. A previous Labor spokesman emphasised that point and then qualified his remarks by saying, "with a few exceptions". Let me talk about the few exceptions he has referred to. A good starting point would probably be the action taken by Sir Peter Abeles.

Mr Palaszczuk: You are out of puff.

Mr GATELY: I am not out of puff. The honourable member should never suggest that.

I now refer to Sir Peter Abeles and the transport officers federation strike over a very minor demarcation dispute regarding the Ansett baggage-handlers. In that case Sir Peter Abeles took a leaf out of the book of none other than the Premier, Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen, and solved the problem in very quick time by sacking 370 Ansett baggage-collectors involved in what can only be described as an interunion dispute and a dispute in which Ansett were blameless. As a knight of the realm, he happens to have a pretty good "in" with none other than Bob Hawke, the previous ACTU leader. He was not put in the position that our Premier was. No obstacles were placed in front of him as there were when the ETU and the ACTU got their heads together in the SEQEB dispute in Queensland. However, in that dispute the Premier was the winner of the day. Sir Peter Abeles was able to take a leaf out of the Premier's book and resolve a dispute that could only be described as being over a very minor issue.

Let me now refer to unions and the good ways in which they go about doing things. Following the SEQEB strike, a fitter who fought the ETU levy was sacked. An article in the *Courier-Mail* of 31 October 1985 states that a father of six, Mr Frank Marett believes that he lost his job for a good cause. It states that he was prepared to stand up and fight for what he believed in; he was prepared to stand against the tyranny of unions imposing levies against people—and doing it in a very sinister way, might I add. That man has since been successful in a claim for wrongful dismissal and he was awarded \$10,000. However, that did not give him his job back. He was a man of 38, a father of six children and the union could not give a damn about him. Yet Opposition members in this House talk about how much unions think about the worker. What nonsense and utter rubbish.

Mr Marett was a refinery worker who was employed by the company for nine years. I suggest that there was nothing wrong with his capacity to carry out his job or he would not have lasted nine years. He was a member of the Amalgamated Metal Workers and Shipwrights Union. That union threatened industrial action if that man was not sacked for standing up for his rights and his beliefs. That is an example of a union kicking people in the guts and kicking a man out of his job. Mr Marett said that he refused to pay the levy on four grounds. The AMWU constitution states that only a national or State conference can impose a levy. It sets out further that only a \$2 levy can be imposed. The initial \$10 a week levy was moved by an organisation from the powerful Storemen and Packers Union, not even the man's own union. No wonder he refused to pay the levy. That is another indictment against the union movement. The man also objected

on the ground of religious beliefs and said that all welfare contributions had to be made through his church.

Mr Palaszczuk interjected.

Mr GATELY: I did not bother asking him. The facts are there for the honorable member to read. With that sort of an attitude the honourable member would not know what a Christian was.

I will now talk about the builders' union in Melbourne. People talk about unions doing the right thing for people. This Bill is about making certain that people have a right, if they so desire, not to belong to a union. Under the proposed legislation an employee and his employer have the right to make between themselves a voluntary agreement which will be ratified by the appropriate authority. There is no need for a union to be involved. That is what it is all about. That is why unions are crying. They are seeing that they will lose membership. They are trying to amalgamate into bigger and better unions so that they can have more clout and kick the soul case right out of Australia.

An article in the *Australian* of 14 February 1986 stated—

“The building industry war is likely to explode after employers last night threatened to sack all Victorian members of the Builders Labourers Federation (BLF) today unless the union drops all bans in support of a flow-on of the 3.8 per cent national wage rise.

The Victorian Government made an urgent plea to builders' labourers last night to ‘protect your jobs and the jobs of your mates’.”

That was a plea to protect the jobs of the mates of honourable members opposite, who couldn't care less about their mates. Unless a person is in a union and doing exactly what the organiser tells him to do, he will get nowhere. If a union-member does not do what the union tells him to do, the union asks the employer to sack him.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr GATELY: Listen to them fight and bark now. They are like a mob of yapping dogs out the back that haven't been fed for a week. I will get into them now.

I will sweeten them up a bit with what I am about to say. What do they say about what happened to the candy man in Victoria? I will quote the following newspaper article on this subject—

“Workers loyal to the Dollar Sweets Co in its six-month battle against a union picket yesterday congratulated their boss on obtaining a Supreme Court order banning the picket.”

That picket was staged because 15 employees had been sacked. Twelve loyal employees sat in the back of the Supreme Court to hear Mr Justice Murphy prohibit the union, officials and workers from continuing their unlawful harassment of people, employees and vehicles entering and leaving the premises. That is an example of the actions of the mates of those who stand in this House to try to tell us that they stand for the workers and for the people of this nation. Be damned they do! They are here for the ruination of Australia. That is what they are on about.

Mr Palaszczuk: You've lost your place.

Mr GATELY: No, I have not lost my place at all.

The words “anarchy” and “nihilistic” are not often applied to trade union behaviour from the contemplative calm of the judicial bench, yet that is what Mr Justice Peter Murphy had to say about it in Victoria.

I now turn to another dispute that honourable members opposite will not like to hear about. This dispute was the very reason for the presentation of this Bill to the House.

Mr Vaughan: You wouldn't know what's in the Bill.

Mr GATELY: Wouldn't I? That is how much the honourable member knows. He should pick it up and read it so that he might know something about it.

I shall talk about the Mudginberri abattoir dispute in the Northern Territory. I ask all the unionists opposite to take note of this. The facts are that the dispute did not even exist until the entry of the Australasian Meat Industry Employees Union. The dispute involved a valuable rural commodity. Shipments to fulfil overseas contracts had been halted. Once again, Australia's capacity to meet trade commitments against international competitors was called into question. The company involved lost a \$2.5m contract to Taiwanese competitors. The workers concerned lived in rural Australia and relied upon it for their livelihood, as do many members in this place. I recall one day in front of the public hall at Singleton saying to Gough Whitlam, "Don't forget, Mr Whitlam, that the farmers of this country are the ones who fill your belly with the food you eat." Honourable members should never forget that.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr GATELY: The same applies to members opposite, who need to think about that.

In the Mudginberri dispute an efficient enterprise processing rural produce was placed in financial peril. It brought about the establishment of a legitimate case for rural producers to take much more than a passing interest in industrial disputes. Furthermore, it can be reasonably assumed that such interest will persist. The primary industry people of this nation will not forget Mudginberri, the name Jay Pendarvis and the court battle waged by him, the National Farmers Federation, the National Party of Australia and the small-business associations of Australia, who combined to tell the union to go to hell.

Now I will tell the House what Mr Crean, the president of the ACTU, had to say about this. He foreshadowed continuing industrial action over the Mudginberri abattoir dispute and warned employers that the union movement would retaliate. If that is not intimidatory, I am damned if I know what is.

A further article on the dispute states—

"Mudginberri station meatworks, about 200 km east of Darwin, has employed its men under a contract system to slaughter cattle and buffalo for a multi-million dollar European buffalo contract."

Mr Davis interjected.

Mr GATELY: The honourable member for Brisbane Central would not even know what a buffalo is. It goes on—

"The present dispute could jeopardise that contract. Arguments and disputes have been rife in the Territory over whether meatworkers should be employed as contract/labor or permanent/labor under a tally system."

Mr Davis interjected.

Mr GATELY: The honourable member should listen to what I am about to say. If he does, then he will understand what it is all about. It continues—

"The Australian Arbitration Commission Full Bench decided after a dispute last year that Northern Territory meatworks should have their own award. Federal Arbitration Commissioner Mr McKenzie handed down an award which included the option of contract labor under Clause 33—Payment by Results."

If any member of the Opposition had to worry about achieving results, he would not get tuppence in his pay. It goes on—

"The National Farmers' Federation . . . stepped in and took action under the federal secondary/boycott provisions—under section 45D of the Trade Practices Act.

While it does not represent meat industry employers, it was successful and the Federal Court ordered an end to the picketing and industrial action at Mudginberri.

The union refused and on June 21 was fined \$10,000, to be increased at the rate of \$2,000 a day after a certain period. The union refused to pay the fines and owed \$44,000 when the temporary order was replaced by a permanent order on July 11."

Members of the Opposition have been misleading the House by saying, "with a few exceptions".

Mr Palaszczuk interjected.

Mr GATELY: If I need a hand from members of the Opposition, I will pay them later.

They say that with a few exceptions they settle disputes and take notice of the referee. What utter nonsense! They do not. It is stated clearly—

"On July 21 the court issued sequestration orders freezing the union's funds.

Mudginberri has called on the court to punish the AMIEU and its federal secretary, Mr Jack O'Toole, for breaching the permanent orders—the court has reserved its decision on that matter."

All honourable members have no doubt at all about the result of the Mudginberri dispute. It was a resounding win for Mr Jay Pendarvis, the National Party, the National Farmers Federation and the Small Business Association of Australia.

I will go down the track and slip into Wagga Wagga down in New South Wales. We are dealing not with a bush fire but with another indictment of the Labor Party's friends and unionists—bearing in mind that some members of the Labor Party were previously unionists. I refer to a five-year dispute in a town of 55 000 people which resulted in the closure of the abattoir in Wagga. What an indictment indeed of a union organising the bringing-down of an industry that is vital to a town of such a small size!

Mr Lester: They should hang their heads in shame.

Mr GATELY: They should put their heads down lower than their feet; down in the gutter is where they belong.

I turn to some of the rorts that go on, such as those in the stevedoring industry. I will deal firstly with non-work-related strikes. In 1985-86, the number of man-hours lost directly or indirectly by waterfront employees was 309 800. That is a 98.1 per cent increase on 1984-85 figures and close to a 250 per cent increase on 1983-84 figures. This is during the period when none other than the Labor Party was running this country in cahoots with the ACTU alliance.

In 1985, 45 per cent of man-hours were lost through industrial disputes in the stevedoring industry which concerned non-work-related issues, such as section 45D, anti-strike legislation in Queensland, nuclear-powered ships and South Africa. I will look at some of the extravagant allowances. Waterfront employees receive additional pay for performing, or is it non-performing? I think that non-performing would be more like it. They receive an allowance for abnormal—that would be the right term as well—or unpleasant work, such as dirty work, stooping money—I do not know how they can stoop so low as to take the money with the little amount of work that they do—rain money and cold money. The next thing they will be asking for is to be paid to make love to their wives.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr GATELY: If that is a bit low, so be it.

I look now at silver service. It is a long-established custom in the shipping industry for Australian officers, both deck officers and engineers, to receive silver service when

at sea. This makes interesting reading. It is a pity that the honourable member for Port Curtis, Mr Prest, is not in the House, because I recall hearing him going crook about one of the Labor Party's union friends, Mr Ray Dempsey, getting a meal in this Parliament House for \$1.95. I vividly remember Mr Prest giving him a right old tickle-up over that. In fact, I thought it was me sitting over there or throwing my voice to him. He is a bit of a puppet, but I had better not say too much about that.

While their colleagues in other countries make do with a meal in the cafeteria with the rest of the crew, the Australian officers are entitled to separate dining facilities—that is fine—and a full table service from a steward. The steward has to be formally dressed in a suit coat, bow tie and cummerbund. I ask you! Members of Parliament do not get that service. It is amazing.

I turn now to look at some of the other rorts. It is interesting to note there is a thing called "restrictions on work times"; for example, no work on week-ends. It does not matter whether the boss says it is important for the business to perform its duty and keep the industry going. That is irrelevant. Also, there is no work at Christmas or during school holidays and there are no round-the-clock shifts. Don't let us have any productivity in this country, but we will have productivity superannuation so that the employer has to pay again. Not only does he have to pay again, but also along the way he cops the fringe benefits tax, the assets tax, the capital gains tax and possibly a wealth tax.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr GATELY: They have to bark like yapping dogs. I wish I had a pack like that out on the farm. I would shift the cattle really quickly.

A tradesman now has to have an assistant. He cannot go and do the work himself; he has to have a little lackey there to help him hold it. I wonder whether he needs his lackey to go home and help him with that other little matter with his wife that I mentioned earlier.

I turn to the darg agreement, which is struck on how much work is to be done in a shift. When this quota is met, the workers go home or get overtime to work the remainder of the shift. Have honourable members ever heard anything so ridiculous in the whole of their lives? I will repeat it. The agreement that is struck is this: they decide how much they will do for the day and how long they will take to do it. They are paid for eight hours' work. Then they say, "What shall we do? We will work until 11 o'clock. That's the go. We will get the work finished and then we will go home, fellers." They get off their butts because they are in a hurry and they did not have a night out on the town the night before. They say, "If we finish the work at 10 o'clock we can go home and we expect to be paid for the next six hours at overtime rates." What a rort! No wonder this country has an overseas debt and deficit.

I turn now to the "nick system", which is a beauty. I have often felt like telling some of these fellows on the opposite side of the House to nick off. This system is in operation and is referred to here.

Mr Yewdale: You are on this side of the House. They won't have you over there.

Mr GATELY: They have put me over here to keep a sneaky eye on you fellows. They have got me planted here so that I can keep a real good eye on you and so that you do not get away with anything.

Although Opposition members do not want to talk about it, I will return to the "nick system" where two men are rostered to do one job. Here we go again; the man and his mate. They take it in turns to nick off while on full pay. Isn't that lovely? Don't you love it? They say, "We'll go and have a nick-off day." Then they draw straws on late shifts——

Mr Yewdale: You robbed the drunks.

Mr GATELY: The honourable member should prove it.

An Opposition member interjected.

Mr GATELY: I inform the honourable member that I was put out of the police force as a result of a head-on smash when I was on a police motor cycle. I suffered a busted spine, left hand and right knee. I received a hit on the head that improved me enough to know why I should leave the Labor Party—get out of it. That is what it taught me.

Now I will have some more fun. I turn to the restrictions on whom management may fire or retrench—the last-on, last-first rule. As to flexi-time, the workers say, “If we decide we are going to work today, we will come to work.” It would be like the time in April of this year when I went down to Sydney to have a look at Comeng’s factory. What did I find? The total factory had closed down. Not one skerrick of work was being done. There was no productivity. What did they have? A flexi-day. What a beauty! One day off a month. There was no productivity. They did not give a damn about the customer who was waiting for his product. Don’t let us do that. Don’t let us have flexi-days here, there and somewhere else. No, we must fix this up all right.

Then we come to the unions dictating what work must be done—the waterfront repair program; overmanning/overstaffing; using more employees than necessary to do a job and retaining employees, to man equipment, who are no longer needed.

Let us think about the things that were happening out in the Pilbara. What did we see out there? The workers had to have a water-cart travelling in front of the bus that was taking the workers to the worksite. That is brilliant! I agree that they should not have to have dust up their nostrils. But on a wet, rainy day the water-cart was still travelling along in front of the bus. In addition to that, what happened in the afternoon on a very dry and dusty day? At knock-off time, the bus was gone. The water-cart could not jolly well catch the damn thing. The workers were home with all the dust up their noses.

What can one expect of unions when they are attacking the best Bill that the Minister has brought into the House? As I said earlier, the only reason they object to it is that it cuts into their power—the power that they misuse and abuse to the detriment of this country. If any Opposition member does not believe that, he ought to start to look at the escalation of costs on a number of jobs around this nation, such as the new Parliament House for his mate down in Canberra. If I were to read out the list of union demands, I would be ashamed to say that I was a member of a union or the Labor Party.

Mr SMYTH (Bowen) (5.28 p.m.): I rise to speak against the Government’s introduction of amendments to the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act—contract labour! The Honourable the Minister will find it very difficult to write down one matter contained in the speech made by the member for Currumbin that he can address. The only matter that could be noted from the honourable member’s speech was that he is anti-worker. The honourable member did not have one good thing to say about the workers of this country. He spent most of his time walking along tracks with his head in the sand. I am sure that that is a very difficult position for a person such as the honourable member.

It has been stated that to be one’s own boss is the dream of many Australians. Some think they are achieving it by working under contracts rather than awards—but are they better off?

Government members: Yes.

Mr SMYTH: The Queensland Government is trying to convince wage and salary earners—as we hear Government members interjecting—that because they will be their own boss and be able to name their own price, they will be better off. However, if we have a look at the Government’s attitude towards wage and salary earners in past years, we will clearly see that the National Party in this State—as well as the Liberal Party, I might add—has opposed CPI increases, advocated cuts in youth wages and created an

environment in which Queensland has the highest unemployment and the lowest take-home pay.

In Queensland, the average weekly take-home pay is \$369.70. In Victoria, which is a Labor State, the average weekly take-home pay is \$394.20—\$25 more than the take-home pay in Queensland. The cost of living in Victoria is much lower than it is in Queensland. According to CES statistics, as at June this year 172 140 people in Queensland and 154 458 people in Victoria were unemployed. Therefore, approximately 20 000 additional people were unemployed in Queensland as compared with the Labor State of Victoria.

Mr Lester: What about Mrs Darling's comments that the cheapest prices in Australia were in her electorate?

Mr SMYTH: If the Minister and his Government were to introduce better legislation, more people in Queensland would be in full employment and contract legislation would not need to be considered.

This legislation will further lower living standards and working conditions in this State. It will by-pass the arbitration system and, in the long term, encourage a master-and-servant attitude, which existed in the nineteenth century.

This Government would have us believe that individuals have the same bargaining power as organised unions. Government members were interjecting before on this point. Approximately 100 years ago unions came into existence in order to stop the capitalistic exploitation of workers. With all due respect, the companies of today are no different from the companies of 100 years ago. They are interested in making profits from working people. The Government of this State is interested only in supplying money to the very rich people in this State. This legislation is attempting to introduce conditions that our great grandparents fought to overcome. The proposed contract legislation will legitimise conditions of that type.

Mr Gately: Is "profit" a dirty word?

Mr SMYTH: No, "profit" is not a dirty word. I believe that a fair profit for a fair investment is okay. It is the same as a fair day's work for a fair day's pay.

This Government encourages the exploitation of people. All it thinks about is money, money, money. It would like to remove the working conditions and wages of the workers of this State and, in fact, of the whole country. However, I cannot envisage that occurring, because the National Party will never win Government in Australia. It does not have the numbers.

The Minister mentioned the two types of agreements that would be possible under this legislation. The first would be a voluntary agreement between an employer and at least 60 per cent of employees in a calling that is covered by an award or agreement, or in a business establishment or undertaking. That would automatically cover the remaining employees in that calling, business establishment or undertaking. I cite the example of new projects in which the expected work-force might be 10 or 200. Under that first agreement, a company that is employing a few people needs only to sign a contract with one or two people, and all people who are employed after that time will be bound by the contract that was agreed to by previous employees.

A good businessperson with good business sense—what Government members might call a smart operator—would probably get one of his friends to sign a contract. He could then enforce that contract on all of his future employees.

The second type of proposal would involve agreements between industrial unions of employees and unions of employers. However, that proposal would not apply, because companies would force people to sign contracts on the basis that, if they refused, they would not be given a job.

The situation in Queensland at this time is that we have industrial inspectors doing their best to enforce the existing legislation with the support of the union movement.

Unions in this State have continually brought to the notice of authorities the use and abuse of workers by employers. The case of the young 15-year-old Roma girl, Sonya Outen, would not have been highlighted if it was not for the Australian Workers Union. Cases such as this are happening throughout this State without the knowledge of industrial inspectors. Currently there are 3 000 State awards in existence in Queensland. How does the Government envisage that industrial inspectors will cope with the situation when many more thousands of voluntary contracts come into existence? It is an impossible fiasco. This legislation will be impossible to administer.

Contract labour certainly has tax benefits on both sides. In many arrangements the employer pays no State pay-roll tax. Since no pay-as-you-earn income tax is deducted from the employee's pay envelope, he can attempt to avoid income tax by using a false name—a practice which the unions say is widespread. The unions do not support that attitude. They believe that everybody in this country should pay his way.

If he does elect to pay income tax, the employee can minimise it by setting himself up as a company, paying his wife as secretary, and claiming for his car and other expenses supposedly used to help him in his business—an avenue not open to the wage employee. This contract legislation obviously will encourage corruption.

A form of contract work in the building industry is "body hire", under which men, usually unskilled, are picked up on street corners under conditions akin to the old "bull" system on the waterfront and paid cash in hand—usually less than the award. They need the income to support their families. This practice is condemned by both unions and the Master Builders Association.

Opposition to the contract labour system, aimed at breaking down organisation and corrupting those under it, must be total, for the system is being used as a Trojan horse to smash the trade unions. That is what the Government is all about. It is trying to bring down the trade union movement. The second clause of the Minister's Bill does not apply, as I explained before.

Mr Gately and the Liberal Party member spoke about unions blacklisting employers who did not comply. No doubt, some companies are very good employers; however, the employers' black list has long been part of the metal trades, with many workers' livelihoods placed in jeopardy when they take an active part in union affairs.

Over the last few years in Sydney we have seen a number of important disputes such as the Tooths redundancy dispute, the Tooheys, Fox's, Cockatoo 35-hour dispute and the Shell contractors dispute. The employers fear the growing organisation and class-consciousness that is beginning to develop after such struggles, and are determined to nip any organisation and opposition in the bud. They do not understand that those disputes were won by the mass of workers, not by just a few leaders as has always been implied by Government members. Thus we have seen a tightening-up and obvious use of the black list and the victimisation that goes with it.

In 1981, at its Clyde refinery, Shell instituted an American-style ID card system under which all those who work at the refinery, permanent and contractors, must pose for a glossy photograph, with one photograph going on the ID card, the second going to the person and the third going to the Shell company.

ICI, which had a large construction project under way at Botany, showed its paranoia by taking photographs of those workers on the job.

At a recent shut-down, many workers were turned away at the gate by employer federation representatives who were using secretly compiled dossiers. In plants such as Toohey's and CSR Chemicals, individual contractors were being victimised when they were sent to those plants to carry out normal replacement work.

Allied to this growing employer victimisation is the constant growth of body-hire subcontracting—the highest stage of which is guest-workers. This American-style labour system is growing like a cancer all through the metal trades, with the hiring-out of casual labour by new companies growing every day. The latest I heard of is called "Man-trade."

This system is aimed at breaking up the permanent work-force and replacing it with a self-employed, divided work-force which is without permanence. That is exactly what this contract labour legislation implies. A contract cannot have a term of more than three years. I suppose, in some ways, that could be a blessing.

The casual nature of the body-hire system is open to massive use for victimisation—open your mouth and you're transferred to another job! Evidence that this is what employer federations have in mind for workers is starting to build up.

In 1981, at the Shell refinery shut-down, the most obvious use of the body-hire system yet was observed, with many small contractors making use of subcontracts and workers working for cash in hand, in many cases well below the award. As well, the use of Koreans on the shut-down had elements of the guest-worker system.

A number of Korean labour hire companies have been set up hiring labour both in construction and large factories such as occurs in Sydney's western suburbs on a subcontract basis. Many of these companies are allied to the major construction firms, such as EPT, Transfield, World Services and EGLO, who see labour and hire companies as a way of bringing in a passive work-force without direct involvement.

In construction areas, many workers are being recruited direct from New Zealand, especially riggers. This was evident at recent shut-downs at both Caltex and ICI.

Previously, the honourable member for Currumbin, Mr Gately, said that contract labour was great. In my younger days, I was a subcontract carpenter. I worked from six in the morning till six at night and I had half an hour for lunch if I could afford the time, depending on whether the job was behind or the rain was coming. In those days, wet money was not paid. The contract prices for the jobs I worked on and the contract prices obtained by subcontract carpenters these days are worth less and less because the level of unemployment is increasing.

I left a particular builder in the Mackay area because he owed me money for a house—an entire house. Under the legal system that operated at that time, I had no recourse. I doubt very much whether this National Party Government would even consider sticking up for the worker in a case such as that.

In the early seventies when the mining communities were built, a Mr Driscoll was the owner of National Homes. I believe that he is a friend of members of the National Party. At that time, Mr Driscoll had the major contract for building commission homes in those mining towns. Mr Driscoll had a clause written into the contract stating that the final payment could not be collected until one month after completion of construction of the dwelling. Honourable members can imagine the size of the work-force that would be required to build a town in a couple of years. When the contract was completed, the subcontractors moved on because they could not afford to wait for a month, so I wonder who got the final payment?

I do not think that the subcontract system is good for workers, even under the system that the Minister is introducing with the Bill. Although contracts save firms the expense of supplying plant and equipment, they erode working and safety conditions. The job simply has to be completed; otherwise, the contractor whose very low price tender was accepted will run out of money, and will have insufficient money for himself or herself and family members.

When an examination is made of the practice of subcontractors subletting contracts, the erosion of conditions is very apparent. It is a process that leads to cumulative undercutting of prices, and thus wages, at each stage. Under this legislation, this practice would be difficult, if not impossible, to curtail, particularly in the absence of sufficient enforcement or incentive for enforcement.

Workers in the clothing industry are being subjected to the type of wages and conditions that this Government is advocating. They have been traditionally associated with contract labour in its most exploitive forms. The women's employment rights committee argued that while there are no definite figures, information suggested a sharp

increase in the number of women in that employment over recent years. That group is not effectively covered by the relevant union, the Clothing and Allied Trades Union. Because the people who work in that industry do not have adequate union coverage, their wages and conditions have fallen behind those of workers in other industries. Most do not work under the conditions specified by the award but under contracts that offer considerably less. That type of work is contracted out to small non-unionised firms and they, in turn, subcontract to women in the home. Those firms do not guarantee employment and they pay their workers much less than the award rate.

This legislation is supposed to be about efficiency, with people being interested in supporting their employer and being loyal to their employer. I do not know why the Government brings up the scenario that employees have to be loyal to their employer. I am sure that there should be a giving on both sides, but it always seems to come from the Government benches that the worker has to be loyal to the employer, but with nothing in return. The attitude is taken that the worker should be grateful because he or she is being paid an income. Previously the small-business scenario was mentioned. This legislation will not suit small business in small communities or provincial cities. It will enable large companies to take added profits from communities at the expense of small-business people. Small-business people rely on workers spending their weekly wage. This legislation will allow large corporations to take that money away from those communities.

The Kelso company in the United States was mentioned. I have an article about that particular company stating that some five years ago the workers on that company's shop-floor were earning \$14 an hour. The company introduced this you-beaut contract system and told the workers that they would share in the company's profits. Now, five years later, those workers are earning \$7 an hour. The Liberal Party supports that. It supports a cut in real wages and it supports a cut in the youth wage, as does the National Party.

Mr Palaszczuk: There is no response to that accusation.

Mr SMYTH: No, there is not. I thank the honourable member for Archerfield.

A previous speaker mentioned that the life-blood of the country is the rural industry. I do not support the attitude that is adopted by the Government that the ideal of efficiency should be supported in all aspects of employment and industry in this country. If the Government is convinced that efficiency is the supremely important goal, then it will also endorse the winding-up of rural life. The rural crisis is largely about all those little farmers who want to go on living on the land but are facing bankruptcy because the economy does not need them. It would be far more efficient to stop subsidising them with tax-payers' money, allow market forces to force them from the land and let a handful of giant companies and firms produce all of our food. I do not support that attitude, but the Government's attitude is for deregulation of the labour market but not overall deregulation.

The State Government takes the attitude that, through legislation, it should subsidise large companies and support the rich. On a final note, I think that the Government should take on board the notion that the rich in this country must live more simply so that the poor may simply live.

Mr HYND (Nerang) (5.51 p.m.): In rising in support of the Bill, I must first congratulate the Government and the Minister on having the courage to tackle the problem with the introduction of this pioneering legislation, which will be responsible for the creation of many more jobs in the workplace and will, of course, put more money into the pockets of those parties who participate in this new scheme.

Let me first quote the old saying: there is nothing so constant as change. This is quite true. If we, as a progressive Government, were to continue along the old, outmoded path that exists today, we would have to accept part of the responsibility for the continued lessening of job opportunities. Instead, this new initiative will put Queensland and

Australia back onto the road to success with profitability to all. It will be responsible for carrying this State into the future and into the twenty-first century.

I cannot help wondering why some Australians have become the vocal minority of knockers and why some members of the union movement have set up a campaign that displays a narrow, hostile view to the potential benefits that this new proposal offers. Quite obviously, the campaign is based on misunderstanding. It is to be hoped that all parties will enter this new era in the development of industrial relations with an open mind.

Let me first emphasise that all agreements entered into will be administered by the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Commission, will be registered with that body and enforced through the Magistrates Court. The commission will have enormous powers of control, such as the right to refuse to register agreements or to void existing agreements if, in its opinion, any practice is unjust or not in the best interests of the public.

The mere fact that agreements will be in writing, witnessed by a justice of the peace and lodged with the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Commission means that they are far more secure and binding than the normal, loose, walk-up start and finish engagements that currently occur. Under a voluntary employment agreement, an employee would know that, all things being equal and giving a fair day's work for a fair day's pay, his or her job would be secure for at least the balance of the agreement. That alone would give employees the security to make that other purchase that otherwise they would not make, thus putting more money into the market-place.

At the very least, agreements must provide for all those things currently in the relevant award, such as hourly rates of pay, holiday pay, sick pay and long-service leave. Union criticism that voluntary employment agreements will result in a loss of job security could not be further from the truth.

The Government is ever aware that all members of the work-force perform at their best when they know they are secure in their jobs. The security alone helps to achieve optimum productivity. A better appreciation of job-related problems will bind together employer and employee so that they will enter into agreements with the one objective—that will be productivity first and the job security that follows. With good job security and productivity, profits should surely follow. This will result in benefits to both parties to agreements.

In my opening remarks I mentioned change. This is the one thing that man has always chased and pursued. Had this not been the case, we would not be debating this change here in the House. Of course, change means flexibility. This is a time when there is widespread acceptance of the fact that there needs to be more flexibility with existing agreements. Flexibility will result in the achievement of faster growth in all incomes.

Mr Lester: Queensland will be a better State as a result, won't it?

Mr HYND: Indeed, it will be.

If flexibility will mean higher income to the work-force, then no honourable member in this Chamber would dare to disapprove of this legislation.

It is the Government's belief that this proposal will result in the removal of restrictive work barriers, thus creating more jobs and opening up mutually beneficial options such as productivity bonuses and profit-sharing. I venture to suggest that the Opposition would like the ring to that phrase "profit-sharing". This is possible if people are allowed to negotiate and produce at a level capable of making profits, not held back by some archaic industrial legislation that long ago outlived its usefulness.

The Government believes that agreements would be binding on parties who have executed them and concurred therein. It is intended that if a voluntary agreement is entered into between an employer and at least 60 per cent of employees in a business in any calling, such agreement would automatically cover the remaining employees in that calling or business. I believe 60 per cent of all those in agreement with any decision to be a fair balance to a change of direction, whatever the circumstances or proposal.

Those people who are seeking employment with a company engaged in a voluntary employment agreement with existing staff would be informed of the terms of the existing agreement and its duration at the point of the new employees' engagement. It is the intent that voluntary employment agreements should run for a specified term of not less than 12 months and up to a maximum of three years and to continue for a further one month after notice of termination has been given by either of the appropriate parties. However, this does not preclude either party from giving or receiving the required amount of notice provided by the relevant award or agreement.

Employees who choose to join a voluntary employment agreement would be assured of all benefits which were their due or had accrued prior to the signing of any agreement. What a change it would be to see employer and employee sitting down and reaching agreement by negotiation and not by confrontation, which has been the case so often in the past.

Employees will not work on more than six out of seven consecutive days, and the time worked by such employee within any six-day period will not exceed 40 hours. The time worked by employees on each day shall not exceed eight hours. However, should the signatories of any voluntary employment agreement agree that a continuation of any eight-hour period is in the best interest of a project or the agreement in total, then those signatories would determine such extension of the eight-hour day as was required from time to time.

Overtime shall be paid at a rate not less than that prescribed within any calling for working in excess of one shift in any day, and it should be explained that rest pauses of not less than 10 minutes in each of the first and second half of an employee's day have also been taken into account.

Apart from agreements being registered with the Queensland Industrial Commission, the agreements will be made available for perusal by members of appropriate tribunals and industrial inspectors. Although this new system of agreement is a massive step forward in the workplace, it is not the intention of the Government to include apprentices and trainees who are registered under the Industry and Commerce Training Act.

The Government believes that we can no longer enjoy the luxury of being locked into a no-change system that would place an impossible burden on the future of this State. I say that no member of this Parliament has the right to put his or her feet against the tide of progress.

I support the Bill.

Sitting suspended from 5.59 to 7.30 p.m.

Mr HAYWARD (Caboolture) (7.30 p.m.): I rise to continue the opposition to the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act and Another Act Amendment Bill, or, as it is better known in this House and the Queensland community, the contracts legislation. The opposition to the legislation and its application will continue long after the Bill passes through this House, which it will, as surely as night follows day. There can be very little argument about it. The opposition to this legislation will continue until the Australian Labor Party is elected to the Treasury benches in Queensland at the next election. Make no mistake about it, such legislation will be withdrawn by a Queensland Labor Government.

In his second-reading speech, the Minister said that the union movement's view of the potential benefits has been hostile. Why wouldn't it be? The honourable member for Currumbin, Mr Gately, earlier showed very clearly what the attitude of this National Party Government is towards workers.

Mr Davis: Did he ever talk about Queensland issues?

Mr HAYWARD: He is an unbelievable knocker of Queensland.

Even in his second-reading speech, the Minister said that there were no examples of these potential benefits, except to say that the Bill will introduce a degree of flexibility

in the award system. Apart from the argument for the so-called flexibility benefit, which I will destroy later, the Minister merely asserts that his proposals will provide these various potential benefits. Presumably, from an employee and community point of view, the major issues and concerns in this State are whether voluntary employment agreements will lead to higher incomes for people, provide more jobs in this State, ensure fair opportunities for employees and improve the general living standards of the community of Queensland. Nowhere has the Minister, during the period that this legislation has been on the table of this House, produced any evidence to answer these very real community and employee concerns.

Even in his second-reading speech, the Minister made no mention of these concerns, preferring instead to concentrate on the notion of flexibility as the potential benefit. The notion of flexibility as the potential benefit for employees does not bear any close examination. Let us not kid ourselves—the benefits provided by flexibility are for employers. As I said before, the honourable member for Currumbin made that very clear in his speech.

The hidden agenda of this legislation is to attack the trade union movement and reduce the living standards of all Queenslanders. The advocates of flexibility, that is, this National Party Government and the radical New Right, promote deregulation and freedom of contract. These aims are to be achieved by abolishing industry standards for wages and conditions, curtailing the industrial commission and placing onerous controls on unions. These are justified on the ideological grounds that the market is best. The honourable member for Redcliffe, Mr White, alluded to this earlier. What the conservatives always say is, "Let the market sort things out for the economy and the State." The proponents of contract employment and other forms of deregulation are not moved by practical considerations, but are moved solely by ideology, blind faith and fanaticism, no matter what the cost to the community and the individual employee. With these ideologues people's lives are irrelevant. What is important to them is the market and that it be allowed to operate as flexibly as possible.

The New Right represents a political movement whose distinguishing characteristic is more that of a think-tank rather than the voluntary association as a mass movement. The fundamental difference with the old Right is its concentration on economic issues. It represents a frustration of individual business people, perhaps as few as 100 and certainly no more than a few hundred. Perhaps the most notorious headline-grabbers would be Charles Copeman from Peko Wallsend, Hugh Morgan from Western Mining, Ian McLaughlan from the National Farmers Federation and Andrew Hay from the Melbourne Chamber of Commerce. The main push is for deregulation and, in order to achieve these aims, they concentrate on the prejudice of the Australian community. The plan of the New Right is via a think-tank to change the social fabric of Australia. It is making forays into Australian cultural and traditional themes, and is concentrating on people's prejudices.

They refer to issues such as immigration, land rights, the arbitration commission, welfare, matters such as the flag, the Australian Constitution—emotive issues—and trade unions, especially. Those matters are raised in this Parliament all the time. The honourable member for Townsville is in the Chamber bashing homosexuals.

Mr R. J. Gibbs: He used to, too.

Mr HAYWARD: He probably did.

A question was asked about union-bashing. Another question was asked by Mr Gately, who was bashing Vietnamese people. Not only is he fixing them up; at the same time he is bashing public servants. Another question related to industrial disputes, where the trade unions are again bashed, as is the arbitration court. Another question relates to World Heritage listing in which the prejudices that people have about the Australian Constitution are drawn out.

The Bill, which provides for the making of voluntary employment agreements, represents one of the steps in the deregulation of the labour market that is so vigorously

pursued by the New Right. The Minister in his second-reading speech indicated that this legislation was pioneering legislation. Behind the big headline-grabbers—the people to whom I referred earlier—are a number of Right Wing think-tanks that have developed in Australia. They are well funded and have attracted to them various academics and researchers. They comprise a network of sympathetic organisations whose research, publishing and discussion activities are having a profound effect on the Australian political agenda.

One of the best known New Right think-tanks, which was recently quoted in this Parliament by the Premier, is the Institute of Public Affairs, whose conservative literature is placed periodically on my desk in this Parliament and, I would imagine, on the desks of all members of this House. The booklet to which I am referring is the *IPA Review*. I think that all honourable members would receive a copy of that. That booklet provides commentary on industrial, economic and social matters in Australia and around the world. The Institute of Public Affairs is based in Melbourne and is directed by Rod Kemp, who was the former senior private secretary to Senator Dame Margaret Guilfoyle.

In this House over the past couple of weeks the Premier and the member for Warrego have become very excited about a very inept economic statement. Honourable members will recall that on 14 October 1987 the Premier gushed forth a ministerial statement based on that document. He informed the Parliament that Queensland had won the Institute of Public Affairs award for the most “restrained and responsible Budget for the second year in succession”.

The director and author of that economic document is Mr Les McCarrey. Mr McCarrey is lesser known as the former Under Treasurer during the years of Liberal Government in Western Australia from 1975 to 1983—the failed and totally discredited conservative Government of Western Australia. Let me examine the record under the stewardship of Mr McCarrey.

During that time, the Consolidated Revenue Fund growth rate—that is the time when Mr McCarrey was in charge and was the Under Treasurer in Western Australia—was 4.9 per cent per annum in real terms. Since that time—since the election of the Burke Labor Government—the average growth rate has fallen to minus 0.6 per cent. That record speaks for itself. Mr McCarrey was Under Treasurer when the burgeoning Government expenditure in Western Australia was almost uncontrollable.

In his ministerial statement, the Premier described the IPA and its director, Mr Les McCarrey, as an “impartial objective observer”. Let me examine that premise. An article in the May/June 1987 issue of the *IPA Review*—a document that all honourable members receive in their offices—titled “Around the State—The Last of the Big Spenders”, states—

“The increase in current outlays on wages and services can give a better indication of a government’s commitment (or lack of it) to expenditure control . . . The big spenders on current outlays have been . . . Queensland . . . with . . . New South Wales the most restrained.”

New South Wales was the most restrained; Queensland was the worst. Yet when put into the political context, suddenly New South Wales gets what Mr McCarrey describes in his *IPA Review* as the “award of the lemon” as the State that budgeted for the highest increase in recurrent expenditure of all Governments this year.

Where are the Institute of Public Affairs and its director, Mr Les McCarrey, coming from? Where is the economic credibility of the Institute of Public Affairs? They cannot have it both ways. In his own journal, the *IPA Review*, in which there is no real political publicity to be had, Mr McCarrey is fair dinkum. However, as soon as the glare of publicity is required to prop up this Government’s economic position, out comes Mr McCarrey’s media release.

Mr McCarrey is an embittered John Stone clone. The only thing that is missing is National Party Senate nomination. That is probably for him in the future—maybe even

in Queensland. The IPA and Mr McCarrey have no economic credibility when the heat of detailed economic analysis is placed upon them. They are biased sycophants of conservative politics and political parties in Australia, especially in Queensland. The sooner that their insidious influence is negated, the sooner that people can get down to the serious economic and industrial debate that is being attempted in Australia.

Quoting the Institute of Public Affairs award for the Queensland Budget and support for National Party economic competency in this State is like asking Iwasaki, as an impartial, objective observer, for an opinion about the extent of foreign land-holdings in Queensland. It is like asking Beryl Young, as an impartial, objective observer, whether or not it is a good idea to have a Government air wing. It is like asking the former National Party trustee, Sir Edward Lyons, as an impartial, objective observer, for an assessment on the financial well-being of the Rothwells Merchant Bank. Of course the Institute of Public Affairs is going to perpetuate a myth about the National Party's economic competency in this State; that is its job.

There are a number of think-tanks operating in Australia that provide the input into the preparation of this contract legislation. That shows the hypocrisy of the exercise and the direction from which things are coming. The think-tanks act as a network of organisations that interact their ideas, and they publish jointly. They act as a united front and include many former conservative advisers with close and high-ranking conservative advisers and close and high-ranking conservative political connections. They have undoubted influence on the conservative political parties and their policies. Through their research, they provide the Right Wing answers to their Right Wing questions. But where are the potential benefits of this legislation that were mentioned by the Minister? Where are the answers? If there were any potential benefits, surely the Minister would have taken a great delight in detailing them to this Parliament.

What makes this contracts legislation more insidious than usual is its support from newspapers, particularly the *Australian*. Where are the biting editorials about the proposed legislation? Where are the newspaper columnists who are calling for details of those potential benefits? Where are they calling on the Government to explain how the degree of flexibility will benefit workers? Where is the careful analysis of the effects of contract legislation on workers and people in provincial and country towns?

Des Keegan writes a column called National Affairs in the *Australian*.

Mr R. J. Gibbs: A nice Right Winger.

Mr HAYWARD: He is a beauty, is he not?

Mr Lester: He is all right.

Mr HAYWARD: I am glad that the Minister said that. I am sure that the Minister would agree that Mr Keegan's style of writing is aggressive, crude and contemptuous with a less-than-firm grip on the facts.

Mr Keegan's writing concentrates on prejudice against wage-earners, taxes, unions, Labor Governments, homosexuals and welfare payments. He also uses some wonderful terms such as "junior doles" and "mums' dole". Above all, he concentrates on trade unions. For example, during the Peko dispute, workers were described as "a horde of Cro-Magnons".

Mr Vaughan: Who?

Mr HAYWARD: During the Peko dispute, Mr Keegan described workers as "a horde of Cro-Magnons".

Mr R. J. Gibbs: He is a latter day production of Bob Santamaria.

Mr HAYWARD: I think that he is worse than Bob Santamaria. In some ways Bob Santamaria has probably a form of social conscience, but there is no way in the world that Des Keegan has that.

I ask honourable members to listen to this: the Peko board was described as "loyal talented Australians".

I have some good examples of Keegan's style of writing. He says—

"Unions fear the New Right and the wrath of reality; unions dread normal behaviour which would put them and their class hatred in the museum. The New Right is only middle Australia seeking decency and time-honoured behaviour."

Another article states—

"Australia's success is impeded by its institutions and until these change, or they change philosophy, we shall continue our long-term decline. Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen wants to arouse middle Australia to arrest this."

Another article states—

"... industrial commissions who have done so much against middle Australia. They make no jobs and create no wealth."

There is an attack on the existing systems that we have in Australia. However, I will read probably the most amusing article—

"I see no solutions to our industrial relations until a new regime of conservative governments arrives."

The article continues—and we will all have a laugh here—

"Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen is going to say a few words about this at Wagga on January 31 and even the ALP will have to listen."

I do not know what happened to him at Wagga.

Mr Davis: He was going to light the bushfire.

Mr HAYWARD: Yes, I think that was when he was going to light the bushfire, but he obviously burnt himself.

Des Keegan must imagine himself as some kind of a poor man's H. R. Nicholls. In one article he attacks a State arbitration court judge in Western Australia. That is his favourite pastime. He likes attacking the arbitration court. The next day in the same newspaper there appeared an apology to the judge by the solicitor for the *Australian* newspaper, saying what an awful person Des Keegan is and that that paper would never have him do it again. However, on the same page of that that paper was another Keegan article remorselessly attacking the arbitration system.

The current State award system ensures protection of the pay and conditions of Queensland workers, but contracts will be made without arbitration. There will be no independent umpire. The Industrial Commission will not be able to protect contract workers.

The new public platform—

Mr Alison: I thought you had the wrong page.

Mr HAYWARD: When honourable members opposite—such as Mr Alison—and their New Right advisers say "deregulation", what they mean is that they do not want to be restrained in their oppression of the work-force.

Mr Alison: Do you believe that?

Mr HAYWARD: I do. I listened to Mr Hynd and Mr Gately. All that they want to do is oppress the work-force. They do, however—I do not think that the honourable member will disagree with this—want the work-force to be restrained from retaliation against that oppression. That is the key. So why would not the union movement take a narrow, hostile view of that legislation—a narrow, hostile view of those potential benefits? There are no potential benefits for workers.

In his second-reading speech, the Minister bemoaned the fact that there was—and this is in his own words—"the creation of a climate of fear". Why would there not be

a climate of fear about that legislation? The union movement and the working-class people of Queensland know that the hidden agenda of this legislation is to reduce the living standards of Queenslanders.

Mr Alison: Have you ever had your photo taken with a dinosaur? You are in the same era.

Mr HAYWARD: I say to the honourable member for Maryborough that that is obvious to even the most feeble-minded in this House. If that is not true, why has not the Minister spelt out the potential benefits of the legislation? Why has he not explained it? I invite the honourable member to read the speech and try to find where that is. I would bet that the honourable member cannot find it. He has no idea.

The Minister has not spelt out the potential benefits of the legislation, because there are none. There are no benefits for the great mass of Queenslanders. The potential benefits of the legislation—Mr Gately went through them earlier, Mr Hynd later and certainly there will be other National Party and other conservative speakers tonight—are for a select group of employers.

Mr Alison: Why are they coming over the border at the rate of 10 000 a year?

Mr HAYWARD: Who is? Who is coming over the border? Has the honourable member ever looked at the figures?

Mr Alison: Yes. I have the figures.

Mr HAYWARD: The reality is that people in their most productive working years are moving south because that is where the jobs are; so let me get that perfectly straight, once and for all.

Mr Alison: Rubbish!

Mr HAYWARD: It is not rubbish at all. It is perfectly true.

I would like the Minister, Mr Lester, to come up to Deception Bay in my electorate and explain the so-called benefits of labour-market flexibility and deregulation to the people who live there. There are people in my electorate whose family incomes are less than \$20,000 or even less than \$10,000. These people fight every day to feed and clothe their children, to pay the mortgage or the rent, the rates and the electricity bills.

All members on the Government side of the House—especially the honourable member for Maryborough, Mr Alison—ought to think about that. How much do Government members want to squeeze these people to subsidise the hedonistic life-style of the privileged few? How much do you want to squeeze them for?

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Caboolture will address his remarks to the Chair.

Mr HAYWARD: I am sorry, Mr Speaker. The honourable member for Maryborough wants to take away from these people their 17.5 per cent leave loading. He wants to increase working hours, to the detriment of their families. He wants to fight every step of the way to stop their wage-indexation increases. Now he wants to put them at the absolute mercy of unscrupulous employers.

Mr Speaker, do not doubt for one moment the mentality of many employers. It has changed very little since the nineteenth century when workers were seen as, and treated as, mere pawns who were to be used, exploited and then dispensed with when they were no longer needed.

Mr Davis: How are they going to police it when they cannot police the awards now?

Mr HAYWARD: Well, the Government has no intention of policing this legislation.

Mr Speaker, make no mistake about this. National Party and Liberal Party deregulating New Righters hold that view. They know and consciously seek what deregulation

and flexibility really means—squeezing the many to privilege the few. That is the hidden agenda.

These radical changes proposed by the New Right and by Government members mean permanent hardship for average Queenslanders. The adoption of this legislation will mean the promotion of greed and selfishness, and the primacy of property interests over all other rights.

Mr Beard: It might lead to some jobs, too.

Mr HAYWARD: The honourable member for Mount Isa should remember the words of Gary Punch, the Federal member for Barton, that were mentioned by the honourable member for Mansfield a short time ago—

“Brought down to the footpath with the rest of us, the New Right looks old and wrong.”

When brought down to the footpath with the rest of us in Queensland, this National Party Government looks very old and very wrong because of the way it carries individualism to its uncaring lengths. What this legislation represents is dogma and the hard edge of its solutions.

Mr SHERRIN (Mansfield) (7.53 p.m.): It gives me great pleasure to rise in this House in support of this piece of pioneering legislation.

Mr Alison: A breath of fresh air.

Mr SHERRIN: I thank the honourable member for Maryborough.

I wish to take the opportunity to commend to the House the work of the Minister—in particular the extensive trouble he has taken to consult widely with unions, employers and other interested people throughout the community during the period in which the original Bill lay on the table of this House. The Minister's approach is something that should go on record.

I was fortunate to be invited by the Minister to participate in the public seminar that he conducted at Bardon. As somebody who is not au fait with the industrial relations sector, and certainly not a member of the Minister's committee, I found it highly informative to be present at the seminar and to listen to all sides of the argument. I certainly found the employers' point of view very interesting. I must say also that I will certainly take cognisance of a number of points raised by the union movement and take on board the comments made.

One feature of this Minister's handling of his portfolio is the way in which he endeavours to consult not only widely in the community, but also within the ranks of the Government. He also must be commended for his willingness to listen to all points of view. They are a couple of the features of the legislation that I will be referring to in my speech.

I am pleased to say that I was present at meetings with the Minister during the formulation of the revised Bill that is now before the House. The Minister has certainly taken account of concerns expressed by members on this side of the House as well as the comments that were made during the public seminar at Bardon. I know that he has also undertaken extensive travel throughout the State to provincial centres and small towns to listen to what employees and employers in those areas have to say. It is a pleasure to look at the amended legislation and see that the Minister has taken the trouble to take on board those points of view.

In my view, the legislation presently before the House is significantly superior to the legislation that was presented originally, and it is a great credit to the Minister that he has taken the trouble to do that.

Mr Alison: He is a Minister who listens.

Mr SHERRIN: That is right; he certainly is. He is a Minister who listens not only to members on this side of the House but also to those on the other side.

Mr Davis: It goes in one ear and then gets shredded.

Mr SHERRIN: No. That is certainly an unfair comment. That is a negative point of view. Let us try to be constructive here tonight.

On 8 April 1987 a Bill to amend the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act to provide for the setting-up of voluntary employment agreements was introduced into this House. As we all know, to allow public scrutiny of the Bill's proposals, the Bill was allowed to lie on the table until that parliamentary session ended. I have already alluded to the extensive consultation that took place during that period.

The Bill now provides for two types of voluntary employment agreements. Whilst significant recognition has been given to the agreements that may be formed between unions of employees and unions of employers, it is important to understand that agreements between employers and employees are also able to be made. So, not only is provision made for individual places of work and workers employed in a particular industry to make voluntary employment agreements, but also the amended legislation provides an opportunity and a role for the union movement as a whole to participate in this new deregulation proposal for the work-force.

The legislation is not set up to exclude the union movement. I certainly challenge the union movement, with the new freedom that is available, to take the opportunity to try the legislation. It is very clear to all of us involved in it that it is pioneering legislation. It should be given a go to see what happens with it. That is certainly the attitude on this side of the House. Over the next couple of years it will be looked at closely to see its effect. Everybody should come together and give it a go to see what happens. If there are any ill-effects that have not been foreseen, let us have a look and see what can be done. But the legislation should not be slammed now, and people should not merely say, "That's it. We don't want to have anything to do with it." There is a role here for unions, just as much as there is a role for individual places of work and employees to come together and make these agreements.

The agreements will have a minimum life of 12 months and a maximum term of three years. I want to say a little bit about that because there has been some serious misrepresentation about the effect that such a time-scale will have in relation to minimum conditions and tenure of employment. That is one area that has been grossly misrepresented during the debate.

It has been claimed that, upon the termination of the agreement, workers would be thrown out of work and so on. That is certainly not the case. At the end of that period, the original conditions of the basic awards would take over automatically.

Mr Vaughan: What about after the end of three years?

Mr SHERRIN: The minimum award conditions would take over automatically. That has been made very clear.

Mr Vaughan: Do they go back onto the award?

Mr SHERRIN: They go back onto the award. The honourable member should have listened to the Minister's speech.

I will now refer to the proposed minimum conditions. This subject is very important because some rhetoric has been flung around about taking away conditions of workers, creating sweat-shops, and so on. The minimum conditions include a minimum hourly rate based on the respective award rate for the classes of work on which employees are employed. Long-service leave will be at the rate of 13 weeks for each 15 years' service. There will be four weeks' annual leave, a 19 per cent loading for casuals, eight days' sick leave per year and all of the public holidays.

In addition, the right of both the employer and the employee to terminate the employment relationship in accordance with the termination or notice provisions of the relevant award is prescribed as the minimum requirement. Some members of the union movement have tried to cloud the issue by saying that such employees would be locked into an agreement for the years of the tenure of the agreement and that they would not be able to get out of it. That is certainly not the case. The basic termination requirements of the respective awards would supplant the actual agreement that was made.

Mr Vaughan: That is not what Mr Cooper from Roma said.

Mr SHERRIN: That is not the case. I ask the member for Nudgee to look at the Minister's second-reading speech.

Under other important features of the revised legislation, ambulance employees, firemen, public hospital nurses and local authority employees have been specifically excluded from the Bill. This was not clear in the original legislation. During the consultation process the Minister was willing to listen to representations. I am pleased to say that it was in that area that I made representations to him to specifically exclude these people.

Mr Lester: I recognised the fact of your representations, too.

Mr SHERRIN: I thank the Minister kindly. The public servants in my electorate appreciated that.

They were categories of employees that needed to be excluded. Public servants, police and railway employees are now specifically not covered by the legislation. I certainly see no need for the legislation to cover those areas of employment.

Another matter on which I made representations to the Minister—I know a number of other members from this side of the House did, also—was the important new option for payment of equivalent cash in lieu as a monetary adjustment for a maximum of 50 per cent of annual leave. Members will recall that under the original legislation it was possible to be paid cash in lieu for all annual leave. I know a number of us were concerned about the loss of the recuperative effects of taking annual leave. I admit that some form of flexibility had to be built into the system but the 50 per cent requirement that is contained in the revised legislation provides an opportunity for workers, as a minimum requirement of the system, to take part of that annual leave so that they can benefit from the recuperative effects of a break from work.

Mr Gilmore: That gives people who are prepared to work an opportunity to do so.

Mr SHERRIN: That is exactly right.

The State Industrial Commission will have jurisdiction to review agreements prior to registration to ensure——

Mr Ardill: They will cut down on jobs.

Mr SHERRIN: That is exactly what the Government is on about—jobs. I thank the member for Salisbury very much for his support, which is accepted gratefully.

As I was saying, the Industrial Commission has jurisdiction to review agreements prior to registration to ensure that they meet the minimum requirements and are not against the public interest. So a mechanism is built into the legislation so that the State Industrial Commission can review agreements to ensure that they meet the minimum requirements of the legislation. Additionally, the commission will be able to declare void agreements that are in operation that are harsh, unjust and against the public interest.

The State Industrial Commission will still be involved in settling disputes, other than those going to the appropriateness of the agreements. So the Industrial Commission has a conciliatory role to play. If the parties agree, the commission may also be involved in varying the terms of agreements. So the arbitration and conciliation roles of the commission are recognised in the Bill.

The agreements will be registered with the Industrial Commission and enforceable by the Industrial Magistrates Court. One point that I am very pleased to see is the continuation of the requirement that minors can be parties to agreements only with the consent of a parent or guardian. Some who have contributed to the debate have said that minors could be taken advantage of. That certainly will not be the case; their parents or guardians will be able to safeguard their interests.

The inclusion of adequate safeguards in the form of realistic minimum conditions—I emphasise “realistic”—the requirement that such agreements can be reached voluntarily, the continued role of the State Industrial Commission and the fact that the Government has indicated its willingness to protect the interests of all employees provide the sound basis necessary for the operation of such a system.

Mr Hayward: What are the potential benefits?

Mr SHERRIN: I am coming to them. I ask the honourable member to wait. That is my punch line.

Features of the VEA legislation that I have not covered in my earlier remarks are that copies of the agreements shall be provided and given to all present and all new employees coming into the place of work——

Mr Vaughan: That will be novel.

Mr SHERRIN: When the honourable member has worked, has he ever seen a copy of his award?

Mr Vaughan: They don't even post up copies of the awards in shops now.

Mr SHERRIN: That is it. I have not seen copies of the awards that I have worked under. As I said, under the legislation, copies of VEAs shall be given to all present and new employees.

The important point is that the role of the commission is preserved. If an agreement is found to be harsh, unjust or against the public interest, the commission has the power to declare it void from the beginning or at any time during the previous 12 months. The commission has the power to backdate the termination, and the arbitration powers apply only where agreed between the parties; but, as I have said, conciliation is available in all cases.

Another important feature of the legislation is that the VEAs take effect from the date on which they are registered and not from the date on which they are signed.

I have already outlined the minimum conditions and the negotiable conditions. VEAs are to be enforceable as if they were awards. Previously accrued rights and benefits are not affected by the VEAs.

Mr Davis: Who's going to enforce it?

Mr SHERRIN: The commission.

Mr Davis: The commission hasn't got the power to enforce it. Who's going to police it?

Mr SHERRIN: Is the honourable member speaking on this legislation?

Mr Davis: Later on.

Mr SHERRIN: I wait with bated breath.

Either party can terminate the employment relationship in accordance with the relevant awards, too. As I have said, the VEAs will run for a minimum of 12 months and for a maximum of three years.

Following a brief analysis and overlay of the awards, it would be helpful to examine some of the factors that have brought the Government to the stage at which it feels that

it has to deregulate the labour market to an extent and free up some of the restrictive work practices that have arisen.

My colleague the member for Currumbin has outlined a number of restrictive work practices. I also will outline a number of restrictive work practices that have come to my attention. On 3 July this year the *Gold Coast Bulletin* contained an article on restrictive work practices that were prevalent in the building industry. That article raised the matter of how to tell whether it is raining.

I had the opportunity of spending two years working on an industrial work site back in the early 1970s and the late 1960s. As a matter of fact, it was the Riverside Expressway. I experienced some of the restrictive work practices that went on.

Mr Vaughan: Were you a member of a union?

Mr SHERRIN: No, I was not. I was fortunate.

As I said, the article raised the matter of how to tell whether it is raining. If one is a building worker and a member of a union, one takes out a piece of newspaper, puts it on the ground and, according to the definitions supplied by the union, if two spots appear on the newspaper, it is raining. Then everyone gets the rain allowance and there is a reason to knock off work and go and sit indoors.

Mr Vaughan: What were you employed as?

Mr SHERRIN: A tradesman's assistant—an assistant to a mechanic.

As I was saying, conditions are pretty tough for workers! For example, at one Sydney building site the men demanded and got from their employer a special allowance because they could smell dim sims. The smell of dim sims wafting across the road from a Chinese restaurant was too much for them to bear. However, the important point is that they got the special allowance not because they did not like the aroma but because it made them hungry for Chinese food. That was the ground for a special allowance.

I make it clear that I am not talking about all unions. I know that it is a very sensitive issue. I am talking about some irresponsible elements of the union movement. In another incident, 600 employees walked off site for two days when their boss could not meet their demand for vanilla slices for morning tea. How is that for tough workers? Six hundred workers held up an industry, putting people out of work, because the boss did not provide them with vanilla slices for their morning tea. That is incredible! Workers on high-rise buildings——

Mr Ardill: This is the most overworked lot of cliches I have ever heard.

Mr SHERRIN: This is my information. I know that it hurts members of the Opposition. I know that I have hit a sensitive point.

Workers on Gold Coast high-rise buildings can get up to \$30 a week special allowance simply because they have to work high up on the buildings. All the safety provisions are there, but because they are off the ground they get an extra \$30 a week. Even those who go down in the excavation hole still receive the allowance. Even if they are working on the ground floor during the construction, they still receive a high-rise allowance.

Wet weather and strikes add 22 per cent to construction time in Australia. Compare that with the United Kingdom and the United States of America—and the weather is far worse in the northern hemisphere—where only 4 per cent is added to construction time. I repeat: 22 per cent in Australia compared with 4 per cent overseas. On a \$20m project, that means \$1.2m extra built into the cost because of these restrictive work practices. It is incredible.

For example, the price of the great Taj Mahal in Canberra has risen dramatically over the term of the current Labor Government in Canberra. It has trebled and quadrupled.

Mr Hayward interjected.

Mr SHERRIN: I will take an interjection from the honourable member for Caboolture in a moment.

This is the reason why the price has trebled: crane-drivers on the new Parliament House project in Canberra are paid climbing time of two hours per day, at overtime rates. They must be pretty tall cranes. It only takes 45 seconds to climb up to the cab of a crane, yet they receive two hours' special overtime for climbing time. For example, on many building sites tradesmen have two special assistants to carry their plywood because they cannot carry it themselves. I could go on and on with more details.

The Liberal Party, including my colleague opposite, the honourable member for Mount Isa, and Senator Parer have detailed awards that are prevalent on the waterfront in Australia. On the waterfront it costs \$15 per tonne to load scrap metal for a Queensland exporter, yet in the United States of America it costs \$4 and in the United Kingdom it costs only 64c. This is all due to restrictive work practices on the Australian waterfront. It is absolutely incredible.

Mr Hayward: When are you going to tell us about the potential benefits for employees?

Mr SHERRIN: Is the honourable member for Caboolture endorsing these kinds of restrictive work practices? I appreciate his comments on these restrictive work practices, but does he endorse this kind of treatment?

Mrs McCauley: Of course he does.

Mr SHERRIN: I think so, but his silence is enough. Let *Hansard* note his acquiescence.

There is a movement towards increased labour market flexibility in most countries in the Western World. Many European countries—for example, France—with socialist Governments have achieved greater flexibility in working-time arrangements which have benefited both employers and employees. The lack of flexibility in the Australian system has at long last been recognised right here in Queensland. Several economic commentators have argued that Australia's centrally regulated labour market is a contributing factor in the country's current economic troubles. For many years Australia's performance in terms of growth, unemployment and inflation has been ranked at the poorer end of the international scale and the country has slipped further. Many commentators have argued that this is due to restrictive work practices.

A Government member interjected.

Mr SHERRIN: The honourable member is absolutely right.

Mr Lester: We will go better from now on though, won't we?

Mr SHERRIN: I am sure it will. Under the Minister's guidance and with this pioneering legislation, it will be very interesting.

I will briefly wind up with a few arguments in favour of a deregulated work-force and the voluntary employment agreement legislation. To begin with, it will break the prevailing near-compulsory unionism that exists in some industries, giving employees more freedom of choice to negotiate their pay and conditions at enterprise or company level.

In my background reading for this debate, I found it very interesting that one company in New South Wales had a high proportion of migrant female labour. I think that there were about 60 ladies working in a factory. A large number of them were single parents with dependent children. Their award specified a starting and finishing time. The employees went to their employer and said, "Could we start 30 minutes earlier?" That would have allowed them the opportunity to drop off their children at child-minding centres which were run by the Government and which opened at certain hours.

The employer said, "Yes. By all means start work 30 minutes earlier and we will finish 30 minutes earlier." Their working hours were specified under the award.

The arrangement they entered into with their employer worked successfully for a number of months, to the great satisfaction of the mothers and to the obvious advantage of their children because they had their mothers at home in the morning and in the afternoon. However, an industrial inspector came along, noticed the starting and finishing times of the employees, and forced them against their will to comply with the award. That meant that many, many children were forced to become latchkey children because of the requirements of the award. There was not sufficient flexibility in the award system to allow that variation. This legislation will provide flexibility for employees in their particular place of work.

Mr Palaszczuk interjected.

Mr SHERRIN: I would be more than happy to show that to the honourable member.

Mr Henderson interjected.

Mr SHERRIN: The real reason for the opposition to this legislation is that the unions see some threat to their monopoly of power. It is as simple as that. That is why there is an almost paranoid, knee-jerk reaction from the members of the Opposition. They are obviously acting under instructions from their TLC masters who have said, "Stop it at all costs." It is a power situation—nothing more, nothing less. They see their monopoly coming under threat.

The legislation will make businesses—particularly small businesses—more viable, with presumably differing wage rates, thus enabling more people to be employed. It will also ensure greater productivity.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SHERRIN: I know that Opposition members regard "productivity" as a dirty word. However, the legislation will allow greater productivity in the work-force and, ultimately, in the long term, higher living standards for all employees in the State. In particular, it will benefit the Queensland tourism industry—a labour-intensive tourism industry to which I have already devoted a 20-minute speech in this Chamber today. I referred to the need to stimulate that industry as a third pillar for the State and the nation's economy, particularly if the problem of penalty rates can be overcome.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Mr R. J. GIBBS (Wolston) (8.18 p.m.): The most awesome task that I have had in this Chamber is following Pastor Klimionok's personal messenger. As award wages have been mentioned, it will always be a welcome revelation to find out what that gentleman's award wage is. Of course, when one talks about the provocative smell of dim sims that wafts across the street, I cannot help but wonder what the award wage was that was paid to Pastor Steve Ryder about four years ago when he flew first-class to New Zealand and became the first evangelist in the world to cure a woman's blindness on talk-back radio.

The honourable member summed up in the last couple of phrases of his speech what, in the first instance, the thrust of the legislation is all about. Of course, he made reference to the tourist industry. It has been recognised for a long time that the worst abuse of worker's rights in this State has been among the major operators of the Queensland tourist industry. I could refer to the abuse of the wages that have been paid, the lack of award conditions, the lack of suitable educational facilities for families on tourist islands and, in many instances, the lack of basic health facilities. I could detail some of the complaints received by Opposition members about the sexual harassment that has taken place on those islands that are run by prominent members and supporters of the Queensland National Party. It has been known that the ambition of the Queensland

Government is to smash the trade union movement in this State. That is the very same sort of pattern that was adopted many years ago in the southern States of the United States of America. It then spread into the northern States.

I notice that the honourable member for Southport is making jokes. I cannot help but remember a small joke that I heard during the week from a little shoeshine boy on the Gold Coast. He told me that Mr Veivers drops in each week to have his shoes cleaned. That boy told me that if ever he has seen an easy touch, it is Mick Veivers. He said, "I never clean his shoes because he cannot see over his stomach to see the job that I have done."

The Government is pinching ideas from the United States. It should accept some from the union people in this country. Although I acknowledge that there is some vulnerability within the trade union movement in Australia, there has been a drift away from union support for a number of reasons. Of recent years, for example, there has tended to be more employment in the public sector than in the private sector. That applies particularly to white-collar unions. The traditional base of the blue-collar unions has been eroded. That is a challenge to the trade union movement in this country. It needs to pick up the membership of those unions in a more constructive way than it is doing at present.

I agree with the proposal that was put forward by Bill Kelty, and outlined by the Queensland Trades and Labor Council, for an amalgamation of unions in this country. I am a great believer in and supporter of unions in this country. In 1972 I supported the establishment of the Amalgamated Metal Workers Union, which was made possible by the amalgamation of the three metal trades unions at that time.

This Bill attacks some very basic fundamentals that have not only long been cherished as part of a democratic system in this country but which must also be protected. I will mention those aspects later.

I intend to quote from several articles that I believe are of importance to this debate. There is no way in the world that this legislation did not originate through the involvement of Right Wing forces not only in this country but in the United States. Much of this legislation is a carbon copy of the American legislation.

The United States is a country that perhaps did not take an interest in unionism in the way in which Australia did. In many ways it tended to be a party to this system of contracts. This is what is happening in the United States—

"Among unorganized workers there exists widespread pro-union sentiment and interest in workers' rights. Serious obstacles, particularly in the private sector, frequently prevent translation of those sentiments into collective bargaining. Intensified, often illegal, employer resistance, and the inadequacy of the collective bargaining legal apparatus combine to deny workers their right to determine freely whether they want union representation. Many employers seek delays to defuse organizing efforts; others violate employee organizing and collective bargaining rights through illegal discharges or refusal to bargain. Illegal antiunion consultant activity subverts congressionally established national labor policy to encourage the practice of collective bargaining."

The article continues—

"The proliferation of antiunion consultant activity on the part of law firms and employer associations—including some public employer groups—as well as specialized antiunion management consultants, has reached the point that such activity is now part of most organizing campaigns, no matter the industry or area of the country. A uniform component of labor-management consultant service is the instruction of employers in ways of exploiting weaknesses in the labor law and of intimidating employees to induce them to reject union representation."

A la what is happening in this State of Queensland! It continues—

"Supervisors are warned that the NLRB offers them no protection, then are indoctrinated in their role as the shock troops in management's campaign. Carefully

coached on what they can say and how to get a message over just this side of the law, supervisors eventually spend much of their time pursuing the antiunion program delivering management's message and closely monitoring employee sentiment. Defeating the organizing effort supersedes every other managerial objective. Employees sympathetic to management are mobilized and enlisted in the effort. Union activists are isolated from other workers, and their every step is watched so that supervisors can start building a case for reprimand and/or discharge."

I will prove that point towards the conclusion of this speech. The article continues—

"Union-busting consultants usually assume complete control of the management countercampaign but rarely confront workers face to face, so as to protect their contrived interpretation of Landrum-Griffin reporting requirements. If the union somehow manages to win against these odds, the consultant stands by to guide the employer through surface bargaining and/or decertification. Prominent among the tactics employed leading up to decertification is management refusal to negotiate in good faith toward a collective bargaining agreement . . ."

Where have we heard and seen these ingredients before? The article continues—

"... especially in first-contract situations. Often, the consultant-advised company manoeuvres the union into a strike, then brings in replacement workers who can vote the union out after a year."

Mr Veivers: Every Sunday at Carrara.

Mr R. J. GIBBS: I will take again the interjection from the honourable member for Southport. One can look at the disgraceful way in which he stands accused of driving Brisbane's and Queensland's first recognised Australian Rules football team from the Gold Coast. The Brisbane Bears, who played at Carrara, personally blame the member for Southport for the shocking type of catering that used to be provided to the general public.

The article goes on further to say—

"Sophisticated personnel management practices often represent a less overt form of union avoidance. Programs to increase individual worker motivation and improve the quality of work life often serve dual objectives. One is the laudable aim of raising productivity . . ."

That is the word used constantly by the member for Mansfield. The article continues—

"... the other, not publicized, is that of undermining potential unionization. From an employer's point of view, it is easy to understand the popularity of these programs. Such efforts usually do raise the organizing threshold. Yet they certainly do not lessen the need for collective action. In most cases in which these programs really have served worker as well as management interests it is because unions have cooperated and supported them. To the extent that management maintains unilateral direction over worker participation programs, workers' interests will be a subsidiary concern. Indeed, management is the first to assert that it is in business to produce for profit, not to provide jobs or rewarding employment, or to enhance the dignity of work."

That in itself is a scathing comment on the very system that now operates in the United States. It goes on further to say—

"Many employers seek protracted delays to defuse organizing efforts; others violate employee rights, with virtual impunity, through illegal discharge or refusals to bargain. Their examples embolden other employers to resist unionization and to attempt to intimidate and coerce workers into sacrificing their collective bargaining rights. The rise of overt union busting is the culmination of intensified employer opposition to unions and the creeping paralysis that grips the collective bargaining legal apparatus."

As I have just said, I believe that that in itself is a bad enough condemnation of the legislation before the Parliament this evening. As I have heard my colleague the

member for Bulimba express concern in this House previously, I carried out some research into the future of people in this State who belong to trade unions and who apply to employers for jobs in establishments in which these types of agreements may be enforced.

Of course, I am aware of the provision in the Bill that refers to the employment or proposed employment by an employer of one employee in a particular calling. It means that if that particular employee in the firm agrees to the terms of the contract and signs the contract, any person who applies for a job with the firm after that is bound by the terms of the contract that one person signed.

In the United States, one of the things that surfaced constantly—which is now illegal but against which I see no protection for workers in a similar position in this State under this legislation—is what became known as the yellow dog agreements. For the benefit of those members on the Government side I will explain what the term means. I know it takes them quite some time to absorb these things. A yellow dog agreement is a name derived from the protestation by unionists—and rightly so—that only a dirty yellow dog would sign such an agreement. In Australia, I do not think that people who sign such agreements are called dirty yellow dogs; in Australia, they are referred to as straight-out scabs.

In the United States, the yellow dog agreement relates to the illegality of certain employment contracts. In the United States, the so-called yellow dog agreements were prohibited on the basis that in the employment contract, the worker represents that he or she is not a union-member or supporter. Such contracts state that they will be automatically terminated upon the worker's becoming a union-member. The United States legislation made yellow dog contracts or similar provisions in employment contracts void and unenforceable in the Federal courts. In addition, entering into such contracts can now constitute an unfair labour practice under the National Labor Relations Act. A majority of the States have adopted law that similarly invalidates such contracts by making them illegal and unenforceable as a matter of law.

I challenge the Minister—and I challenge the people who advise the Minister——

Mr Palaszczuk: He is not even here.

Mr R. J. GIBBS: Of course he is not here, because he knows that he is losing this debate and that the Opposition is winning hands down.

Tonight, I challenge the Minister to lay before this Parliament a document indicating where, in this legislation, protection is going to be afforded to Queensland workers. The kind of protection I refer to relates to whether a person who happens to be a member of a trade union applies for a job at a place where these contracts apply. If a person reveals that he happens to belong to a trade union, I want to know whether that person will be discriminated against. I believe that people in that position will be discriminated against, victimised and blacklisted, which is what has happened to thousands of workers in this State for many, many years. I challenge the Minister to provide me with proof that protection is given under this legislation.

This legislation not only goes to great lengths to totally by-pass the role of the arbitration commission but also attempts deliberately to prostitute the role of the arbitration commission—a commission that has become a cherished part of Australia's industrial history. Its role is fundamental to good industrial relations. Its role has stood abuse and attacks by conservative Governments over a number of years. If ever there was an example of that abuse, it was the way in which a former Prime Minister, Malcolm Fraser, tried to abuse it by establishing the Industrial Relations Bureau. All honourable members would know that he fell on his backside in respect of that legislation. I believe that that was a fundamental contributing cause to his downfall.

The legislation presently before the House provides in clause 8 as follows—

“(4) The Commission shall only refuse to approve a voluntary employment agreement if it is satisfied that—

(a) the agreement contravenes or provides for the contravention of any of the provisions of this Part;

or

(b) it is not in the public interest that it should approve the agreement.

(5) Every voluntary employment agreement approved by the Commission shall be registered.

(6) Until a voluntary employment agreement is registered by the registrar it shall be of no effect and upon registration, shall take effect from the date of registration.”

I again go back to the point that I made previously: where in this specific clause of the Bill is the protection for people? What guarantee can be given that, apart from the yellow dog segment that I have referred to, if the commission agreed to register contracts which are not in conformity with the political views of this Government, such as the example that I have just given, this Government will not introduce further legislation to again short-circuit the legitimate arbitration system in Queensland?

Again I say that this Bill is not only very deliberate in its attempt to sabotage the union movement, the industrial movement and the arbitration system in Queensland but is also an endeavour, as mentioned by the honourable member for Caboolture, by the National Right, as part of its insidious action, to try to infiltrate further into the national scene.

There has been much debate about and many comments made on this Bill. I am fascinated, of course, by the proposed section 94F, which relates to provision for paid leave entitlements. On the surface it looks wonderful. It looks as though it is protecting the five weeks' annual leave, the applicable statutory holiday leave, sick leave and long-service leave. However, the major “out” is that, if it is required, an employer, to meet the requirements of the company, will be able to break down those conditions or the contract that a person may have signed. The fact is that it has not been simply as a result of actions by the union movement and, in many cases, of bargaining and agreement with employers without the necessity of going before the arbitration system that conditions have been awarded. Many of the conditions in relation to sick leave, statutory holiday leave, annual leave, etc., have come about not just because of a commitment required of unions to obtain the best entitlements for their members, but because of hard research work that shows that people in certain occupations who suffer from stress and who can develop health problems need breaks of four to five weeks each year. The object of annual leave is not that a worker takes two weeks here, a week there and two weeks there. The object of annual leave is what it says: annual leave—a four or five-week break from one's occupation.

This insidious legislation deliberately writes into the Act that that shall be broken down. One can very easily imagine what could happen. In my own electorate I have experienced it. I have seen the recipe for it. In some of the Housing Commission areas there, people who suffer dreadful emotional problems and who are not on a sufficient wage will take their four or five weeks' annual leave, and after two weeks of that leave they have to get a job elsewhere for three weeks because they are in a diabolical plight. That is what this legislation will encourage. That is what it is meant to encourage.

Mr Sherlock: How about small business? How much leave do they get?

Mr R. J. GIBBS: I would question the honourable member's experience in small business. The honourable member for Ashgrove is better off sticking to what he speaks best about in this House, and that is the boy scout movement.

The simple fact is that this Bill will contribute, I believe, to a further increase in the public health bill. It will mean that, by breaking down conditions for people, it will

contribute to health and stress problems. I wonder what will happen and what sort of pressure will be applied to women in the work-force who want maternity leave. What will be their position? Will they be told, "Yes, you can work and you can take your leave, but because of the action in the company at the moment we have a few problems. You will work up to a week before you are due to have the child, and if you want to hold your job under this contract, we will want you back a week after you have had the child. We might give you the other two weeks' maternity leave perhaps some time in eight months' time."

Mr Palaszczuk: Mrs Chapman will look after them.

Mr R. J. GIBBS: If any female employee relies on the honourable member for Pine Rivers to look after those sorts of things, she will be waiting a long time. The Bill breaks down those most basic fundamentals.

At the outset I said that I would prove beyond any doubt the points that I have made tonight. I shall do that. The proof lies in the article that I have in my hand, which was written by Victor Schachter, a San Francisco labour law attorney who has some advice for employers who wish to protect their right to dismiss a worker. This fellow is recognised as a legal genius in this field and is one of the people in the thriving business of advising companies on how to screw unions. This is what he advises companies to do—

"When advertising a job vacancy, avoid terms like 'permanent'—say 'full time' or 'regular'. Note that continued employment is subject to economic conditions and satisfactory job performance.

On job applications, state that 'employment is terminable at will by either party.'

Instruct interviewers not to say anything that overstates job security, such as: 'if you do a good job, you'll always have a place to work here.'

Eliminate language in personnel handbooks and policy manuals informing employees that they will be disciplined only for cause. If the manual includes specific infractions for which an employee can be fired, add a statement that the list is not exclusive.

Make sure your employee-appraisal system is candid and allows for early identification of problems and reasonable time to correct unsatisfactory performance.

Base every discharge on a set of clearly defined, attainable and job-related standards. Know that all policies and procedures have been complied with and that the discharge is in line with past disciplinary practices."

That article is titled "An Expert's Word To The Boss". There is just no way in the world that that is not the same sort of treatment that employed people in Queensland can look forward to under this legislation. This evening I make the prediction that, in line with the Government's back-down on some of the more controversial legislation of recent times, with the retirement of the Premier in August of next year——

An Opposition member interjected.

Mr R. J. GIBBS: Perhaps with the axing of the Premier before August of next year, I am quite confident in saying that I believe that the raised voice of the industrialised movement of working people in this State will cause such a furore over this legislation that the Government will be required to withdraw it. I cannot let the point pass: how could any person have confidence in this legislation when it is supported by Alderman Burreket, that poor, punch-drunk fellow who represents the seat of Townsville?

Mr STEPHAN (Gympie) (8.43 p.m.): I have pleasure in joining the debate on voluntary employment agreements. I was interested in many of the comments of Opposition members, one of which reflected their attitude towards leadership. From time to time Opposition members have commented about the retirement of the Premier in 1988 after 20 years in that office. I also note that the same members of the Opposition

have had a great deal to say about their own leader and are trying to force him to retire from the position after holding it for only a few years. I wonder where their loyalties lie. I wonder whether they realise in what direction they are heading and whom they are supporting. Their loyalties seem to shift constantly. For that reason I do not think that any member opposite is in a position to make any comment about the closing stages of the Premier's 20-year term. That just shows the stability on the Government side, and that annoys members of the Labor Party. They cannot live with it; they cannot come to grips with it.

In some of their comments during this debate members of the Opposition have indicated that they are running away with their own ideology. They think that this approach will be applied to every other piece of legislation that is introduced. That is just not the case.

The comment was made that the plan is to smash organised labour. That is just ridiculous. In fact, the Government is working towards flexibility in the system that will enable the employee and employer to work together and to work towards achieving better productivity.

Mr Sherrin: "Productivity" is a dirty word to members of the Opposition.

Mr STEPHAN: It is indeed. "Profit" is also a dirty word to members of the Opposition. They do not like either of those words.

Members of the Labor Party like to run the employer into the ground. They like to be able to say, "We've run him out of business. Now we'll try and find somebody else." That does not do very much to enhance their image, and it does not help the export industry.

Mr Sherrin interjected.

Mr STEPHAN: I do not know what members of the Opposition prefer. However, it has certainly got nothing to do with the ability of this nation to be able to compete on overseas markets.

It is interesting to note that a special agreement applies in relation to the Expo site. It is quite all right to have a special agreement for Expo but it is not all right to have special agreements for the general work-force. It is a different world on the south bank. Members of the Opposition say that the Expo agreement is okay but that it is no good the Government trying to introduce agreements in the general work-force. It makes one wonder whether members of the Opposition want to know what is going on in the real world or whether they want to believe that the whole world revolves around the ideology of the Labor Party, which it does not.

Mr Vaughan: Do you realise that that Expo agreement can be busted up by voluntary employment agreements?

Mr STEPHAN: No. Voluntary employment agreements work both ways. That is what members of the Opposition will not accept. They do not want to accept it. They want to be able to say to the employer on behalf of the unions, "This is what you will do.", irrespective of what it will do to the work-force. Members of the Opposition do not care what happens to employees or to the productivity and the profit margins of both small and large businesses in this country.

Mr Vaughan: Your Government wants a nice smooth Expo, doesn't it?

Mr STEPHAN: The Government wants a nice smooth operation for employers and employees throughout the year.

Mr Vaughan interjected.

Mr STEPHAN: The honourable member is getting carried away.

Members of the Opposition isolate one area and say, "It is all right to have a special agreement for that area but not anywhere else." If the Opposition adopts that attitude, it is running away from its responsibilities and from what it really believes in.

Mr Vaughan: It's your problem, not mine.

Mr STEPHAN: It is the honourable member's problem as much as anyone else's. That is why he is leaving the Chamber at this stage. It is a pity that he cannot stay and listen to what Government members have to say and hear the other side of the argument. I feel sorry for the people whom the honourable member represents because he cannot come to terms with the other side of the argument.

In his speech, the member for Wolston tried to suggest that employers would try to belittle female workers and deny them maternity leave. What a ridiculous attitude! What a ridiculous statement to make. If this is an example of the mentality of the members of the Opposition, I feel sorry for the people whom they represent.

Mr Wells: Why is it being introduced in the first place if you reckon employers are all so nice to workers?

Mr STEPHAN: The employers and employees are given an opportunity to reach an agreement, and that is what the Opposition cannot come to terms with. The Opposition is putting up some eventualities that may occur. Because of the case that occurred in Roma, strict guide-lines are required. If the present system is so perfect, why is it not working well and why do those sorts of cases occur? Everyone admits that the system is not perfect, that differences do exist and that improvements must be made. This legislation is one way in which this Government believes that improvements can be achieved.

These arguments must provide at the very least the following minimum conditions—and this is what I am trying to point out to the Opposition—an hourly wage rate equal to the rate of pay of ordinary time shown in the wages clause of the relevant award or industrial agreement shown under that industry; all public holidays in accordance with the Act; long-service leave of not less than 13 weeks for each 15 years of service; a 19 per cent loading for casuals; at least four weeks' annual leave for weekly workers and five weeks for continuous shift workers; and up to 50 per cent of the annual-leave entitlements can be cashed in if the employee wishes. In many instances this is the wish of the employee because he is looking for a bit of extra cash in his pocket to pay for the necessities that he and his family require. These conditions allow him to do so of his own free will. There is no force and no pressure on him to accept it, but it is there for him to cash in if he chooses.

I remember in my youth—30 years ago—that the amount of holiday leave was certainly not five weeks. Did that upset the mental attitude of the members of the Opposition? It certainly did not upset me, but I can only speak for myself. If it had an effect on their mental attitude, I feel sorry for them. These are the conditions that are available and they can be taken advantage of with the agreement of both sides.

It has been argued that the current arrangement provides insufficient flexibility and that universal, across-the-board decisions do not always suit the needs of particular enterprises. Voluntary employment agreements provide flexibility for businesses which have a particular market to meet in an efficient manner, for example in the tourist industry during the week-end peak periods and in primary production or horticulture where it is not always necessary that employees work between Monday and Saturday. Some industries do require that work be done during the week-ends and often more work is required to be done at the week-ends than during the week. This legislation provides the opportunity for that work to be carried out during a time that makes businesses competitive and able to meet the requirements, demands and financial opportunities that exist.

A movement towards this kind of flexibility is taking place overseas and Australia cannot afford to cling to out-of-date practices and be isolated. If we are expecting tourists

to visit Australia, we must not price or force them out by saying that we do not want tourists because no-one works on Saturdays or Sundays, or only do so under extreme circumstances.

This is not complete deregulation. Controls, checks and balances still exist. Minimum conditions are still set down and the 60 per cent requirement is voluntary. I know it has been said that this 60 per cent figure can be worked in different ways, but, whichever way one looks at it, 60 per cent is more than half. This is a fact of life. This is one of the requirements contained in the legislation and one that will give support and protection to those who are working in a particular firm.

Co-operation at the workplace level to remove outdated work restrictions, allowing more productivity and potential to actually increase wages, is a matter on which I have not heard very much. There is an opportunity for those people who are willing to put down their heads and do a bit of extra work. That should be encouraged rather than someone saying to a person, "You cannot do that."

As to the potential for multiskilling—employees now are not permitted to learn new jobs because of award restrictions. There is nothing worse than a person's being told, "You cannot do that job because of award restrictions and because of the restrictions imposed by the unions." There is nothing worse for an employer than to require two or three different persons to perform a job that could be done very well by one person. There is a wide range of opportunities for one employee to take care of the different jobs.

A number of exclusions are features of the VEA legislative proposal. Those persons excluded include public servants, teachers, railway employees, public hospital nurses, and ambulance, fire brigade and local authority employees. As to minors—those who are under the legal age of consent—parents or guardians must give written consent before an agreement is legal. The role of the Industrial Commission is to register an agreement only if minimum conditions are attained and only if they are not against the public interest. Negotiable conditions include working six out of seven days, a maximum of 40 hours, rest pauses, overtime and mixed functions. As I said earlier, on cashing out, an employee is only able to cash in a maximum of 50 per cent of his annual leave.

As to job security—from time to time statements have been made that jobs are not secure. But what job is secure at present? Given present economic conditions, even with the requirement of two weeks' notice, and in some instances a shorter time, an employee can find himself without a job. It only requires that notice be given. I am sure that any honourable member who knows what is going on would realise that there is no such thing as complete and utter job security, whether it be for an employer or an employee. The employer suffers in the same way as an employee. If his profitability goes down, there is no security for him; and, consequently, there is no security for his employees, irrespective of the terms and conditions under which they are employed.

A feature of VEAs is that an employee is to be advised of the particulars of the agreement before he is engaged in employment. If that person does not want to have any part of it, it is up to him not to sign the agreement and not to be a part of it.

The term of a VEA is a minimum period of 12 months and a maximum period of three years. It is important that the term is no more than three years. After that period, discussions can be held and a further agreement reached. If a person is not satisfied with his terms and conditions, it is certainly in his best interests to have them changed. Employees will have an opportunity to have discussions, possibly every 12 months. That will not disadvantage anyone.

There is a movement towards increased labour market flexibility in most countries in the Western World. Many European countries—for example, France—have achieved far greater flexibility in working time arrangements which have benefited both employers and employees than has Australia. The lack of flexibility in the Australian system has now been recognised, and at least Queensland is doing something about it. Opposition

members are not willing to accept that Queensland is prepared to do something and is receiving support for the actions that it is taking.

Certain economic commentators have argued that Australia's centrally regulated labour market is a contributing factor to the country's current economic troubles. For many years Australia's performance in terms of growth, unemployment and inflation has been at the poorer end of international rankings.

Dr Gerard Henderson, the Director of the Institute of Public Affairs, has written about a case that typifies some of the problems that this legislation will address. That case in Sydney involved the Federal Arbitration Commission and is symptomatic of the need for more flexibility in industry today.

Mr Davis: I make this comment: your reading hasn't improved.

Mr STEPHAN: I make this comment: perhaps the honourable member should listen to what I have to say about that particular case.

The factory concerned was well run and there appeared to be an excellent working relationship between employees and the employer. Some years previously the employees—mainly migrant women—had petitioned the management to alter their working hours by starting 30 minutes earlier and having only half an hour for lunch. In that way they could go home a little earlier and be there when their children returned from school. The management agreed to that suggestion. I am not sure what Mr Davis' position would be under those circumstances, but in that case there was an agreement between the employees and the employer.

That factory was subject to a routine visit by an arbitration inspectorate inspector, who discovered that the award had been breached in that standard hours were not being worked. The employer was warned that, should the award be violated again, he would have to pay each employee one hour's overtime per day. In fact, the company would be liable for back pay for every employee who had worked in that factory during the previous six years, even though they had been willing parties to that voluntary agreement concerning not wages but hours and conditions of work. It was to their advantage that they reached that particular agreement.

Mr Davis: Why didn't they apply for a variation?

Mr STEPHAN: It was a variation. They agreed on those conditions.

Mr Davis: Why didn't they apply for a variation?

Mr STEPHAN: The employer involved got the hint and returned to the standard hours that were laid down in the award. The employees' children became latchkey children. They are the ones who suffered.

Mr Davis: That is rubbish! Why didn't they apply for a variation?

Mr STEPHAN: The honourable member says that this is rubbish. Those children were looking for their parents when they got home from school. They were looking for support from their parents when they needed assistance with their homework or when they wanted to go to sport or wherever.

Those parents were unable to be at home when their children returned from school, because the award stated that they must work between certain hours, and how dare they consider that they could have only half an hour for lunch and finish work half an hour earlier.

Mr Davis: Why didn't they apply for a variation?

Mr STEPHAN: The honourable member is speaking rubbish. Surely he would realise that that situation benefited all people concerned.

Mr Davis: Why didn't they apply for a variation?

Mr STEPHAN: They reached agreement between the employer and the employees. They could have made an application.

The point is that an agreement was reached, but because they did not go through the red tape and did not ask the union whether they could do it, the union said, "How dare you vary that arrangement." That was done irrespective of the benefits that would flow to the remainder of the community.

There will also be the potential for the elimination by mutual consent of costly and unnecessary restrictive work practices under arrangements of that type.

Mr Davis: You're a law-breaker.

Mr STEPHAN: The honourable member is arguing that the union should be the central part of an agreement; that the union should be consulted under all circumstances; and that the union should have the final say.

I notice that Mr McElligott is nodding his head and saying that that is the way that things should be.

Mr McElligott: I was asleep.

Mr STEPHAN: I am sorry. I thought that the honourable member was nodding his head in agreement. I am sorry to have woken him up.

On many occasions jobs have been destroyed because of the sort of attitude that is expressed by unions. I have already cited one example of how children were affected.

Mr FitzGerald: The pretender to the throne is nodding in agreement with him.

Mr STEPHAN: The pretender to the throne is sitting on it at the present time.

The unions and the trouble-makers have destroyed thousands of manufacturing jobs in Melbourne, Newcastle and Wollongong during the five years of Labor Government in Canberra, Victoria and New South Wales. I ask all honourable members to listen to a couple of examples of that. An article states—

"Mr Hawke's masters in the ACTU bring down childish blueprints like 'Australia Reconstructed' while Comeng Victoria a division of ANI Ltd is sabotaged by its own workers.

This week Comeng sacked 200 'workers' after prolonged strikes threatened losses of \$100,000 a day, for failure to fulfil its \$220 million light rail export contract with Hong Kong.

Victorian reports said the 'surprise move represents a big setback for the Victorian Government, which negotiated the contract in expectations of more job opportunities.' "

That sort of attitude is destroying the work-force, Australia's credibility overseas and its ability to compete. The article continues—

"Australian workers support, through cowardice, apathy and ignorance, actions designed to lower our standard of living and to ruin our employers.

It takes a very thick or a very frightened individual to damage or destroy the company that employs him and from whence he gains his very livelihood. But this is exactly what has happened at hundreds of plants, not least ANI Ltd's plant at Dandenong.

About 1 year ago, on November 12, I wrote of sabotage ANI was suffering at Dandenong. One assumed Mr Cain, Bob Hawke, Simon Crean or one of the socialists would restrain union attempts to kill ANI's \$200 million Hong Kong export deal."

Apparently they were quite in favour of that and were not prepared to take any action at all to ensure that the jobs in that contract were looked after.

Mr Davis: Going interstate again.

Mr STEPHAN: I suppose the honourable member is in favour of that. I suppose that he supported that activity, irrespective of the damage that it caused.

Mr Davis: I would sack whoever wrote this.

Mr STEPHAN: This is Mr Cain speaking. It is the honourable member's friend Mr Cain, the Premier of Victoria. Has he heard of him? He does know him? I have heard in some instances that Mr Hawke has come to Queensland in an endeavour to give advice to the Labor Party in Queensland. However, he walked away in disgust and said, "Well, we can't help those fellows. There's nothing we can do for them." Under those conditions, there is not much hope that the honourable member will do too much himself. That is, of course, unless Mr Hawke is in a group or guard that is different from that of the honourable member. Is Mr Hawke in the honourable member's guard? Or is the honourable member one of the individuals who does not belong to those factions?

Just to whet honourable members' appetites, I refer to another article, which states—

"BHP Ltd's embattled steel division plans to make more large cuts to its workforce. The 1,800 jobs to go from its Newcastle and Whyalla plants over the next two years will add to 2,600 already being slashed from its Port Kembla works.

Despite cuts under the Federal Government's steel industry plan and outlays of \$1.4 billion on new equipment, BHP has failed to reach the productivity targets that its executive say are crucial if it is to compete with steel producers in Japan, South Korea and Brazil.

BHP Steel's general manager of planning and development, Mr Rob Chenery, said yesterday that Newcastle would shed 1,000 jobs and Whyalla 800 jobs through natural attrition and voluntary retirement.

The new job losses mean that BHP will cut the number of steelworkers it employs by 40 per cent to 32,900. The number in 1982 was 53,800."

Honourable members opposite do not like that. They do not like to hear these comments.

Another article states—

"Now, as a result of the further damaging effects of disruption over the past month, the company has been forced to transfer further production to Queensland and reschedule its other work commitments."

Honourable members should note that that article says that production is being transferred to Queensland. However, Opposition members are saying that that is not important. They do not like to hear those things; but that is what is occurring in this country. That type of attitude needs changing.

Mr Davis: This is a terrible brief. You're going to have an original thought one of these days.

Mr STEPHAN: The honourable member would not be able to listen long enough to be able to remember what I said.

I turn to the restrictive work practices to point out what effect they will have on productivity. Restrictive work practices result from any action at all by employees to limit the amount of work done, the nature of the work done, or the methods of doing the work for which those employees are employed. The process of describing and listing restrictive work practices, and then setting out to eliminate them, is not in itself directed towards causing employees to work abnormally hard, or to oppress employees in some way which is unusual, in relation to the general standards of the community and of industry.

Of course, some restrictive work practices are outrageous. Some of the systems that are being used certainly are not in keeping with what is expected of people in Australia. The infamous "nick" system means that two men are rostered to do one job. They take

it in turns to nick off while they are on full pay. It has been claimed that, until recently, rosters for such systems were openly displayed on the waterfront.

Mr Campbell: I have never heard of that. This legislation isn't going to stop that.

Mr STEPHAN: The honourable member does not like that. He has not heard of it? Don't tell me that!

A study undertaken on behalf of the Australian Wool Corporation showed that 47 per cent of the total door-to-door cost of shipping local wool to Europe was absorbed by landside costs in Australia while similar costs in Europe take up only 15 per cent. Honourable members ought to compare those figures—47 per cent in Australia and 15 per cent in Europe. That is what Australian products are competing against. This is the factor that increases costs.

Earlier, some Opposition members spoke about the primary producer not being efficient. The information that I have presented shows where the inefficiency is. It is not on the farm and it is not in the production side; it is in the distribution sector. There are vast differences between distribution costs in Australia and those of other countries with which Australia has to compete in international trade. These landside costs include terminal and stevedoring charges, packing and unpacking of containers and costs incurred by moving containers to and from packing and unpacking points. Members of the Opposition will have to change their attitude and look carefully at the trade union environment.

Members of the Opposition denigrate Queensland. Let me turn now to examine what is happening in the industrial relations scene in Queensland. Queensland is leading the way in productivity and in the peaceful settlement of industrial disputes. Those facts have been stated, claimed and proven a number of times. For example, Queensland has more than halved the number of days lost due to industrial disputes, and no other State can claim such a record. In the year ended 30 June 1987, 125 days per 1 000 employees were lost due to industrial disputes in Queensland. In comparison, New South Wales lost 232 days; Western Australia lost 249 days; and Victoria lost 222 days. Do Opposition members want me to repeat that? Did that sink in? Did Opposition members note the differences?

Mr Prest interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Row): Order! The honourable member for Port Curtis is not in his proper place.

Mr Clauson: He has only a 30-second concentration span.

Mr STEPHAN: That is why I asked whether I should repeat it.

Mr Prest interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I remind the honourable member for Port Curtis that he is interjecting from other than his usual seat, which is not allowed in this Chamber.

Mr STEPHAN: It is not worrying me, Mr Deputy Speaker. I would not worry too much about the honourable member. He is entertaining himself, and, unfortunately, I am not educating him very well. Under the circumstances, though, I am doing the best I can.

Over all, I point out that 104 000 working days were lost in Queensland, which accounts for 9.2 per cent of all days lost in Australia. When it is considered that Queensland has 16 per cent of the national work-force, 9.2 per cent of the total number of days lost is not a bad record. It must be recognised that Queensland's industrial policies are working.

The Minister is able to negotiate with both unions and employers. He is doing a particularly fine job under the circumstances. I can recall times when events in the

industrial relations scene made the Minister's job very difficult. I must point out, however, that in some instances the trade union movement has acted responsibly.

Time expired.

Mr BEARD (Mount Isa) (9.14 p.m.): Honourable members are certainly getting their share of debate on this legislation, and so they should because it is a very critical piece of legislation. When it is passed—and I have no doubt that it will be passed because the Government has the numbers—it will have the capacity to change the face of industry in Queensland.

I have listened with great interest to the earlier ALP speakers in particular. I will address them by their own names because, both as individuals and as people, I have tremendous respect for Mr McLean, Mr Vaughan, Mr Hayward, Mr R. J. Gibbs and Mr Smyth. I do not doubt their genuineness in the slightest degree. They say what they believe in and they say it with feeling. They are consistent in what they say. However, I think they are wrong because they are not in the real world. They are very doctrinaire in what they say. They are stuck with an outdated thesis all their life and they do not seem to be able to face the future that we are facing now in 1987. They are resistant to change.

To enable us to live in this real world, if Australia is to survive the closing years of the twentieth century, many things will have to be changed, and we will get dizzy. I believe that the relationship between industry and unionism is one of the critical matters which, in 1987, are susceptible to change.

The honourable member for Wolston, Mr Gibbs, made a big point of saying that the origin of many of the Government's ideas was the United States. I do not give a damn where the origin was. If it is going to work in Australia, it does not matter where it came from. It will be given a try here.

Mr Smyth: There will be a change in Mount Isa at the next election if you support this Bill.

Mr BEARD: The honourable member's father said that 20 years ago.

It does not matter where the origin was, as long as it will work here.

The honourable member for Caboolture, Mr Hayward, spoke about people at Deception Bay who were struggling with mortgages, who were without jobs and who cannot make their pay stretch far enough. I have the greatest sympathy for those people, and I resent any attempt on the part of any member in the House to take the moral high ground and imply that I do not care about those people who are struggling with mortgages or anything else. However, I will say this about people who are struggling at Deception Bay: it is a reasonably attractive part of this State. There used to be an old saying, "Go west young man; go west." There are jobs in the west. There are jobs in the north. It is tight there, but they should go where the work is.

Seven years ago I was commissioned by my then employer to help someone else undertake a study of where industries were going to get all the tradesmen that Australia would need in the late eighties and early nineties. It is incredible to believe that as recently as 1980 that was being looked at. Two of us went all round Australia, to Sydney, Melbourne, Canberra and everywhere. We found that there was high unemployment in the eastern suburbs of Sydney; there were jobs in the western suburbs of Sydney; but the youngsters would not travel from the eastern suburbs to the western suburbs to take them. They preferred being on the dole and on the beach to being in employment in the west. That was within a city.

I am not talking industrial conscription. I am saying that when times are tough people should go where the work is. My father did it, and the fathers of plenty of other people did it as well. When times are tough people should go where the work is. They should not sit crying on the beach and say that there is no work there. They should go out and look for it.

Not for one moment do I doubt Mr Smyth's genuineness. Someone asked him whether "profit" was a dirty word. He said, "No, a fair profit on an investment is okay." I ask him: what is a fair profit? Is it the profit that is equal to what an investor would get if he sold everything he had—sold his whole business—put the money that he received from that into the bank and received interest on it, or should he add a little bit of an extra margin onto that because he has taken a risk with his money by putting it into a property, spent it on capital and has done all the work and has had the worry? Should he perhaps have a little bit left over for research and development activities? Should he perhaps make a little bit extra profit for expansion, for capital investment?

Mr Smyth: What about the worker who risks his life when he goes to work?

Mr BEARD: I risk my life when I cross the road. I will risk my life tomorrow morning when I get on an Australian Airlines flight to go back to Mount Isa. We are now living in a country that is governed by occupational health and safety laws which are enforced by inspectors who protect everything a man does. There are also anti-pollution laws. I am talking about living in a country in which people on the whole are very well paid for what they do.

I am talking about a person who, instead of putting his money in the bank and living on the Gold Coast on the interest from it, is taking that money and putting it out as venture capital, taking a risk and creating jobs for other people. What is making it so hard for that man nowadays is that on top of taxing him on those profits to the extent that jobs are being lost, the present Government in Canberra is taxing the costs of doing business. I refer to the fringe benefits tax in particular.

Mr Campbell: What about rail freights?

Mr BEARD: I do not exclude for one moment the rail freights charged by this Government.

Mount Isa Mines is an organisation that is creating employment, developing the west, being taxed on its profits and competing in a world where it is a price-taker, not a price-setter. The only way it can survive and protect the 5 000 jobs that it creates in Mount Isa is by cutting costs to the bone. Believe me, there are people out there in what Opposition members scathingly call "management" who are working far longer hours and under far more stress than some of those who are whining and whinging about what is going on in the world.

I will take what I have said so far as my introduction.

Mr Smyth: This contract legislation will affect management as well as wages employees.

Mr BEARD: If the honourable member will give me my remaining 24 minutes, I will try to deal with the contract legislation.

The members of the Liberal Party welcome maximum flexibility in industrial relations without any exploitation of workers. That is it in a nutshell. Things have to be opened up. For too long the hands of industry have been dead hands, moribund hands, hands without any imagination and hands that are far more interested in subclause (c) of clause 48 (b) or outmoded k and p—for the uninitiated, that is custom and practice—than with creating an environment in which management and workers together can create not for any individual a bigger slice of one pie, but a bigger pie—more wealth—so that the same proportion of the pie will create more wealth for everyone. If the dead hands can be removed from the tiller by creating more flexibility in industrial relations, then I am all for it. If it takes something that is called contract legislation or voluntary employment agreements to do that, then let's give it a go.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr BEARD: Let me take my 23 minutes remaining.

Let us unlock in Australians the creativity, the initiative, the energy and the get up and go that typified the Australian diggers in two world wars and made Australians legendary for being able to build anything at all out of a piece of fencing wire. Let us not be locked into a situation that prevents employees from talking to their management man to man and from setting up a fair sort of a deal between themselves under which they are happy to work simply because it side-steps the unions. Let us get rid of that. Let us get people rewarded for their talents, their energy and their skills, and depart from the lowest common denominator.

Before I venture too far into my speech, let me acknowledge what has happened in unionism in Australia today in general. Unions are maturing. There are signs of increasing responsibility and there are examples all around Australia of unions doing what unions should: helping to create employment and denying themselves the possibility of increased rewards because they know the state Australia is in. However, there are still far too many examples in Australia of unions which are all for what they can get. I do not even have to talk about Norm Gallagher, because he is not the only one; there are others, just as there is some management with dead hands on the tiller as well. They have to move into the late-1980s as well.

People in this country must keep telling themselves that the United States is the engine that drives the world, Japan is the steering wheel and Australia is just a little dicky wheel that drags along behind with no control whatsoever over the direction that is taken. If Australia is to try to compete with those big boys in that world out there, there is only one thing it can do. Productivity must be increased, the cost of production must be cut and people must get on with the job instead of saying, "How am I going in comparison with that fellow there?"

This country has to take whatever steps are possible. It is past the stage where we really have any choice in the matter. So I think that step one is to loosen up all the old structures and strictures. New ways have to be found. In considering that, let me say that there are plenty of examples around the place of where unions and management have got together and are working wonderfully.

Last night the Leader of the Opposition referred to the Expo workers. That is a classic example of where workers, through their unions, and management have got together. There are no strikes; there is high productivity; things are happening and everyone is happy. Those people do not want VEAs, so for heaven's sake stop bringing them up. Which party—the unions or the management—will ask workers to sign VEAs? They do not want them; they do not need them. They will not be interfered with and they will not be forced to sign them.

For 21 years I worked for Mount Isa Mines. Just to make sure that I would be telling the truth tonight—I am an habitual truth-teller—I phoned the manager of the personnel division of the company yesterday and I said, "Tell me, is there any possibility that Mount Isa Mines Limited would ever seek with their employees a VEA?" He laughed. Why wouldn't he? For 21 years the company has had a better scheme than any VEA, through two-yearly negotiations between management and the troops, signed with a contract at the end of each two years and good for those two years. They do not want a VEA. The workers on the Expo site do not want a VEA. The management of those two concerns do not want VEAs either.

I could cite many other examples of set-ups in Queensland in which the old system of enlightened unionism, management amenable to consultation, getting together, communicating, talking, negotiating, dealing, signing agreements in goodwill is working perfectly well and is resulting in high productivity, high earnings, high morale and everyone is happy. We must not be blinded and say that a VEA will be introduced on the Expo site.

I will not go on to talk about Mudginberri and Dollar Sweets. That subject has been talked to death in this Chamber. I have spoken about it myself. However, what I will say is that in those two cases the unions did not want their members to be happy. It is as simple as that. I do not know why the unions went to the wall over these

disputes instead of facing facts. They are like Hercules and the many-headed Hydra; every time a head is chopped off, two more grow in its place.

If unions are going to spend the rest of this century attacking Mudginberri here and Dollar Sweets there and trying to chop that head off, two more will grow, believe me. They will go down screaming and fighting instead of saying, "Let's help to steer this boat in the direction we want so that we can be a part of it."

Mr De Lacy: You need a pilot when you have a boat.

Mr BEARD: My word a pilot is needed, and a pilot will be easy to find because every group of men will offer its own spokesman, its own leader who will speak for his mates. That is not a problem. Now the honourable member has made me lose my place. I will turn to some motherhood statements, as I call them, which I have been using all along.

What I am talking about is consultation, negotiation, joint working parties and collective bargaining. Believe me, it can work.

Mr McElligott: Who wants these VEAs?

Mr BEARD: I am telling the honourable member for Thuringowa a good story. It develops pretty well. It will build up nicely to a climax. I will let the honourable member know the answer then.

VEAs are for areas where productivity is low, morale is low, labour turn-over is high, obstructive or restrictive work practices are in place and earnings are restricted by artificial means such as bans or limitations on overtime, week-end work and so on. That is where VEAs are needed because that is where an industry or a business is sick. Something has to be done to fix it. If the medicine of old-time unionism—strikes and bludgeoning—or old-time bludgeoning from management will not work, then for heaven's sake let us try something that will work, and maybe VEAs are the way to go.

Having said all that, I will now walk through the legislation being debated tonight. I must tell the Minister, who is present in the Chamber, how disappointed I was when I saw the format of the Bill. I am not an experienced parliamentarian; I am not a lawyer; I am not greatly minded to go into the detail of something like this, but even I can find holes in this legislation that can and therefore probably will be exploited by some unscrupulous employers.

If the Bill is passed without amendment, because it will need to be tightened up, believe me, it will come back before this Parliament for amendment time and again during the next two or three years. Some parts of the Bill left me puzzled and worried, and that should not happen. If a Bill is not clear enough to be read and understood quickly by people who have had enough gumption to become members of Parliament, there are problems, and lawyers are going to get rich.

Let us face it; this Bill will be passed. The Government has the numbers. It cannot be stopped. The best that honourable members can do is draw attention as forcibly as possible to some parts of the legislation that justifiably give rise to concern.

For a start, the Bill is careless. In his second-reading speech the Minister made no mention of sick leave. He frightened the daylight out of me. I thought, "If the Minister is not including sick leave in this legislation, we've got a problem." I was sent a magazine through the mail by his faithful department entitled *Better Small Business* and I guess all members received a copy of it, because I am not special. In that magazine he lists the minimum conditions and says that sick leave is there. It is frightening, when there are all these resources available to a Minister, that errors crept into his second-reading speech.

I will now walk through the legislation and take careful note, Mr Deputy Speaker, of parts of this legislation to which attention has to be paid.

Mr Lee: It is no longer the Acting Speaker.

Mr BEARD: He could well be “acting” if I keep playing up.

Because of the problems that I had in my electorate, I was delighted to see at the beginning of this legislation that public servants have been excluded from its provisions. After the first Green Paper was released at the beginning of this year, the objections came in in trumps from schoolteachers, policemen and nurses and so forth at the public hospital in Mount Isa. They did not want any part of it. When I spoke to them and listened to them, I could understand why. For example, it was conceivable that two or three teachers at the Thargomindah State School could have struck a VEA that then would have applied to all teachers in the State Education Department.

Mr Henderson: Not true.

Mr BEARD: It is drawing a longbow, but according to that Green Paper it was entirely possible.

It was also entirely possible, based on a reading of that Green Paper, that the maids or kitchen staff at the Mount Isa Base Hospital may have got together and outnumbered the nurses to the required 60 per cent to 40 per cent and struck a VEA which would apply to the entire hospital. There were too many loose ends. I was delighted not to have to worry about those loose ends when public servants and other Crown employees were removed from the legislation which was presented in September of this year.

The bottom of page 3 of the legislation refers to VEAs being made between an employer or a group of employers and a union of employees or 60 per cent of the employees of an undertaking. I have no great concern with that. Quite honestly I would rather it was 67 per cent, which is two-thirds. One might say it is trivial, but I have said for a long while that, if someone wishes to change the constitution of a sporting association, a two-thirds majority is required. I think that 67 per cent would have been better than 60 per cent, but I will not hang out for 7 per cent.

The proposed new section 94B (2), as it appears at the top of page 4, states—

“Where an employer employs or proposes to employ one employee in a particular calling in a business, establishment or undertaking, the employer and employee or prospective employee may enter into an agreement of a type specified in this subsection which, upon registration, shall, subject to this Act, bind any other person who may thereafter be employed by that employer in that calling in that business, establishment or undertaking.”

I have read this many, many times and I cannot help feeling that—and Mr Gibbs raised the matter earlier tonight—it makes it possible for an employer who is unscrupulous enough—and they are out there—to take on an extra employee under a VEA and thereby bind all future employees in that undertaking, calling, organisation or business to that VEA. I hope I am reading it wrongly, Mr Speaker, but I do believe that the Minister and his staff should give that matter very careful attention.

For example, if I ran an engineering works and my employees were all employed under the award and I decided to open a restaurant with one employee, that employee could come in under a VEA and all subsequent employees in that restaurant could be bound by it. I accept that, because potential employees would know the deal before they took the job and they could take it or leave it. That is their freedom of choice, just as I have freedom of choice in whom I hire or fire. The way this section reads, it looks dangerous. The only safeguard I can see is on the next page, where it states that the commission may refuse to approve a voluntary employment agreement if it is satisfied that, amongst other things, it is not in the public interest that it should approve the agreement. How does one define “public interest”? I draw the Minister’s attention to that and urge that he give it his very careful consideration.

I move on now to other parts of the legislation and refer to the bottom of page 5. I intend to move an amendment to this clause, a copy of which I have already given to the Minister. The bottom of page 5 of the legislation deals with annual leave. Mr Gibbs also mentioned this and I am thankful that I had my amendment typed out and

distributed to the Minister before I heard Mr Gibbs; otherwise I am sure that that worthy gentleman might have thought I was stealing his ideas. I can assure him that I am not. Months ago I placed on record in the press in my electorate my belief that no-one should have the capacity or power to negotiate away annual leave.

I am talking specifically about people who live in remote areas who may have to use six days of their annual leave to travel to the beach and back by car. I am talking about people who live in a harsh climatic environment who may well need at least three or four weeks' annual leave, otherwise their health will suffer.

Mr Henderson: They can negotiate to have three weeks.

Mr BEARD: Indeed they can, but human beings being what they are, I must admit that, if I were 27 years old, newly married with a couple of kids and trying to pay off a house, I would gladly negotiate away my annual leave for extra money to meet the mortgage. I believe that I would thereby endanger my health and the happiness of my family.

Mr Henderson: You reduce the stress situation.

Mr BEARD: I do reduce the stress situation; but, if the honourable member worked in Mount Isa for a little while, or any other hot place—if he considered the climatic environment—I am sure that he would consider the distance that a person must travel to spend a holiday at the coast and concede that at least three weeks' annual leave is necessary. Accordingly, I have submitted an amendment that I propose to move to that effect.

Mr Lee: Mr Henderson tried to go to Mount Isa but got lost.

Mr BEARD: That was Mr Comben. Mr Lee is terribly inaccurate. On his behalf, I apologise to Mr Comben.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr BEARD: I wish that everybody would keep quiet. There is obviously a socialist and National Party plot to make me to lose my place. However, I have so much good material still to go.

Mr Comben: National Socialists.

Mr BEARD: They are not National Socialists—not yet!

Pages 6 and 7 of the Bill seem to deal only with safeguards for employees. Earlier I heard ALP speakers claim that the Bill contained no safeguards for employees. I find that difficult to believe. I think that the drafting is vague enough that honourable members might be compelled to take some of the Minister's assurances on trust. I must be honest and say that that would not be good enough in this State. I would prefer to see it well worded in the Bill—properly drafted—so that we would not have to rely on trust.

I intend to move a further amendment to clause 11, in proposed new subsection 94M (2) (a), which states—

“Where the Commission is of the opinion that any term or condition of a voluntary employment agreement—

(i) is unfair;

(ii) is harsh or unconscionable;

or

(iii) is against the public interest,

the Commission may declare the agreement void to be effective *ab initio*—

which my learned friends tell me means “from the beginning”—

An honourable member interjected.

Mr BEARD: No, I got it from Mr Lee. Mr Lee once had a horse called Abinitio on which he won heaps of money, and he tells me that it meant "from the beginning" because that is where the horse commenced its run.

Mr De Lacy: He has still got the money.

Mr BEARD: He has still got him. He is feeding the horse at Roma.

Mr Ahern interjected.

Mr BEARD: I am surprised that Mr Ahern would join in on the plot to interrupt me and distract me from my speech. I thought much more of the Minister.

Returning to the amendment that I propose—I believe that if the Industrial Commission finds that a VEA is unfair, is harsh or unconscionable or is against the public interest, it should be declared void, to be effective from the date of the application or from the date of that finding, not eight or nine months earlier, which could put people in a position in which they operated with goodwill and with good intent of going right back several months and meeting payments that they would not have allowed for. I do not believe that legislation should be retrospective. The clause implies retrospective legislation.

I have six minutes to go. I must have been speaking faster than I thought. Mrs Nelson keeps giving me a wind-up notice. Is she speaking next? I thought that we were going back to a series of ALP speakers.

I want to compliment the Minister for several reasons, and I mean this in all sincerity. At the beginning of this year, the Minister put out a Green Paper and gave everyone in this House and in Queensland ample time to consider it. The Minister made himself available all over the State to accept feedback. The Minister responded to that feedback. The Minister put out a paper reflecting much of the feedback he received—not all of it—and the Minister, the Leader of the House and Mr Speaker are allowing this legislation to be debated at great length. I appreciate all of those things. I compliment the Minister for that.

Mr Lee: He has walked backwards to help you.

Mr BEARD: How did he ever get into the Liberal Party! It is made up typically of gentlemen. Obviously I can say that the honourable member was in the Liberal Party long, long before I became interested in politics. He is certainly entertaining.

To continue—why tolerate carelessness? Why tolerate the little loopholes that probably will be exploited by unscrupulous employers? The situation definitely needs tightening up.

Mr McLean: You are a two bob each way man.

Mr BEARD: No, I am not a two bob each way man. I will give my position.

Mr McLean is a genuine man. I respect his views, which he put forward forcefully and respectfully a couple of weeks ago in this House. I hope that my views will be received with the very same respect.

I believe that this legislation is moving in the right direction. New solutions must be found for new problems. This is 1987. This country is in big trouble, and it was in big trouble before the stock-market started to crash during the last week or two. Australia is a primary-producing country. It takes the prices that are set on the world market; it does not set its own prices. The world market is wanting our primary produce less and less. Our manufacturing industry is too small to compete with overseas countries. Our production costs are too high. Whether we like it or not, we have to live in this world. These are new problems to me. I grew up in the fifties. In those days, if a person did not like the job that he had, he found another one without any trouble. Our children are not in that situation. We are facing a severe fall in our standard of living. New problems demand new solutions.

I am in favour of voluntary employment agreements that allow for flexibility and open up the possibility of new industrial arrangements that may be made, as long as this legislation is tightened up to eliminate the loopholes and to clamp down on the possibly unscrupulous employers. Legislation such as this is moving in the right direction. I hope that this is remedied at the Committee stage so that it does not have to come back before this House for amendment after amendment, which has been the case with other legislation during the short time that I have been a member of this House.

Mr CAMPBELL (Bundaberg) (9.43 p.m.): The honourable member for Mount Isa made an entertaining speech during which he said that problems exist today that have never existed before. These problems were around in 1929 and in 1980.

I believe that an article that appeared recently in the *Telegraph* demonstrated exactly what is going to happen under these voluntary employment agreements. The article stated—

“Japanese Replace Employees

Three Gold Coast duty free shop assistants have been sacked and replaced by Japanese visitors working on temporary visas.”

That is what is going to happen under voluntary agreements. Jobs will be given to people who will work for the least amount of money; in other words, the maximum that anyone will receive will become the minimum. Neither the Minister nor anyone in the Government stood up for those three shop assistants. The trade union movement had to do that.

Mr Ray Dempsey said—

“It is disgraceful people passing through on working holidays who are prepared to work on the smell of an oily rag undercut local workers.”

Mr Dempsey is the type of person who will stand up for the young and disadvantaged people so that they can keep their jobs. In that same article the Minister described the sackings as “unfortunate” and said—

“. . . the businessman was ‘within his rights’ and the government ‘would not buy into the internal matters of a private business’.”

That is what is going to happen to our children. They will be replaced by people who will be prepared to do the same jobs for less money.

Mr Porter, who was managing that business on the Gold Coast, said that he was not trying to undercut award wages. He said, “We have to hire the people who can do the job.” He said that there should be more education.

If that is the problem, why is nothing being done about it? In the last State Budget, the Government cut education funding that could possibly provide children with additional skills. Not one high school in Bundaberg teaches Japanese. If that is what is going to occur, how can children expect to obtain decent jobs?

I was disappointed with the speech that was made by the honourable member for Currumbin. It expressed hatred for workers, and it was unpleasant, vicious and nasty towards the workers’ movement.

After reading it in today’s *Telegraph*, I went back to discover how even foreigners can appreciate the roles of unions. So often I have heard Government members speak with such hatred and viciousness. However, I refer to someone who has been welcomed to Queensland as one of the great entrepreneurs, Mr Shuji Yokayama, who is the principal of the Gold Coast International Hotel. When he was in Australia launching the \$250m hotel and spending all the money, this is what he had to say—

“I regard myself as the chief unionist in our company. When the company board meets I am the one who argues for workers’ pay rises. A fair distribution of profits and a willingness to understand a worker’s point of view, will usually solve most problems.”

I have not heard one person from the Government side say, "Let us get together and try to solve the problems." All they want to do is belt and hate and try to get away with it.

I point out that the attitude of Government members is not new. They say that they will introduce flexibility and productivity bonuses—and that is what voluntary employment agreements are all about. That has been said for the last century, has been said in this House and has been said by the same type of people. However, the member for Nerang said that we need these VEAs to replace archaic legislation, because it is not working. If that is the case, it is a damnation of what the Government has been doing for 30 years with industrial relations. Its own member is saying that it is archaic legislation and it has not kept up.

The first time that an attempt was made to implement changes occurred with the extended hours of work for shop assistants during the Christmas shopping farce. Honourable members should ask any of the shop assistants if they received any of the Christmas profits from the companies. Ask them if they enjoyed their flexible working hours, working at night and on week-ends without penalty rates. Because of their hard work, did they receive any bonus for their efforts? I can guarantee that not one cent went back to the shop assistants who worked in the different shopping centres in which there was a great increase in returns to the employers.

The member for Mansfield said that this was pioneering legislation. In fact, the Bill attacks the basic rights of workers and erodes and decimates over 100 years of struggle by Queensland men and women to obtain freedom and natural justice. It is repressive and it reeks of the feudalism and servility of the overbearing and oppressive Masters and Servants Act of 1861, which was implemented by the wealthy tory colonists at that time.

Government members said that the tourism industry would receive the benefit. I will discuss the tourism industry. The first article that I referred to stated—

"Already we believe businesses at the Gold Coast underpay about \$400 per year, and this could become rampant with cases like this."

In other words, all that they want to do is to legalise the exploitation that is already occurring.

The member for Mansfield then said that the Minister listens. I will tell honourable members something about the Minister. He is a person who will blatantly mislead the workers of Queensland and blatantly exploit the gullibility of people, the same people who will be taken in by the voluntary employment legislation.

I refer to a press release from the Minister on 22 October 1986 which states—

"Employment and Industrial Affairs Minister, Vince Lester, today rejected claims by the ALP that the National Party would scrap holiday leave loading for State Award workers after winning office on November 1.

Mr Lester said his government had no plans to disadvantage State Award employees, and said the Labor Party was merely trying to use scare tactics to win votes."

I believe that the Labor Party was telling the truth, because in the first Budget that was presented since the election, the first thing that was hit was holiday-leave loading. In black and white, the Government stated that there was no way that it would act to scrap holiday-leave loading. That type of action can only be described as a lie which was told at that time.

The Minister's press release states—

"... the matter of holiday-leave loading is one that needs to be addressed on a national basis, and not by individual States or industries."

The Minister even predicted that if anything such as that were to occur, the result would be as follows—

“For an individual State to do away with holiday-leave loading without a similar move nationally, would be counter-productive and quite impossible.”

How true those words are. How distasteful and how hypocritical this whole Government has been when, at the height of an election, it could tell such lies and go back on its promises at the first opportunity.

I will tell honourable members what has happened. The very story that is being told today in terms of flexibility and more freedom was told in exactly the same circumstances back in 1891. At that time, a pastoralist wanted to reduce the wages of shearers. Pastoralists wanted to strike at any type of organisation among the shearers. They said that they had to be able to reduce wages. They said, “We want freedom in relation to employing people; we want freedom of contract.” In those days, that is what it was called. These days it is called voluntary employment agreements.

Members of the Opposition know what is going to happen, because the things that are being said today were said nearly 100 years ago. In Queensland’s Legislative Assembly in 1891, Thomas Glassey spoke about the strike and what was happening. What he had to say is just as true today as it was when it was said—

“Now, the real cause of the late strike has been concealed from the very beginning, and I think purposely concealed from the public by a proportion of the Press. The whole kernel of the subject is undoubtedly a reduction of wages . . . they (the pastoralists) may cloak it round as they like; shroud it in mystery as much as they will, but the real sum and substance of the whole dispute was a reduction of wages . . . Undoubtedly the Pastoralists’ and Employers’ Association generally put forth a very plausible plea to conceal their real intention, and that plea was ‘freedom of contract’.”

What “freedom of contract” means nowadays is what it meant in those days: freedom for the employer, and contracts for the employees. In those days, pastoralists wanted to reduce wages by 33 per cent. The report in *Hansard* mentions a pastoralist who was on good terms with the Government at that time—the tory Government—a Mr Dutton. During the strike, Mr Dutton said the following—

“... had it not been for the labour unions . . . shearers would be shearing for 3s. per score instead of 4s., and the general labourers would be working for 15s. a week instead of 30s.”

The same kind of thing has been happening ever since.

People on the Government side of the House do not want to call this move freedom of contract. One century later, they want to call it a voluntary employment agreement. The intention is exactly the same.

Mr Ahern: Would you give my regards to Skye?

Mr CAMPBELL: Right. I thank the Minister very much. I hope the Minister’s children do the right thing by her, if they get the chance.

The Minister has put me off somewhat. However, it is interesting that other honourable members have referred to this legislation as pioneering legislation. Of course, that is not really the case, because the law relating to the master-and-servant relationship will be altered along with the organisation of employees, so that the Government gets back to a basically subservient role for employees in circumstances in which an employer can dictate terms and conditions. That is what will happen. This legislation does not use the term “master and servant”, but the intent of the legislation that is presently before the House is not much different.

For all Opposition members know, the Government might have a clause inserted into those contracts along the lines I have referred to. Section 3 of the Act to Regulate the Law between Masters and Servants states in part as follows—

“... if any servant having entered into such service or commenced such work shall absent himself therefrom without reasonable cause before the term of his agreement shall have expired or before the work agreed ... shall be completed ... or shall refuse or neglect to fulfil the same”—

he could be fined £20 or be put in gaol for up to three months. If he did not have the money, all his goods and chattels would be sold. There is no reason why a similar clause will not be put into the voluntary agreements. They will not be seen by any unions because they will not be available to them.

Mr McLean: It is already in the Industrial (Commercial Practices) Act that the fine is not \$20,000 but \$50,000.

Mr CAMPBELL: That is right. Not only that—any person can be directed by the Minister to do any work that he so directs. It demonstrates that the wheel is being turned back one century. Everything that has been won by the working men and women of Queensland—this State has been the leader—did not just happen. It happened originally because ordinary people were prepared to get up and fight the fascist type of attitude, that very unjust, nasty attitude of, “It does not matter what the worker is paid, he is always getting too much.” It would not matter what hours someone worked, he would not be working hard enough.

I will tell the House when it all started. This is something that I am proud of, because this is what makes our nation different. I reckon that it stands out from any other nation. Something that I am unashamedly proud of is that we have a very strong egalitarian ethos. We believe in equality. We believe in giving everyone a fair go. The only way in which the workers have been given a fair go has been through applications by the workers before the Industrial Commission. Not once has an employer been prepared to give anything straight off his own bat. He has always been forced to do it. But it has been achieved.

Back in 1882 the workers' struggle started in areas such as Bundaberg. Plantation-owners at Bundaberg were going to use a steamship called the Devonshire to bring in Ceylonese labourers to work on the plantations. The ordinary people of Bundaberg turned that ship around and said, “No, we are not going to be treated like slaves. We are not going to have our jobs taken away.” That ship had to go back to the heads and the labourers had to be put into longboats and taken straight to the farms. That is when people realised that they had to start fighting for their rights.

In 1897, eight men on a shift were firing the boilers at the Millaquin sugar-mill and they were being paid 6s. 6d. a day. They commenced duty at 5.30 a.m. and finished at 6.30 p.m. On Saturdays they worked from 5.30 a.m. to 4 p.m. They went on strike. They wanted a shilling an hour and they wanted to work for eight hours a day. Two of the workers were gaoled and fined £20, which was equivalent to more than five weeks' pay. This legislation will take away all the things that the workers have won.

In 1924, under a Labor Government, the workers won a 44-hour week. In 1947, 23 years later, the 40-hour week was introduced. In 1952, long-service leave was introduced. This legislation really contains no provision for long-service leave. I believe that employers could manipulate the system in such a way that the employee did not receive long-service leave.

I believe that the introduction of this legislation is really an effort by the conservative forces to crush the trade union movement, and crushing the trade union movement is simply another way of crushing the average worker into submission. One very effective way of destroying organised labour is to introduce the contract system into the workforce. The legislation will mean the end of job security, reduced wages and conditions, and the loss of penalty rates, holiday loadings, shift loadings and specific allowances for performing various duties.

The other real problem is that the employee will have to approach the employer on his own. If he wants to complain about incorrect pay, victimisation, inadequate safety on the job and working conditions, nobody will be there to look after him. He will be left on his own, and he will be put in a very difficult bargaining situation.

No information will be available to those workers about the conditions of those who hold positions similar to their own. There will be a complete lack of information about other workers' pay rates and conditions in general in industrial and social changes that are occurring elsewhere. That is an attack on the basic principle of equal pay for equal work. Because people will not know what other workers are getting, people employed on the same job will be getting different pay.

Under these contracts it will be more difficult for trade unions to represent workers, yet the only gains ever made by workers have been through organised labour movements. I believe it is very important that the ramifications of the Bill be considered. In the long run these contracts will give complete freedom to employers to ensure that everything goes their way and, as the Green Paper points out, that will be without union interference. There will be total insecurity for workers, insecurity about whether the job will last and about whether the pay will last.

In all, this legislation allows for the exploitation of workers to be legalised. Those who are least able to look after themselves will be the most disadvantaged. In the words that Thomas Glassey used in the Assembly in 1891, this type of thing gives freedom for employers and contracts for employees. The real, basic issue of this legislation is the reduction of wages.

Hon. V. P. LESTER (Peak Downs—Minister for Employment, Small Business and Industrial Affairs) (10.01 p.m.), in reply: I wish to take this opportunity to sum up. I thank honourable members for their contributions.

Mr McLEAN: I rise to a point of order. There is a large number of members still on the list of speakers. The Minister, both publicly and in this House, has given assurances that this debate would continue in the usual manner and be allowed to go to its end. With some 10 or 15 names on the list of speakers, he has tried to close the debate. I object strongly to that.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! There is no point of order. I have a list of speakers. The member whose name is next on it is not in the House. I waited for someone to stand. The Minister stood. I have called the Minister.

Mr McLEAN: I object strongly to that ruling.

Mr Goss: I was waiting for the call. I am next on the list.

Mr McLEAN: On behalf of the Opposition, I object strongly to what has happened. We in the Opposition have been given assurances.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! If it is the Minister's wish, I will call another member.

Mr LESTER: In view of the circumstances, perhaps that should be done. I would suggest, though, that in the future the Opposition remain awake.

Mr DAVIS: I rise to a point of order. I regard that as an insult.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The member whose name was next on the list is not in the House.

An Opposition member: Who is it?

Mr SPEAKER: Order! It is the member for Thuringowa. If it is the wish of the House, I will at this stage call the member for Logan.

Mr GOSS (Logan) (10.04 p.m.): I would indicate that it was my understanding from the list that we have here that I was the next speaker. Mr Speaker, I was simply waiting for your call. Anyway, that is behind us.

In rising to speak in the debate, I simply want to register a protest on behalf of ordinary working people and the fair-minded people in my electorate against this legislation. I want to support the comments made at the outset of this debate by my colleague the member for Bulimba. In a very comprehensive speech, the member for Bulimba really outlined all of the basic problems and the potential for conflict and serious prejudice to ordinary working people that lies down the track if this legislation is passed.

I will speak in general terms because the particularity of the Bill has been dealt with by many of those who have preceded me. This legislation is the manifestation of a Government or a political movement that has been in power for too long. What happens with such Governments and such movements is that they lose their way and lose touch with the original policies and principles that they stood for. Most importantly and unfortunately of all, they lose touch with the electorate and the needs and aspirations of ordinary people.

I believe that that is what has happened in this instance. This Minister and this Government have lost sight of ordinary working men and women, their aspirations and their needs. They are not ciphers; they are not figures on a balance sheet and they are not part of the books of account; they are real people. As I said, they are not entries on a balance sheet; they are people who want some dignity. They need and deserve some dignity. They are entitled to some recognition of their worth as human beings and as workers. The general thrust of this legislation and the general policy of this Government is to deny that recognition of the basic worth of ordinary working people and what they contribute to society.

It seems to me that the attitude of this Government is that the contribution comes from the employer, from business, and that employees are simply there to fill the vacant slots like automatons, robots or what have you. It is not like that. If it is looked at at a human level, at a working-place level, it is seen that working people are entitled to more than that, and if the Government denies them that in the quest for short-term gain, in the long run it will prejudice not only the interests of those people but also the productivity and the viability of those businesses and our economic undertakings.

I think that up till now there has been enshrined in our system a basic acceptance of the importance of the Industrial Court and the arbitration system, of a system of awards, of a system of checks and balances. The system is sometimes cumbersome and does not work as quickly or as efficiently as we would like. However, with all its imperfections, that system, which has been built up over a long period, has a lot to offer and it is worth preserving because it is basic to fairness; it is basic to giving all sides a fair go.

The danger of this legislation, and the danger of this Government's policies, is that they will create an imbalance. We will lose that balance that has obtained in the past and, because of the anti-union bias of this Government, it will be replaced with an imbalance that is obviously designed to crush unions. However, it will also crush ordinary working people because of the way in which it removes the checks and balances. In the long run that will not be healthy for society. It will increase divisions and cause problems with the economy and it will not provide the solutions that are suggested by members of the Government.

What concerns me is that the people most at risk by these policies and this legislation are the people who are in the worst position to defend and represent themselves. I refer to the unskilled and semiskilled workers. In debates such as this, one hears a lot of extravagant and dramatic terminology. One hears phrases such as "slave labour" and so on. That sounds dramatic, but I think that we are facing the very real risk of creating—and I am sure that some people would like to see this—what might be called a subclass or a group within society who get subsistence wages, no conditions—nothing!

That is not the kind of society in which I want to live, and it is not the kind of society that I think Australians would want to have in this country. It is particularly not the kind of society that we would want our children to grow up in. In Australia and

in Queensland we want to provide a better future for our children and a better way of life, and it can be done if the Government does not go down this particular road.

A great deal has been heard during this debate about the need for productivity. A great deal has also been heard about the problems faced by this country and how change and flexibility is needed as we approach the end of the twentieth century. I do not deny—in fact I agree—that this State and this country have considerable problems. I support the notion of productivity. I support the notion of a fair profit. I support the notion of competitiveness. I support all of those things quite happily.

I think it was the member for Mount Isa who said what so many honourable members have said in support of this legislation, that is, that they support flexibility without exploitation of the worker. What sort of motherhood statement is that? It is meaningless because when one considers that description and how it fits into this particular legislation, one realises that there is an inherent contradiction that cannot be resolved and that will lead to conflict, confusion, uncertainty, division and problems. This mistaken notion of productivity or competitiveness will lead to solutions like this legislation, which is counter-productive. This kind of solution is not conducive to increasing the morale or the appropriate attitude in the workplace and therefore it is not conducive to increasing productivity, particularly not real productivity.

The solution does not lie with subsistence wages and conditions, but with real productivity. This means new enterprises, research and development budgets being at an adequate level and some of the great entrepreneurial flair that has been referred to, and the great creativity that is supposed to reside within the business community, must be seen. It seems to me that their great creativity and entrepreneurial flair is pretty much restricted to raising profits by reducing the wages that they have to pay to working people in those enterprises. If they really had that entrepreneurial flair and creativity, a decent and realistic amount of their budgets would be spent on research and development, new management practices and innovation; the kinds of things that will lead to real economic activity. That is what creates jobs and produces productivity; not this Mickey Mouse approach that is simply designed to take something from one side of the ledger and put it on to the other side, without effecting any of the real, important structural changes either to the Queensland economy or to the way in which the Queensland economy operates at the industrial or workplace level.

In addition, there is some notion in this legislation that not only unions but also union-leaders will be hurt or crushed. Certainly many Government members appear to have some pathological or psychological problem when it comes to union representatives and leaders. If that is the notion and the motivation on the part of some people, then clearly it is misguided, because union-leaders and representatives work as representatives and will always emerge to represent and lead working people in the struggle for fair wages and conditions. That is something which is very natural, and it is inevitable. Any notion that a change in that direction will be achieved by this legislation is theoretical and invalid.

Dealing briefly with some of the elements of the legislation—because it has been done to death by a number of speakers, I will not do that in detail—I wish to refer to the suggestion made by the Minister that he has engaged in an extensive process of consultation. There is the appearance of consultation there, but there is a dramatic difference between real consultation and the appearance of it. It is all very well to issue papers, receive letters and reply that he has looked at them, but that is not necessarily real consultation. The Opposition draws a distinction between consultation and tokenism. In his second-reading speech the Minister says that there has been a campaign by the union movement against the concept of the legislation, and that they took a narrow, hostile view towards its potential benefits. Why would they take a hostile view if in fact the benefits are real? The truth is that they took a hostile attitude because they do not accept that there are true benefits there.

The Minister referred to the unions creating a climate of fear. Why wouldn't they? Why wouldn't ordinary working people be fearful of this Government and its policies

when they look at its track record over the last four years; its other industrial legislation and what that did to unions; the potential penalties that are provided; and what the Government tried to do this year by taking away conditions such as the leave loading and job security, just as it seeks to do through this piece of legislation which the Opposition strenuously opposes?

The Minister referred to the introduction of a degree of flexibility. This is a euphemism for saying, "Let's provide the potential to reduce wages and conditions." That is what flexibility means. It is a corruption of the English language which is slick and cynical, but through which ordinary working people and unions can see. The Minister referred to mutually acceptable arrangements for employers and employees. The Opposition rejects this notion of mutually acceptable arrangements, because mutually acceptable arrangements are based on some notion that people have an equality of bargaining power and position. That does not occur in the sort of scenario that is envisaged by this legislation and by the Government's industrial policies, so that the Opposition says that there is no basis for true mutual acceptance of arrangements because of that imbalance in terms of the respective positions of the parties.

Reference has been made to the exclusion of public servants from the legislation. The Minister referred to changing the original concept because of the special nature of the employment of those people. The facts are that, in relation to the classes of employees who were referred to by the Minister as now being excluded, some do and some do not work those 24-hour service arrangements or have the special nature of the employment to which he referred. I think that this also exposes the legislation as being based more on political expediency than on the principles that the Minister would purport to be its basis.

As to the procedure for the establishment of the 60 per cent support level in the workplace—in his comments the Minister conceded quite readily that a procedure for the establishment of the 60 per cent support level is not provided. He said that that matter should be left to the parties to arrange. That surely is a hopeless arrangement and one that is bound to lead to confusion, to litigation and to confrontation, not just between employers and employees but between employees themselves. Unfortunately, there are some people in the National Party and in the Government who seek confrontation—who thrive on confrontation. The classic example of this, of course—

Mr Elliott: You have said that before. That's what you call tedious repetition.

Mr GOSS: Tedious repetition is referred to by the member for—where is it?

An Opposition member: Cunningham.

Mr GOSS: Cunningham. How easy it is to forget where Mr Elliott comes from. I would have thought that the member for Cunningham would have been the last person to use the adjective "tedious", because it certainly applies to him more than most people in this place.

As I was about to say—the classic example of the person who thrives on confrontation is the leader of this supposedly great party, the man who is now engaged in this process of a 10-month political death. Unfortunately, too many of the lesser minds that he has promoted to follow on behind him also feel that this is an example that they might follow. That will be very unfortunate not just for their careers—I am not concerned about them—but for the good government of Queensland.

Turning to the powers of the commission and the safeguards—I want to make a brief reference to something that has been referred to by the member for Mount Isa and other members, that is, the power of the Industrial Commission to void an agreement if it is harsh, unjust or against the public interest. Clearly, I think that we can all see the potential for problems arising out of these definitions and out of this mechanism. Whilst these terms are contained in other legislation, I think that in this context they provide real potential for simply more confusion, more litigation and more confrontation.

That runs right through this legislation. It is simply another example of the problems that we are going to encounter.

The Minister referred also to agreements containing, at the very least, certain minimum conditions. They are listed in the legislation and in the Minister's speech. Once again, we see this obnoxious concept of the provision of cash in lieu of certain benefits. Once again, this is rejected by the Opposition. It is another example of the type of problems that will be experienced. Employees and employers will have an inequality of bargaining power and an inequality of position, particularly when it comes to the renewal of their contracts, and people will be forced into accepting a reduction in conditions because it suits the purposes of the employer. Once again the Government has adopted the attitude of treating people as automatons and entries in a balance sheet to be simply there purely and simply for the convenience of the business and the way in which it operates in pure economic terms. That is not the way in which a business operates; it operates on the basis of some reciprocity—it operates on the basis of give and take from both sides. A successful business will not continue to operate successfully if it treats employees in that fashion. Unless they give some recognition to the basic worth of people who work in that enterprise, they will not continue to be successful. Therefore, the real productivity—the real morale of the enterprise—will slip away, and these arrangements will prove to be counter-productive in terms of productivity and competitiveness.

The Minister stated also that voluntary agreements must have a minimum life of 12 months and a maximum of three years. He rejected criticism that that involves the loss of job security because there is no continuity of employment beyond the end of an agreement. The Minister said that that is not the case because, in the absence of an agreement, the award applies.

The situation is quite clear. The minimum security—the minimum life of 12 months for a contract—has already placed people in a position in which they feel that their job security is threatened. Psychologically, that is having a dramatic and very serious effect on people. The day-to-day practical situation of somebody who has employment at the moment is that that person has ongoing employment. Nobody who has a regular job these days regards that as having a job for one or two weeks. Nobody sees it as employment that is guaranteed only for the period for which he is entitled to notice under the award. He regards it as ongoing employment. The Government is virtually saying to those people who are going to be forced into contracts, "You have got a job for a year." Instead of having ongoing employment, those people have nothing more than a job for a year. The impact of that on people psychologically and on their families has been very threatening.

I am aware of people in my electorate—and even people who live in my street—who have been offered voluntary employment agreements. The impact on those individual workers and their families has been very threatening and very serious. That is the reality. Forget about the fancy words and the terminology of the legislation; the reality of the impact on the individual is serious and threatening. That is completely unnecessary and is not going to produce good morale.

A classic example is the people who work in the electricity industry, who had to continue on but were faced with the concept of contracts. The morale amongst the workers at SEQEB and in the electricity industry is very low. It is pathetic. This Government has created that situation through its industrial policies and this notion of contracts in particular.

The legislation goes on to make it an offence for an employer to prejudice an employee because the employee refuses to enter into an agreement. I have serious doubts as to whether or not that can be enforced in practice. If that assumption is correct, that will be yet another example of mere tokenism when it comes to protecting workers, compared with the vicious and aggressive attitude that is displayed by this Government when it comes to protecting the employers and driving down wages and conditions.

That is what this legislation is all about. It has been drafted in terms that simply corrupt the real and true meaning of the English language.

The Minister concluded his speech by saying, "The Queensland Government has done all it can to create opportunities." As I said before, that is nothing more than a corruption of the English language. This Government has wanted the opportunity to drive down wages and conditions. The Government is removing the opportunity for people to feel that they are worthwhile members of the work-force. Those are the sorts of opportunities that this legislation creates.

All of those opportunities are negative opportunities. This is negative legislation, not positive legislation. It will have a negative impact not only on workers but also on business. Real opportunities for the work-force and business come from competent economic administration. We have not had that from this Government for a long time. Real opportunities come from real economic activity, and we have not had that in Queensland for a long time, either. Real opportunities come from a diversification of our economic base. We have had the opposite in this State for a long time, because we have had a diminishing of our economic base over a long period.

Queensland has a Government that has simply relied on our primary industries. It has simply ridden along on the sheep's back during the wool boom and on the coal industry, the sugar industry and so on. When times were good, it was the first to claim the credit through its expensive public relations machine; however, when times are tough, it squibs and runs for cover, and blames the Federal Government. But who bears the cost? The Government does not bear the cost. It passes the cost on to ordinary working people. And that is what this legislation does. It seeks to pass the cost on. That is where the Government has let down Queensland workers and Queensland business. That is why it is forced into the position of trying to improve the lot of business, because it has failed in terms of its economic policies and its economic administration.

If when times were good the Government had done something to widen our economic base, there would be real opportunities for employment and business. However, because it has not done that, it is forced into taking desperate measures for desperate times. Unfortunately, those desperate measures will not work, because they are negative.

The real economic activity and the real opportunities will come in a situation in which the Government provides Queensland workers with fair wages and conditions. That is not what this legislation has done. What the Government is doing with the legislation is lose sight of people. The consequence of that is that, when the Government faces an election and when it has to face the people, they will quite rapidly lose sight of the Government. Everybody will lose sight of the Government because it has lost sight—it has done it to itself and will have to pay the price for that in due course.

Mrs NELSON (Aspley) (10.26 p.m.): I have pleasure in joining in the debate tonight and addressing some of the issues that have been raised by the Opposition and by other members of the Government. I commence my remarks with a rebuttal of some of the comments made by a few previous speakers.

I draw the attention of the House to the quite fallacious remarks of the member for Bundaberg about working visas. I tried to gain his attention during his speech. It is farcical for Australians to criticise people on working visas here when there are tens of thousands of young Australians on the same sorts of visas working all round the world—in Japan, in the United States, in Canada and in the United Kingdom. I wonder if we can assume that they are taking the jobs of employees in those countries. I am certain that for a temporary period they are.

Because it is so fallacious, that argument does not even bear the tiniest scrutiny. It might be good racist stuff to churn out in the honourable member's local paper in Bundaberg, but it is not a serious argument to present in this Parliament, and it devalues the issues that we are confronting tonight. It also highlights the lack of depth that has been the hallmark—the standard, really—of the Opposition debate in the Parliament on this legislation. Since this debate started—this is now the second time the legislation has

been debated—it has been commented that the Opposition is running like a car with a flat battery, or a battery running down. I know that Opposition members were all given instructions to speak—were ordered to speak—on the legislation. The contributions have been quite paltry.

Mr Vaughan: That is not true.

Mrs NELSON: There have been a few genuine, committed people. I give the member for Nudgee 10 out of 10. He is a fair dinkum Aussie and a genuine union man. His origins are from the trade union movement. He is thanking me for saying this. However, he is a true-blue battler who has come from the union movement and is doing his job for the sources from which he rose. There are several more members such as him in the House, and I give them the same sort of credit.

Mr De Lacy: Go on, name them.

Mrs NELSON: I think that they would like to keep their endorsements, so perhaps I had better not name them.

Before proceeding, I wish to make some comments on Mr Goss' speech. The naivety of the member for Logan never ceases to amaze me. He has been absolutely slaughtered by his own party in the last five days, yet he has the gall to come in here and talk about the position of our leader. What is amusing about it is that he talks about political death, and he does not even know that his colleagues refer to him as "the living death". Honourable members used to refer to him as the Narcissus of the Queensland Parliament. They later discovered that, when he looked in the pool, there was no reflection.

Mr De Lacy: What happened the last time you looked in the mirror?

Mrs NELSON: It was a wonderful, very pleasing reflection—a happy smiling face beats anything!

I pay a tribute to the member for Cairns. I am forced to do so because he is another fair dinkum Aussie battler who is also looking after his constituency. I would like him to be unnamed in this debate because he was protecting his power base and being a pretty good sort of fellow when it comes to protecting the union movement. He is probably taking care of his endorsement. Similarly, I will not name the honourable member for Brisbane Central. It would be quite unfair to name the honourable member for Brisbane Central.

Let me look now at the philosophy underlying this debate. This is a traditional debate; it is the Right versus the Left; it is the conservatives versus the socialists. All honourable members have said the predictable and usual things during the last few weeks in this Parliament. However, what has really saddened me about what has been said by the ALP is that members of the Opposition are still clinging to outdated socialist rhetoric. The honourable member for Bundaberg gave the House a long exposé and even went back to the shearers' strike of the 1890s and the foundations of the Labor movement. With the greatest respect to the honourable member, I point out that this legislation is about the next century, not the last century.

I would entirely agree with members of the Opposition that 100 years ago the workers of the world—not merely the workers in Australia—were people who were exploited by capital. I would also suggest to the House that in the last 20 years—certainly during the last 30 years——

Mr Davis: How would we be working for you?

Mrs NELSON: Wonderful! I had very happy staff. I made a profit and shared it. I ran a very successful business. The family of the honourable member for Brisbane Central also ran a very successful business. Running a business is all about caring for the individual, responding to the needs of the individual, expecting high standards and living up to the same standards.

If the Labor Party wishes to survive as a political entity throughout the world, it will have to change its approach. At the Federal level, the exact opposite is happening.

Mr Goss: Why don't you talk about the legislation?

Mrs NELSON: That is exactly what I am talking about. Opposition members are lying doggo because they know that the legislation is pretty good. That is why members of the Opposition have the flat-battery syndrome.

The fact of the matter is that this sort of legislation is what the Western World will have to implement. It is what the Soviet bloc is doing; it is what China is doing; it is what the United States, Japan, France and Belgium have already done. Australia will have to do it, too. Australia has a small population with a very high standard of living.

Mr Ardill: That is the same sort of claptrap they talked about in 1891.

Mrs NELSON: It is not. The difference is that, over the last one hundred years, instead of labour being dominated by capital, labour has been totally controlled by the trade union movement. If anything needs to be done at all in Australia, it is the creation of a direct relationship between capital and labour. Capital and labour have been divided right down the middle by a trade union movement which grew out of real need. I would never deny that the trade union movement grew out of real need; but, like a monster with two heads, it has taken over.

Australia's economy is gripped in a stranglehold by the trade union movement. The Federal Government never makes a decision without first consulting the ACTU on a whole range of issues apart from economic matters. At times, the Federal Government does not even consult the trade union movement but has its instructions given to it on economic issues. It even went to the extent of a pay rise for Federal politicians. The sheer hypocrisy of Keltly and Crean, highly paid executives on exorbitant travel allowances and expenses, trying to tell Federal members of Parliament that they were not entitled to a reasonable pay increase was mind-boggling. That has been well exposed by Labor members in the New South Wales and Federal Parliaments. I am sure the honourable members do not need me to tell them that tonight.

This is pioneering legislation for Australia. It is not pioneering legislation in the world context. It is the sort of move that Australia has to make. Queensland is the first State to take the steps to introduce legislation that will allow a direct contact between employer and employee. It will allow flexibility and improve flexibility in the marketplace. If it does not work, it can be changed. One would think that it is being set in cement. It is an attempt to see what can happen if employers and employees are allowed to deal directly with each other.

Now, let us look at the real reason why the ALP in this State is against the legislation. A very large number of the members in this House have trade union origins. The trade union movement is the mother and father of the ALP, which gets its power base from the trade union movement. Of course, its members have to object to this sort of legislation because it seeks to provide direct communication and contact between employer and employee.

Mr De Lacy: It seeks to destroy the trade union movement.

Mrs NELSON: The truth lies in the union movement's objection to communication. The honourable member knows that. That is why all the attempts of Opposition members to debate this legislation have been pretty superficial. They know that there is really nothing very wrong with the legislation. They cannot find anything very wrong with it.

We should look at some of the legislation's potential benefits—and they are potential benefits; no-one is promising that these things will occur. A climate is being created in which business, individuals and workers will have an opportunity to grow. That is what the Australian economy has not had for a very long time. Contrary to the rhetoric from the south, there is no growth in the economy. The fact of the matter is that Australia

has enormous debt, high inflation and still the worst interest rates in the Western World. Australia is not getting out of its problems; it is sinking further into them. That is the economic side of it.

Mr De Lacy: Why don't you blame the workers?

Mrs NELSON: Nobody is blaming them.

Mr Davis: You are.

Mrs NELSON: I am not blaming them.

One of the solutions to some of the economic difficulties we face is to try to provide an economic climate that will give social results. That is what the Queensland Government is on about; it wants to improve the quality of life for all Queenslanders. Honourable members opposite, as well as members on this side of the Chamber, know that the situation exists in which a man has a job and his son does not have a job, or the son has a job and the father does not; the mother does, the daughter does not. That is not satisfactory in the Australian context. We are used to full employment and we no longer have anything like full employment.

The member for Mount Isa, Mr Beard, raised those social issues when he spoke earlier in the evening. Some of the benefits of the legislation are that it will create additional employment, full and part-time, and share employment through greater flexibility of working arrangements. It provides scope for direct dealing. I have already dealt with that aspect. The legislation gives flexibility of operations to service peak business periods. That is particularly important in specific industries. It provides the setting of rates of wages which recognise that skills develop with experience.

Many of the problems involved in youth unemployment and general unemployment in this country occur because young people are being paid unreasonable amounts of money. I do not think there is a parent in this place who would not agree with the fact that there is something intrinsically wrong in a society in which 27 per cent of young females and 24 per cent of young males cannot get work, and those who do get work can jet off to the United States at the end of their first year of work as well as buy a car. That is just nonsense. It is an imbalance in society. Those are the sorts of issues that we as a nation have to address if this country is to be turned around and put on its feet again.

Mr Davis: What about you being a bit more productive and working a bit harder?

Mrs NELSON: The member for Brisbane Central has exposed himself. Now he is leaving the Chamber just to make sure. There is absolutely no doubt that, if anyone wants to compare productivity in working skills between the member for Brisbane Central and me, I would win hands down.

From an employee's point of view, the legislation will allow for increased job enrichment and greater scope to develop multiskills. The trade union movement has taken demarcation so far that, because the job of turning off a light switch belongs to a different union and comes under a different award, someone has to be paid for four hours just to wait to turn the switch off. That an employee such as a painter is not allowed to switch off a light—that there has to be somebody from a different union to do it—is an example of the restrictive and absurd work practices that simply have to stop.

These agreements will attract further businesses to the State. The member for Logan certainly made the usual patronising comments about the Queensland economy, but the simple fact of the matter is that this Government has worked harder than most of the other States to offset the effects of the recession. It has put the extra effort in and is alive and alert to the needs of small business. I will pay a tribute to the Minister. If ever there was a Minister in a Queensland Parliament who has genuinely cared about the individual and small business, it is this Minister. He has worked his committee whole-heartedly from that view. That is the absolute foundation of his philosophy and his belief.

This legislation, the trading hours legislation and other legislation that will come into the House in due course are designed to maximise opportunities for individuals, and for small business in particular. I am very certain that the weakness of the debate from the Labor Party, the fact that its members have been obliged—forced—to speak and the fact that they have not chosen to attack in any real way indicates that they know that this legislation is good for Queensland. They know that, if they were in office, they would introduce this legislation. If they are elected, they will leave it on the statute-book. Not one of them has said that a Labor Government would remove this legislation from the statute-book. We on this side know that they would not.

I must say that I cannot resist the temptation to mention the leadership of the Opposition. This week there has been such disarray in the Labor forces. It has been interesting for those in the Liberal and National Parties and for members of the media to watch and observe with great interest. I remind the Leader of the Opposition that perhaps he is the victim in the following little poem—

The other day upon the stair,
I met a man who wasn't there.
He wasn't there again today,
Oh how I wish he would go away.

I am pretty confident that that is how Mr Warburton feels about Mr Goss. However, the good news for the Leader of the Opposition is that Mr Goss will never get the numbers; that there is now another contender for the leadership stakes who is quietly sneaking up. So now there is a second invisible man on the stairs.

I congratulate the Minister on introducing the legislation. It has my total support and I am sure it will be in the best interests of Queensland.

Mr WELLS (Murrumba) (10.40 p.m.): It was a great pleasure to listen to the speech by the honourable member for Aspley, consisting largely as it did of witty interjections from our side of the House. In terms of the provision of her material, the honourable member fed very largely off those interjections. However, she made one or two points that are totally incorrect and that I will address in more detail.

The first thing that needs to be corrected is her proposition that not one member of the Opposition has announced that, when the Labor Party obtains Government, it will remove the legislation from the statute-book. The honourable member can now consider that that has been announced—if indeed it becomes necessary, since this whole shoddy, shonky piece of legislation is liable to be struck down in the highest court.

It was hardly necessary for anybody to say that; but it is interesting that the honourable member for Aspley refers to the event of the Australian Labor Party attaining Government. When the honourable member for Aspley sits back and watches that great event in Queensland's history—the Australian Labor Party attaining Government—she will realise that this is not the only piece of foul and shonky legislation that will be taken off the statute-book.

Of all the contemptible pieces of legislation that have been introduced in the first year of this Parliament, this Bill is undoubtedly the worst. It is reactionary, regressive and oppressive. At a single blow it takes away all the security, peace of mind and justice that has been won by the working people of this State since the eight-hour-day campaign of 1863.

Mr Gately interjected.

Mr WELLS: My objections to the Bill are threefold, and I will enumerate them for the benefit of the honourable member for Currumbin, who is my favourite stupid person and needs to have these things explained to him in detail.

Firstly, the Bill is designed to impoverish the people of Queensland. Secondly, it is deceitful, appealing to voluntariness in circumstances in which the negotiations involved in forming the contract are anything but voluntary. Thirdly, it is plainly a shoddy, shabby, shonky piece of legislation that is filled with drafting errors and meaningless and nebulous clauses.

Government members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Alison): Order!

Mr WELLS: Thank you for your protection, Mr Deputy Speaker, but I can assure you that I do not mind if members of the Government make noises during my speeches. I am so used to it that I would feel lost if they did not interject.

I will take the three objections that I raised in order. The first was that this legislation will impoverish the people of Queensland. That is not really denied by the Minister——

Mrs Nelson interjected.

Mr WELLS: I give the honourable member for Aspley the opportunity to have her words immortalised in *Hansard*.

Mr FitzGerald: You have to take interjections because you haven't even got a speech prepared.

Mr WELLS: The honourable member for Lockyer thinks that I have not prepared my speech. I say to him: don't you worry about that; you just wait and see.

The proposition that this legislation will impoverish the working people of Queensland is not really denied by the Minister. In fact, he said in different words exactly what I have said. He prefers euphemisms. He talks about reducing labour unit costs; he talks about getting rid of employers' add-on costs and he talks about creating new opportunities for capital investment by freeing up capital markets. However, in the end it means the same thing. It means that working people will get less.

This Government has been receiving two streams of economic advice. The one which the Minister apparently believes is that if Queensland is turned into a low-wage State, business will take the opportunity to invest in Queensland and create new jobs and new sources of wealth. The sad and melancholy refrain was parroted by the honourable member for Aspley during her speech that this legislation will make Queensland great, that it will create more jobs and that it will attract more wealth.

The other source of advice that this Government has been receiving from its public servants states exactly the opposite, namely, that causing a degeneration of working conditions in this State will harm the economy of Queensland rather than improve it. The Minister has ignored entirely this second source of advice. He has relied absolutely on the first source of advice, so much so that he apparently really believes that if he turns Queensland into the sweat-shop of the southern hemisphere, it will suddenly become a commercial paradise.

The Minister's view that if he turns Queensland into a low-wage State vast amounts of capital will be attracted to Queensland is obviously and demonstrably false. The proof of what I say is that Queensland is already a low-wage State.

Although its position has fluctuated over many years, Queensland is always on the bottom rung or near the bottom rung of the ladder when it comes to wages. In May 1986, male average weekly earnings in Queensland were \$396 a week—the lowest in Australia—compared with an Australian average of \$425 and \$439 in Western Australia. In May 1987, male average weekly earnings in Queensland were \$433.50 compared with \$451.70 nationally and \$488.30 in Western Australia.

Mrs Nelson: What are they in Hong Kong, Singapore, Taiwan and Fiji?

Mr WELLS: What they are in those places is what the honourable member's National Party Government is trying to make them in Queensland.

Such improvement as there was in Queensland was experienced by Queensland families whose bread-winner was a member of managerial staff. While in Queensland non-managerial wages increased by 7.4 per cent, managerial incomes increased by almost twice that figure, 14.7 per cent. The people at whom this legislation is aimed are the

non-managerial people and their families; those who are doing least well at present. Those who will be worse off in comparative terms are the public sector employees in Queensland who, as at November 1986—the most recent figures available—had the lowest wages of any public servants in Australia. This is why at the present time the Government is not applying the contract legislation to them. It is already ruining them. Why does it need to apply the contract legislation as well?

Mr Veivers: Could you just stand still while you are delivering your speech?

Mr WELLS: For the benefit of the honourable member for Southport, I will summarise: the point I have been making is that Queensland is a low-wage State already, and making it a low-wage State by the expedient of introducing these contracts will not alter the situation, except to make it worse.

Despite the present low level of wages, concurrently Queensland has the highest level of unemployment in the whole of Australia, and I wish to put some figures before the House relating to that matter. Last month unemployment in Queensland stood at 9.3 per cent. The Australian average was 7.7 per cent. The lowest level was 5.7 per cent in Victoria. Over the last three years, or 36 months, Queensland had the highest level of unemployment on 24 occasions and the second highest level on 12 occasions. Now Government members can interject about that.

Mr Hobbs: Tell us about the population score.

Mr WELLS: The honourable member for Warrego wants to know about the population score and about Queensland's net loss of people as a result of its poor economic conditions. I will come to that matter.

The point that I have made is that Queensland is a low-wage, high-unemployment State. If Queensland is a low-wage, high-employment State already, how can this Government possibly run the line that it will create new jobs and attract new capital by virtue of the low wages that will exist as a result of the contracts? The argument does not make sense, because what the Government is aiming at already exists. It has already impoverished this State and created high unemployment; yet Queensland does not have that inflow of capital. That is clear and conclusive proof of the fallacious view on which this Government is working. If it was the case that low wages attract capital, Queensland would not have the highest level of unemployment in the nation. Capital-investors would be flocking to Queensland to take advantage of the low-wage conditions. That has not happened because economies do not work that way any more. Maybe the theory upon which this Government is working would have been valid 50 or 100 years ago and the remarks made by Government members may have been interesting 50 or 100 years ago, but they no longer are.

Mr Ardill: They are still wrong.

Mr WELLS: They would have still been wrong, but they would have been interestingly wrong 50 or 100 years ago. Now entrepreneurs look for much more than low wages. New capital-investors who are seeking to break into new markets look first and foremost for a skilled work-force that is capable of delivering the goods or services which the entrepreneur is hoping to sell.

Mr Henderson: Why will wages go down under a contract system?

Mr WELLS: That is what Government members have said all the time: that wages will go down under a contract system, because the Government is taking away penalty conditions.

Entrepreneurs will not get the kind of situation for which they are looking by artificially depressing wages and conditions. If wages and conditions are artificially depressed, as is done by this Bill, there will be massive migration out of the State.

Now I would like to address that massive migration, since an honourable member opposite asked me to do so.

Mr Henderson: Why will wages go down?

Mr WELLS: I have explained to the honourable member why wages will go down—because penalty rates are being taken away. It is a simple one-move answer. Does the honourable member think that wages should be higher?

Mr Henderson: We're not taking away anything.

Mr WELLS: The honourable member thinks that it is up to people to negotiate. He thinks that people can negotiate with contracts.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Alison): Order! The honourable member will address his remarks to the Chair.

Mr WELLS: I certainly will, Mr Deputy Speaker. I have many more remarks to make, if only you can keep the people on your right quiet.

An Australian Bureau of Statistics survey showed that in the year to May 1986 there was a net loss by migration out of Queensland of 3 400 people in the 15 to 25-years age group. Those people are just starting out on their careers. They are trained with or are capable of being trained with contemporary skills that would lead us into the twenty-first century. They have left Queensland because the opportunities were better elsewhere. This Bill will transform that migration into a massive exodus.

Mrs Nelson: Where have they gone?

Mr WELLS: The honourable member for Aspley wants to know where they have gone. They have gone mainly to New South Wales and Victoria, which have comparatively thriving economies.

The result will be, of course, less capital in Queensland, not more. The reason there will be less capital in Queensland rather than more is that Queensland's skill base will shrink and its local market will shrink.

I turn now to my second point, the so-called voluntary employment agreements, which are the centre-piece of the charlatanism of this Bill. Voluntary employment agreements, or VEAs as they are called by this acronymic administrator the Minister for Industrial Affairs, are simply not voluntary agreements in any meaningful sense of the word "voluntary". A voluntary agreement is an agreement which is not constrained by any sanction either hidden or obvious.

I would like to give the House some examples of true voluntary agreements. If I go into a shop to buy some commodity or other and the price is too high, or I do not like the product, I can go to another shop. My subsequent agreement to purchase is a voluntary agreement because there are alternatives and there is no pressure on me to do business with a particular shop. The situation would be different if all the shops selling that product were owned by the same person and the prices of that product were the same in every shop. Another example of voluntary agreement is where two individuals, each with, say, \$20,000 capital, decide to go into business together. They work out between themselves the terms of their partnership, and if the terms which are offered by one partner are unacceptable to the other, then the second partner can take his \$20,000 and go somewhere else. Again, that agreement to associate for business purposes is a voluntary one because neither partner is in a position to hold any threats, either hidden or explicit, over the head of the other. If either chooses not to go into business with the other, then they can simply go away and invest their money elsewhere.

But with respect to the contract of employment, the situation is very different. If a worker goes to an employer looking for a job and the employer says to him, "Here's the contract", the worker's choices are not unconstrained. He has a choice between signing the contract or going on the dole. It is not as if these contracts are being introduced in the context of full employment. He has a choice between signing the contract and not being able to pay the rent or the mortgage. He has a choice between signing the contract

and enabling his children to eat meat and three vegetables or not signing the contract and having his children eat bread, or, if they are lucky, sausages.

Mr De Lacy: And that's the answer to their question about why wage rates will go down with this system.

Mr WELLS: That is right. I thank the honourable member for Cairns.

The point is that the employee really has no choice as to whether or not he should sign the contract. It is a fait accompli. A contract between two people who are not equal in power is not a voluntary contract. We hear a lot from honourable members opposite about freedom of choice, but a worker whose family is dependent on his or her pay cheque does not have a great deal of freedom of choice. The vast majority of Queenslanders are not in the luxurious position of many of the honourable members opposite who inherited their family farms and have their marketing looked after by a friendly Government quango.

Mr Milliner: And a subsidy.

Mr WELLS: And a subsidy, as the honourable member for Everton points out.

Unlike many practitioners and exponents of private enterprise, the vast majority of Queenslanders do not have Government subsidies for products that they produce and they do not have quangos to help them with marketing or taxes to help them pass their liabilities on to the community. All that they have are their hands and their brains. If employers can obtain those resources at bargain-basement prices, they will.

Labour and capital are simply not in an equal bargaining position if each worker is left to fend for himself. It is that inequality in terms of bargaining positions that makes the term "voluntary employment agreements" so inappropriate. In fact, it is cheating to include the term "voluntary" in this legislation at all. They would be more appropriately called divide-and-conquer agreements rather than voluntary employment agreements. They are exploitative agreements.

The Minister's use of the term "voluntary" in this context is an audacious ruse and a shabby deceit. The fact that, so far, the Minister has got away with the use of the term "voluntary" in this context seems to indicate the force of Adolf Hitler's dictum that, if the lie is big enough, it is going to be believed. We are simply not talking about anything that is voluntary under any reasonable meaning of that word. The point that I am making is that contracts between parties that are not equal in power are not voluntary contracts. This is not merely an abstract, philosophical point. It has legal consequences that are shattering for this Bill.

Mr Innes: Mr Wells——

Mr WELLS: My honourable and learned friend from Sherwood is interjecting.

Mr Innes: Give me a full frontal. What is your opinion on a contract between two people in different circumstances?

Mr WELLS: If the honourable member had been here previously——

Mr McElligott: Will you repeat what he said? We can't hear him down here.

Mr WELLS: Say it again.

Mr Innes: Whether a contract between two parties that are not precisely equal is unenforceable—is not legal?

Mr WELLS: It is unusual, but that was one of the very few occasions on which the honourable member did not repeat himself.

I explained earlier the circumstances in which contracts are either voluntary or involuntary. Because the honourable member is contributing his ideas to this debate, I am prepared to explain the matter to him. A contract is voluntary in circumstances in

which the parties are equal and they have equal negotiating power. When they do not have equal negotiating power, a voluntary contract does not exist. It becomes a contract that is entered into under some form of hidden or obvious coercion. The point that I am making is that contracts between parties that are not equal in power are not voluntary. This is not just an abstract philosophical matter; it has legal consequences.

I turn now to the Act and to clause 11 of the Bill. The proposed new section 94M (2) refers to contracts that involve unfair, harsh or unconscionable terms. It states—

“Where the Commission is of the opinion that any term or condition of a voluntary employment agreement—

(i) is unfair;

(ii) is harsh or unconscionable;

or

(iii) is against the public interest,

the Commission may declare the agreement void to be effective . . .”

Those are not simply terms that might be mentioned in ordinary conversation. When they are included in legislation, they take on a legal meaning. Those terms have a legal meaning.

The system of law under which we operate works on the basis of precedent and statutory interpretation. If words enter into a particular statute and are subsequently interpreted by a court, subsequent courts will take that interpretation as the meaning of those words for further cases that come before them. We are dealing with words such as “unfair”, “harsh”, “unconscionable”, “public interest” and so forth, and those are words on which the relevant statutory interpretation has been done. However, in the context of this Act we will find that there are difficulties with this.

Mr Innes: You’re demonstrating the difficulty. Surely those words provide a massive control over any unjust agreement?

Mr WELLS: I thank my honourable and learned friend. If he would be good enough to hear out the argument I am putting forward, he would realise that they do not provide a massive control.

Since those words have a legal meaning and since they have been interpreted, because the statutory interpretation has been done on those words, we find ourselves in a rather difficult situation. Most of the statutory interpretation that has been done has been in terms of the principal Act, chiefly section 123A of the principal Act, or section 88F of the equivalent New South Wales Act.

For example, the legal, statutory interpretation of the words that will now appear in this statute—and this is the crunch—is that matters which have been held to be “against the public interest” include remuneration below the award level, contracts subversive of award standards, anti-union contracts and contracts in restraint of trade.

That is what those words “against the public interest” mean. If the legislation that has just been brought down says that contracts which are against the public interest can be voided, it follows that every voluntary employment agreement can be voided, because every voluntary employment agreement is subversive of award standards. So that seems to be the interpretation that will be forced on any court that hears this legislation.

I ask the Minister and his advisers to examine this point seriously, because it is a point that tends to make nonsense of the statute.

Mr Innes: Are you aware that there is a statutory interpretation principle that says that there is a presumption that the Act is meaningful and not nonsense, and, if it has two possible meanings, you take the one that makes sense and not nonsense?

Mr WELLS: I thank my honourable and very learned friend for referring me to the maxim of statutory interpretation: *ut res magis valeat quam pereat*. However, I

would point out to him that it does not apply in circumstances in which the whole statute is so infected with the error that it ceases to make sense.

What on earth is the court going to do when it has been interpreting contracts subversive of award standards as against the public interest, and then the legislature decrees that there should be all these employment agreements specifically designed to do away with those award standards?

It could be held by the court that all so-called voluntary agreements are against the public interest. Alternatively, in the absence of any indication, the court might find itself in the dark. The introduction of this legislation would be easier if Queensland had legislation similar to that in New South Wales that governs the sorts of contracts that can come into operation containing those terms.

The Contracts Review Act 1980 of New South Wales, No. 16, an Act with respect to the judicial review of certain contracts and the grant of relief in respect of harsh, oppressive, unconscionable and unjust contracts, tells New South Wales judges what harsh, unconscionable and oppressive contracts are. It says—

“... ‘unjust’ includes unconscionable, harsh or oppressive; and ‘injustice’ shall be construed in a corresponding manner.”

But the following is where the New South Wales statute gives guidance. It is the response to the question that honourable members opposite have been asking about the meaningful content of those words—

“In determining whether a contract or a provision of a contract is unjust in the circumstances relating to the contract at the time it was made, the Court shall have regard to the public interest and to all the circumstances of the case, including such consequences or results as those arising in the event of—

(a) compliance . . .”

It goes on to list the criteria according to which courts are supposed to judge whether a contract is harsh, unconscionable, against the public interest and so forth.

The first criterion is as follows—

“Whether or not there was any material inequality in bargaining power between the parties to the contract.”

Has there ever been an employment agreement that has been entered into by any working man or woman in this State, without union protection, where there was not material inequality between the parties to the bargain?

Mr McLean: Never.

Mr WELLS: There never has been. I thank the honourable member for Bulimba.

It is endemic in the nature of the relationship that the boss has the cards in his hand. There is always material inequality. If there were no material inequality, there would not be one person going to another, asking for a job, and having to sell the labour of his or her hands in order to obtain mere sustenance for himself, herself and family members.

The second criterion is as follows—

“Whether or not prior to or at the time the contract was made its provisions were the subject of negotiation.”

The voluntary employment agreements all explicitly rule out negotiation between the unions and employers. Consequently, the second criterion put forward in the New South Wales Act is not available.

I mention this contract legislation to honourable members in all seriousness—and to honourable members of the Liberal Party—because these provisions would not necessarily apply only to contracts of employment but would apply also to any sorts of contracts. Members of the Liberal Party might like to think of taking up that matter on behalf of their constituencies.

The next criterion put forward is as follows—

“Whether or not it was reasonably practicable for the party seeking relief under this Act to negotiate for the alteration of or to reject any of the provisions of the contract.”

Of course, it is not reasonably practicable, because every contract of employment is a fait accompli. The alternative that an employee has in this State is either to accept a piece of paper that is put in front of him for his signature or to go on the dole. Those are the alternatives—sign on the dotted line or go onto the dole and be unable to pay the rent or the mortgage and be unable to feed the children well.

Another criterion that would be of great interest to any Government members who are capable of understanding it is as follows—

“The extent (if any) to which the provisions of the contract and their legal and practical effect were accurately explained by any person to the party seeking relief under this Act . . .”

How often will these contracts be explained? What is the provision in the Bill that will ensure that the terms of the contract are explained? There are no such provisions, and there are no remedies listed in this legislation.

The legislation does not state how the remedies can be commenced; nor does the legislation say what remedies will be available to the employee. A great deal has been said about protective clauses in the legislation. Honourable members heard a great deal about provisions designed for the protection of the worker. What the legislation does not do is say how the worker obtains locus standi. The honourable member for Sherwood would be able to inform the House what the term “locus standi” means, but the legislation does not state how someone gets the right to come before a court. The legislation contains a gap.

I ask the Minister to look at that particular aspect. If the legislation does not contain a provision setting out how somebody can come before a court, all the provisions that say a person can go before a court and get this, that and the other protection are totally empty and totally meaningless. They are totally nugatory. They are nothing more nor less than empty waffle.

This legislation is shot through; it is full of holes. This piece of legislation is built on hype. It has been sold on hype, and it is being marketed on error, falsehood and travesty. If this legislation is implemented, it will be the most discreditable piece of legislation that has been brought before this Parliament during the last year. It will stand in the annals of the doomed Bjelke-Petersen Government as its darkest hour.

Mr De LACY (Cairns) (11.14 p.m.): My contribution to this debate will be brief. I believe the legislation is important. It is something that the Labor Party feels very strongly about and opposes in detail. Members of the Opposition are philosophically and deeply opposed to it.

I am disappointed that the honourable member for Aspley is not in the Chamber. I would like to thank her for those very kind words she said about me and one of my colleagues. They have probably mortally wounded us. However, by way of reciprocity, let me say that when the winds of change sweep across the political landscape of Queensland and the Labor Party is in power and she makes an application to join the Labor Party, as I am sure she will, I will support her application because of the kind words she said about me.

In her sad and melancholy refrain—

Mr Mackenroth: I hope you said that tongue in cheek.

Mr De LACY: I am wounded now because of what she said about me. In her sad and melancholy refrain, as it was referred to by the previous speaker, she confessed that this legislation was really aimed at destroying the trade union movement. That is not news to Opposition members. We know that that is what it is aimed at. That is why

we oppose it, and oppose it absolutely. We are aware of the fact that the legislation has been watered down from version 1. It has been watered down in terms of who it applies to and the protections that are included in it. It attacks the fundamentals of the industrial relations system of Queensland. They are the fundamentals that the Opposition believes have served this State well for all of this century. For that reason the Opposition is opposing it.

The member for Aspley said also that the Federal Government consults with unions before it makes decisions. Of course it consults with unions, and it ought to. It ought to consult with unions; it ought to consult with business. And it does consult with business and unions. Yet the members of the National Party seem to imply, because the Labor Party consults with unions before it makes important decisions, that there is something dishonourable about that, that something is wrong or that the country is not being run in a correct and proper way. Other countries in the world consult with their unions also, particularly countries such as Japan, West Germany and the Scandinavian nations that have large organised labour forces.

The Japanese, of course, are noted for consulting to an almost ludicrous degree. They consult and they consult. That is why American managers have been unable to come to grips with the Japanese method of management. It is because of the Japanese commitment to consultation. Consultation is something which members of the National Party know nothing about. They still believe in the division of labour—the bosses are there, the workers are there and never should the two meet.

This legislation is the rock on which the National Party will perish. I believe that its industrial relations juggernaut has run off the rails. The halcyon days of 1985 and the SEQEB dispute, for which the National Party pats itself on the back and thinks that that was its greatest hour, are gone. I believe that it ran off the rails at about the time of the last State election in November last year. Around about that time, or immediately after that time——

Mr Powell interjected.

Mr De LACY: What I was saying was that it ran off the rails at about the time of the last State election. What I was leading up to was the time when the Premier lit that famous fire down at Wagga Wagga, that great fire that turned around and engulfed him. He was going to burn Australia out. Who got burnt out? The person who lit the fire!

It will be noted that in recent times the Premier has changed his metaphors. These days he has got onto nautical metaphors. He talks about the ships at sea and rolling the ropes up. What happens to people when you give them too much rope?

Mr Eaton: It just proves what our mothers told us: if you play with matches you will get burnt.

Mr De LACY: Exactly. It has turned around and burnt the Premier.

Mr Mackenroth: He didn't do too good in Canberra, so now he's turned on his own back bench.

Mr De LACY: Exactly. There is no-one left to turn on, so he has turned on his own back bench.

Although I said that this legislation is what will cause the Government to perish, it must be viewed in conjunction with the Government's aborted attempt to abolish the 17½ per cent leave loading. At the time the Premier declared in his Budget Speech that the 17½ per cent leave loading for public servants was to be abolished, the public servants were included in the voluntary employment agreement legislation. The public servants of Queensland interpreted that as a bitter and direct attack on them. They felt betrayed, as well they should have.

As the member for Bundaberg said when he quoted from a newspaper article, the acronymic Minister in the House said prior to the election that the suggestion of the

abolition of the 17½ per cent leave loading was merely scaremongering by the ALP. It may have been scaremongering, but it told the workers of Queensland, particularly the public servants, just what the Government had in store for them. They will never again trust the Government. They felt betrayed. Over the years they have served the Government with a great deal of loyalty. They were betrayed in spite of their wage patience. During the last four or five years, all of the workers of Australia have been very patient with their wage claims. It is no secret that, in real terms, workers are up to 7 per cent worse off than they were four or five years ago. They have played their part in addressing the severe economic problems that have occurred, and are occurring, in Australia.

A variety of statistics show that the workers of Australia have played their part. Real unit labour costs are at their lowest level for the last 20 years. Industrial disputation—something which the Government keeps referring to—is at historically low levels. So workers have played their part. They may well ask: has the rest of Australia? Has the business sector? Has it played its part? As honourable members know, there has been a stock exchange crash which, thankfully, has come to an end, although that end has come about in a way that I do not support. Because the market was overheated, the crash was inevitable. The workers of Australia were not making money on the stock exchange, but some people were getting money for nothing. Eventually, if a country does not have the productivity—that is one of the Government's words—to support the millions being made on the stock exchange, there has to be trouble. It was no secret that the boom had to end; it has just ended in a much more dramatic way than most expected and, certainly, most hoped for.

Mr Eaton: I wonder if that investment of the Bjelke-Petersen Foundation is safe? Will they get all their money back?

Mr De LACY: I hope that the foundation has wiser people handling its money than some of the Government members who have spoken to this legislation.

I addressed three or four rallies in far-north Queensland on this legislation and on the abolition of the 17½ per cent leave loading.

Mr Katter: There were three or four people who listened to you, too.

Mr De LACY: Yes, they were quite large rallies. One was attended by 250 people, another by 200 and another by about 500 people.

I told those rallies that the Government is dressing this legislation up in a variety of ways by saying that it has problems balancing the Budget—that the State is facing tough economic times. However, I told them not to believe the Government as it was introducing this sort of legislation because it hates the workers. I told them that if they want evidence of the way in which the Government hates the workers, they ought to come down to this place and listen to the debates in which members of the National Party stand up one after the other and bash the workers of Queensland. Whether the debate is on primary industries, industrial relations, business or the Budget, one after the other they get up to bash the workers. The Government says that all the problems of Queensland and Australia can be solved if the worker is paid a little bit less and productivity is increased. Members of the Government do it one after the other. I could have supplied those people with speeches made by virtually every back-bencher in the Government. I told them not to listen to Government members when they come to north Queensland and say that there are other reasons why they are doing this. It is because they hate the worker.

Of course, those kinds of comments fell on very fertile ground because Government members are starting to show in a tangible way that they hate the workers. In the past it was empty rhetoric. One after the other members of the Government stood up in this Chamber and spoke to a constituency back in the country, to their grazier mates and to their business mates. They probably circulated copies of their speeches to their mates.

All of a sudden it is no longer empty rhetoric. In the past couple of years the Government has started to deliver the goods to all of its supporters. It is translating

that rhetoric into legislation. It started with the SEQEB dispute and the related series of industrial relations legislation. Of course, this year it has culminated in this piece of legislation that is important to the Government, this union-busting legislation, this voluntary employment agreement legislation.

The Government is surprised that the Opposition supports the Expo agreement and says that such agreements are good for everybody. The Government says that voluntary employment agreements will introduce flexibility and increase productivity and asks, "Isn't it marvellous?" It will introduce flexibility all right—flexibility for the worker to get less pay and poorer conditions.

Mr Palaszcuk: You have won Brian Austin.

Mr De LACY: I noticed that he was not interjecting, so I presumed that he was agreeing with me.

Speaking specifically about this piece of legislation, I must confess that it is substantially softer than the first version that was introduced. It is softer in the sense that there are many more exclusions. The Government has finally realised what I am talking about; that a Government cannot turn on its own public service and continue to exist. No Government can exist without the support of its own public service.

Honourable members know what power the public service unions and public servants have. The public service unions decided to set up a waste-watch committee. They know all the deals that are taking place in the public service. They know the way in which Ministers are rotting the system, and they are starting to feed out that material. It will start off as a leak and it will end up as a flood, and I will tell honourable members what it will do. It will expose the way in which the Government is bleeding the system, and the people of Queensland will continue to turn against the Government as they have done in the past.

Mr Lee: You said this was going to be short.

Mr De LACY: The interjections are the trouble. When these intelligent interjections are made, I must respond to them.

Mr Smith: Please continue. This is one of the best speeches tonight.

Mr De LACY: I thank the honourable member. I am flattered.

The member for Murrumba said that this is a shoddy, shabby, shonky piece of legislation. Of course, his eloquence is something that I cannot match. However, I must confess that that summarises it and summarises it succinctly and absolutely. Despite the fact that this Bill is softer than the original piece of legislation, it is still no good.

As the member for Aspley said, this legislation is a deliberate attempt to weaken and destroy the trade union movement. The member for Bundaberg quoted from newspaper reports in 1891 when the first big debate took place on this issue in Australia. Nothing has changed. There is nothing remarkable left beneath the visiting moon.

In those days the argument was freedom of contract versus the right to organise. What is the difference today? That is what this legislation is about. For "freedom of contract" read "voluntary employment legislation". It is all about freedom for bosses and workers to enter into contracts but, of course, they are never equal contracts. Mr Henderson asked where this legislation says that workers will be worse off. They will be worse off because if they are not in a position to negotiate through their union, they are negotiating from a position of weakness.

Mr Simpson interjected.

Mr De LACY: Is the honourable member for Cooroora making an interjection? How old is he? Is he over 50 years old? That only goes to prove that people never get too old to learn new ways to be stupid.

Mr Simpson: What about Mudginberri, where the unions were trying to steal the wages from the workers?

Mr De LACY: This is heard all the time: Mudginberri was the great thing of the National Farmers Federation. It went around Australia and collected \$15m from all the poverty-stricken farmers and held \$400-a-head dinners in Toowoomba so that it could fight the trade unions. It is probably better off fighting the trade unions than fighting elections. Do the Government members know how the National Farmers Federation went on in the election? It nominated for four seats in Queensland and put the whole weight of the \$15m behind the campaign. One seat was lost to the Labor Party and the other three seats swung towards the Labor Party at a rate of between 3 and 5 per cent.

Mr Burreket: Which one was lost to the Labor Party?

Mr De LACY: Hinkler. Did the honourable member not know? Are there any more questions?

Mr Hayward: What about Fisher?

Mr De LACY: Fisher was not one that was targeted. The four seats that the National Farmers Federation nominated for in Queensland were Herbert, Capricornia, Rankin and Hinkler. There were four massive swings towards the Labor Party, and one seat was won from the Tories.

Mr Hayward: They had a "Joh for PM" clone running for Fisher—Mr Peter Slipper.

Mr De LACY: How did he go?

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Mr De LACY: I did make a promise that I would not be long. I usually am quite brief in these speeches.

Mr SPEAKER: The honourable member does not have to use his remaining 13 minutes.

Mr De LACY: It never ceases to amaze me that the momentum for this kind of legislation always comes from those States or countries that pay the worst wages and have the worst industrial relations system. It comes from the hill-billy States in the United States of America, not from the northern States. The honourable member for Wolston, Mr Gibbs, referred to the yellow dog agreements in the United States. They are the kind of thing that this Government wants to introduce in Queensland. Which State is it in Australia? It is Queensland, which has the lowest real wages and the worst economic performance measured by a whole range of criteria. It does not matter which criterion is used, Queensland has the worst-performing economy on the Australian mainland. Yet this Government has decided that it has to reduce the wages more, Queensland has to have contract legislation, and the workers have to be got at in another way. It is not only State Governments that operate that way, but also the firms. Look at the firms that are always involved in shonky deals, the ones that will not accept union labour. Are they the performing firms?

Mr Burreket: Which State has the best economic performance?

Mr De LACY: I did not hear what the honourable member for Townsville said, but judging by the mirth of my colleagues, it was obviously an inane comment.

Mr Hayward: He said——

Mr Palaszczuk: Mr De Lacy——

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Caboolture and the member for Archerfield!

Mr De LACY: Those firms that will not employ union labour—the high fliers or the shonky firms—are the ones that go broke first and are the ones organised, managed and run by the white-shoe brigade.

Mr Smith: Do the unions get a run down at Sanctuary Cove, for instance?

Mr De LACY: Exactly. I do not know if the unions are working down at Sanctuary Cove. That is a reasonable question.

Mr Borbidge: Ask the workers at Sanctuary Cove whether they are happy or not.

Mr De LACY: Are they members of trade unions, can they be members and are the unions operating there? I bet the honourable member that they are not.

Mr Palaszczuk: Why do the members of the National Party hate the workers?

Mr De LACY: I do not know why the National Party hates the workers, and I will leave that to the honourable member.

When one looks at all of those shonky bosses, it all fits together. They are the ones who do not like trade unions, they are the ones with the white shoes, they organised the New Right throughout Australia, and they supported, aided and abetted the “Joh for PM” campaign.

We know what happened to the “Joh for PM” campaign. The same sort of thing will happen to members of the Government. It will happen because of this legislation. I began my very short speech by saying that this legislation is the rock on which the National Party will perish. Mark my words, it will be!

Debate, on motion of Mr Powell, adjourned.

COURTS OF CONCILIATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Hon. P. J. CLAUSON (Redlands—Minister for Justice and Attorney-General) (11.35 p.m.), by leave, without notice: I move—

“That leave be granted to bring in a Bill to amend The Courts of Conciliation Acts, 1892 to 1931 in certain particulars.”

Motion agreed to.

First Reading

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

Second Reading

Hon. P. J. CLAUSON (Redlands—Minister for Justice and Attorney-General) (11.36 p.m.): I move—

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

The purpose of the Bill is to modernise the Courts of Conciliation Act so that present-day court practice and terminology apply in conciliation proceedings.

The Courts of Conciliation Act, which has existed in Queensland since 1892, is designed to facilitate the process or resolution of disputes by conciliatory methods rather than by litigation. The scheme of the Act that has applied since its introduction is that disputes of various types can, at any stage, regardless of whether litigation of the dispute has commenced, be settled by means of conciliation under the Act if the parties so agree.

The conciliation of the dispute is a process set out in the Act under which the dispute can be heard in private within the locality of the residence of the parties before a person especially appointed under the Act as a conciliation justice. A magistrate or an acting magistrate are automatically appointed as conciliation justices by virtue of their office, whilst other persons who are justices of the peace can in certain circumstances be appointed conciliation justices under the Act. Any conciliation justice so appointed

can then perform the function of determining in the first instance whether the dispute should in fact be conciliated as a consequence of a request to that effect from one or all of the parties to the dispute.

If conciliation is to take place following a determination made by the conciliation justice to do so, notice of the time and place of inquiring into the dispute is then issued by him to the parties. If the parties to the dispute do not attend before the conciliation justice, penalties in the form of a fine may be imposed for non-attendance.

One of the principles upon which the Act is founded is that all conciliation proceedings take the form of oral proceedings, with the parties conducting their own cases before the conciliation justice in the absence of legal advisers. The role of the conciliation justice is primarily one of using his best endeavours in the shortest practicable time to induce the parties to agree to a settlement of the matters in dispute.

The conciliation justice is obliged under the Act to hear the parties and to take evidence from them and their witnesses with a view to reaching a settlement of the dispute without the need for the evidence to be given on oath. In that regard the conciliation justice can give advice to the parties in attempts to achieve a settlement of the dispute.

An important consideration in the process of attempting to achieve conciliation is that none of the evidence obtained by the conciliation justice is admissible in any other proceeding whatsoever arising as a consequence of the dispute.

The terms of settlement, if and when achieved, are to be agreed on by the parties and then reduced to writing by the conciliation justice. The settlement is then signed by the parties as an accurate record of the proceedings. The terms of settlement automatically become a judgment of the court that can be enforced in the usual way.

The principal thrust of this Bill is to amend the Act to ensure that its purpose and object accords with present-day needs and requirements. Assisting parties to disputes to resolve their own disputes through legislation such as this Bill without the need for society to intervene by way of courts, tribunals or arbitrators is worth while in that it can reduce pressure on society to provide resources such as judges, courts, legal aid and the like for the settlement of disputes.

Over recent years, growing concern has been expressed at the ever-increasing costs of litigation of disputes. Consideration has been given to the development of new methods of dispute-resolution techniques through agencies such as Small Claims Tribunals and Small Debts Courts. These bodies are, in effect, alternative tribunals to courts for dispute resolution. Growth has also occurred in other areas of dispute-resolution bodies such as community justice centres as well as an increase in the arbitration process.

The settlement of disputes between members of society by an alternative dispute-resolution method has in fact been established in this State by virtue of the Courts of Conciliation Act. This method of dispute resolution is an acceptable alternative dispute-resolution method to assist the parties to settle their disputes in an informal atmosphere that is devoid of legal formality.

The amendments proposed in the Bill will widen the range of disputes that can be conciliated to include all types of disputes other than those involving offences against Acts of Parliament. The updating and modernising of the terminology used in the Act, such as the changing of the references to police magistrates and Courts of Petty Sessions to stipendiary magistrates and Magistrates Courts is also effected by the amendments.

Provision is made in the Bill to increase the value of the fine that may be imposed on parties to a dispute for their non-appearance so as to accord with present-day money values.

The present requirement that fees for conciliation are to be paid to the conciliation justice—where he is not a magistrate or an acting magistrate—for his own use will be removed. A provision to authorise the payment from revenue of appropriate fees for services performed by conciliation justices who are not Crown officials is proposed in

place of the present provision. It is not proposed to interfere with the established principle that all proceedings before a conciliation justice are to be conducted in private by the parties themselves in the absence of legal advisers.

Amendments have been made to the Act to ensure that its operation accords with modern-day court practices. One of those amendments provides for a method of service of summonses issued under the Act in a manner similar to the method of service of summonses under the Justices Act.

Overall, the amendments proposed do no more than merely update and modernise the references in the Act to court practice and procedure to ensure that those references accord with present-day Magistrates Courts practice. The amendments do not introduce any new procedures of any description and it is not intended to interfere in any way with the overall scheme of the Act that has existed since 1982.

The Act has fallen into disuse over the years, but it is considered that the proposals contained in the Bill will assist in making the scheme of the Act more attractive to litigants so that some incentive will then exist for them to attempt to settle their disputes by conciliation rather than by litigation.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate, on motion of Mr Goss, adjourned.

SPECIAL ADJOURNMENT

Hon. L. W. POWELL (Isis—Leader of the House) (11.42 p.m.): I move—

“That the House, at its rising, do adjourn until Tuesday, 10 November 1987.”

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 11.43 p.m.