

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates  
[Hansard]

**Legislative Assembly**

**WEDNESDAY, 11 NOVEMBER 1987**

---

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

**WEDNESDAY, 11 NOVEMBER 1987**

Mr SPEAKER (Hon. K. R. Lingard, Fassifern) read prayers and took the chair at 2.30 p.m.

**PAPERS**

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

**Reports—**

- The operation of Suncorp for the year ended 30 June 1987
- Rockhampton Harbour Board for the year ended 30 June 1987
- Townsville Port Authority for the year ended 30 June 1987.

The following papers were laid on the table—

- Report of the Dumaresq—Barwon Border Rivers Commission for the year ended 30 June 1987
- Proclamation under the Forestry Act 1959-1984
- Orders in Council under the Forestry Act 1959-1984
- Regulations under the Traffic Act 1949-1985
- Financial Statements of the State Coke Works, Bowen for the year ended 30 June 1987.

**RAILWAY PROPOSAL****North Coast Line Relocation, Woree-Cairns**

**Hon. D. F. LANE** (Merthyr—Minister for Transport) (2.32 p.m.): I lay on the table plans, sections and book of reference of the proposed relocation of the North Coast Line between Woree and Cairns, including a new marshalling yard, together with the report of the Commissioner for Railways thereon, and I move that the report be printed.

*Whereupon the documents were laid on the table and the report was ordered to be printed.*

**MINISTERIAL STATEMENT****Police Complaints Tribunal Report on Visit to Ravenshoe by Senator Richardson**

**Hon. W. A. M. GUNN** (Somerset—Deputy Premier, Minister Assisting the Treasurer and Minister for Police) (2.33 p.m.), by leave: I wish to advise honourable members that I have received a report from the Police Complaints Tribunal on its investigation into a visit by the Federal Minister for the Environment, Senator Graham Richardson, to Ravenshoe on 4 September 1987. The tribunal initiated this action following public allegations to the effect that there may have been some neglect of duty on the part of police officers who were present in Ravenshoe that day by not providing proper security for the senator. The report shows that such allegations were totally unfounded.

Senator Richardson visited Ravenshoe to outline the Federal Government's proposed World Heritage nomination for Queensland's rainforests. Honourable members may recall that there were some rough scenes when Senator Richardson, having spoken to the large gathering present, attempted to leave the trailer which formed a stage for the meeting. It should be pointed out that no complaint was made by Senator Richardson or any of his associates to the tribunal.

Prior to the senator's arrival on 4 September 1987, vehicles and machinery owned by the timber-millers had been parked on both sides of the entrance road. Senator

Richardson and his party arrived at 11.45 a.m. by helicopter and travelled to the town hall in a taxi driven by the owner. The taxi was stopped some distance short of the town hall and Senator Richardson was prevented from going to the hall by the large crowd in attendance.

It was suggested to the senator that the hall was not large enough to accommodate the number of persons wishing to hear him speak. He reluctantly agreed to speak from the back of a trailer.

At about 1 p.m. the senator indicated that he would have to leave, as he had an appointment to keep at Tully. The senator's group then began to get down from the rear of the trailer, so that they could go to the waiting taxi. As they did so, the number of people at the rear increased very quickly, with a rush of people from the other side. There was an obvious crushing motion through the weight of people moving towards the senator's party.

It was alleged that during this incident the senator was punched and kicked. Four police officers moved in and were able to assist the senator in leaving the scene in a police car. He was conveyed to the golf course, where his helicopter was located.

As part of its action, the tribunal obtained uncut footage from TVQ 0 and BTQ 7, discussed the incident with television reporters Mr Paul Bongiorno and Mr Tony Barnett, and considered reports by the officer in charge of Ravenshoe Police Station, Sergeant 2/c N. A. Wilson and by the district officer, Mareeba police district, Inspector H. F. Hansen.

Although the district officer had not been officially informed of the senator's visit, he was aware of it and arranged for local police to be supplemented from nearby areas. Two officers from Cairns who were in Ravenshoe for court proceedings were also made available to assist, bringing the police strength to six.

As the State police had not been informed of the senator's arrival time, and as they wished to liaise with him on his arrival so as to escort him to the town hall, they visited the landing sites of several helicopters which had brought in media crews. They did not succeed in their attempts to meet the senator on his arrival by helicopter.

Subsequently, the police stationed themselves near the entry to the town and it was not until the taxi drove past them that they recognised the senator travelling in that vehicle. This aspect was also confirmed by the Channel 0 footage. By the time police followed the taxi it had been stopped by the large crowd.

As the police were involved in trying to locate the senator they had no pre-knowledge of the intention of a section of the crowd to prevent the senator from reaching the hall. By the time they were in a position to assist, the senator had agreed to speak from the back of the trailer. The police also had expected him to be travelling in an official vehicle, not a taxi.

The police maintained a low-key approach, but remained present during the questioning of the senator while he was on the back of the trailer. After the senator moved down from the back of the trailer the police showed considerable initiative and resourcefulness in protecting the senator while shepherding him to a police car when the way to his taxi was blocked altogether. While the crowd was vocal, it was not dangerous and there does not seem to have been any intention at all to cause the senator any harm.

After the senator had left the scene, Sergeant Wilson conferred with other police officers and they all reported that they had not seen any acts of actual violence towards any member of the senator's party. Consequently no arrests were made during or after the incident.

The tribunal has not recommended any punitive action in relation to any person in respect of this matter. The tribunal is satisfied that the police did not have any pre-knowledge of the events which took place, and had there been liaison between the senator's office and the local police the incident may never have taken place. The tribunal

is of the view that the police concerned should be commended for their actions in assisting the senator to leave the scene.

The tribunal has recommended that in circumstances where Ministers of the Crown are involved in contentious matters which might flare up into an unseemly incident, the police contingent should, where practicable, be under the direction of a commissioned officer.

Finally, it would seem to me that Senator Richardson on that day was a victim of his own ministerial inexperience. Surely he should have realised from his previous visit to Ravenshoe that the World Heritage listing was a contentious issue and that it may have been prudent to advise the district police beforehand of his proposed program.

There is no way that this Government would condone any abusive actions against a Minister of the Crown and I am sure police there would have given the senator even greater support had they been in a position to do so. I suggest that in the future the local police should be notified and arrangements will be made to have police in attendance.

I reiterate that, had there been liaison between the senator's office and the local police, the tribunal's view is that the incident may never have occurred. I trust Senator Richardson will be, hopefully, a little wiser for this experience.

### MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

#### Loan of Queensland Art Gallery Paintings to Parliament House

**Hon. B. D. AUSTIN** (Nicklin—Minister for Mines and Energy and Minister for the Arts) (2.40 p.m.), by leave: As honourable members would be aware, the Queensland Art Gallery has for many years lent paintings to Parliament House. In fact, for the benefit of all honourable members, a regular exchange program began back in 1895, when the Queensland Art Gallery was established under the Premiership of Sir Hugh Nelson.

Since then, many works of art from the gallery's collection have graced these Chambers, and I am pleased to announce the addition of a further five paintings. These superb paintings, by some of Australia's most important artists, are displayed here in the Legislative Assembly, as well as in the Speaker's Lobby.

I might add that a further six paintings will be lent under the exchange program, and are expected to arrive by the end of this month.

### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

**Mr MILLINER** (Everton) (2.41 p.m.), by leave: On 15 September this House carried a resolution on the motion of the Minister for Transport approving the working plans, sections and book of reference for the relocation of the North Coast Line at Mackay. When speaking to the motion at the time, I indicated that the route chosen by the Commissioner for Railways was not the most satisfactory route for the people of Mackay. Since that time I have visited Mackay, have spoken with numerous groups there and have been made aware of the petition signed by 8 000 people protesting against the proposed route. That petition has been presented to the Deputy Premier, Mr Gunn, but has not been tabled in this House or passed on to the Minister for Transport.

I have also had the opportunity of having further discussions with the member for Mackay, who unfortunately was absent overseas on parliamentary business when the motion was debated.

### LEAVE TO MOVE MOTION WITHOUT NOTICE

**Mr MILLINER** (Everton) (2.42 p.m.): I seek leave to move, without notice—

“That this House rescind the resolution carried on 15 September and request that the Commissioner for Railways be asked to resubmit to this House working

plans, sections and book of reference for the relocation of the railway line north of Mackay between 957.9 km and 968.9 km based on the Paget-Te Kowai-Erakala route, known as the compromise route, as recommended in the 1977 Ullman and Nolan report."

**Mr INNES:** I seek leave to move a motion without notice.

**Mr MILLINER:** Mr Deputy Speaker, I sought leave.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Row):** Order! I ask both honourable members to lower their microphones. I call the member for Sherwood.

**Mr INNES:** Mr Deputy Speaker——

**Mr MILLINER:** Mr Deputy Speaker, I sought leave to move a motion without notice.

**Government members interjected.**

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The Chamber will come to order. There is too much audible conversation. Did the member for Everton make a statement?

**Mr MILLINER:** I sought leave to move a motion without notice.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! I had already called the member for Sherwood.

**Mr INNES:** Mr Deputy Speaker——

**Mr MILLINER:** I sought leave to move a motion without notice.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! Is leave granted?

Question—That leave be granted—put; and the House divided—

AYES, 30

Ardill  
Braddy  
Burns  
Campbell  
Casey  
Comben  
D'Arcy  
De Lacy  
Eaton  
Gibbs, R. J.  
Goss  
Hamill  
Hayward  
McElligott  
Mackenroth  
McLean  
Milliner  
Palaszczuk  
Scott  
Shaw  
Smith  
Smyth  
Underwood  
Vaughan  
Warburton  
Warner  
Wells  
Yewdale

*Tellers:*  
Davis  
Prest

NOES, 55

Ahern  
Alison  
Austin  
Beanland  
Berghofer  
Bjelke-Petersen  
Booth  
Borbidge  
Burreket  
Chapman  
Clauson  
Cooper  
Elliott  
Fraser  
Gately  
Gibbs, I. J.  
Gilmore  
Glasson  
Gunn  
Gygar  
Harper  
Harvey  
Henderson  
Hinton  
Hinze  
Hobbs  
Hynd  
Innes  
Katter  
Knox  
Lane  
Lee  
Lester  
Lickiss  
McCauley  
McKechnie  
McPhie  
Menzel  
Neal  
Nelson  
Newton  
Powell  
Randell  
Schuntner  
Sherlock  
Sherrin  
Simpson  
Slack  
Stephan  
Stoneman  
Tenni  
Veivers  
White

*Tellers:*  
Littleproud  
FitzGerald

Resolved in the negative.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! Up till now I have had difficulty in hearing members who are on their feet. There is too much cross-conversation and noise in the Chamber. I ask the Chamber to come to order.

**GOVERNMENT INTRUSION INTO LOCAL AUTHORITY AFFAIRS;  
PROPOSED CENTRAL PLACE DEVELOPMENT**

**Mr INNES** (Sherwood—Deputy Leader of the Liberal Party) (2.53 p.m.), by leave, without notice: I move—

“That this House, like the recent Queensland National Party conference, condemns the repeated intrusion of this Government into matters which are properly the province of local government and, in particular, because of reports that the Government is considering introducing legislation to allow Cabinet to approve the world’s tallest building proposal, condemns any move by the Government—

- (1) to give to the Cabinet and to take from the Brisbane City Council the right to reject or approve the Minuzzo proposal;
- (2) to disguise such a move by hiding it in legislative provisions of general application to all projects of a value greater than \$200m, or any similar sum, on the grounds that this would take away from local government and from local residents the right to oppose, modify or approve the projects that would have the greatest effect on their local communities, infrastructure and resources.”

In the last 48 hours it has been reported widely that the Government—

**Hon. L. W. POWELL** (Isis—Leader of the House) (2.54 p.m.): I move—

“That the House do pass to the next business.”

Question put; and the House divided—

AYES, 46		NOES, 39	
Ahern	Hynd	Ardill	Schuntner
Alison	Katter	Beanland	Scott
Austin	Lane	Braddy	Shaw
Berghofer	Lester	Burns	Sherlock
Bjelke-Petersen	McCauley	Campbell	Smith
Booth	McKechnie	Casey	Smyth
Borbidge	McPhie	Comben	Underwood
Burreket	Menzel	D’Arcy	Vaughan
Chapman	Neal	De Lacy	Warburton
Clauson	Nelson	Eaton	Warner
Cooper	Newton	Gibbs, R. J.	Wells
Elliott	Powell	Goss	White
Fraser	Randell	Gygar	Yewdale
Gately	Sherrin	Hamill	
Gibbs, I. J.	Simpson	Hayward	
Gilmore	Slack	Innes	
Glasson	Stephan	Knox	
Gunn	Stoneman	Lee	
Harper	Tenni	Lickiss	
Harvey	Veivers	McElligott	
Henderson		Mackenroth	
Hinton	<i>Tellers:</i>	McLean	<i>Tellers:</i>
Hinze	Littleproud	Milliner	Davis
Hobbs	FitzGerald	Palaszczuk	Prest

Resolved in the affirmative.

**PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE; STATUTORY BODIES REVIEW  
COMMITTEE; FOREIGN LAND OWNERSHIP REGISTER; SEX AND AIDS  
EDUCATION IN SCHOOLS; INTERFERENCE IN DUTIES AND  
RESPONSIBILITIES OF LOCAL AUTHORITIES**

**Hon. Sir WILLIAM KNOX** (Nundah—Leader of the Liberal Party) (3 p.m.), by leave, without notice: I move—

“That this House in view of the change of Government policy to embrace a number of Liberal Party initiatives recommends that administrative and legislative action be implemented by the Government immediately to

- (1) Create an all-party Public Accounts Committee and a Statutory Bodies Review Committee.
- (2) Establish a Foreign Land Ownership Register.
- (3) Commence a comprehensive sex and AIDS education programme in schools.
- (4) Cease interfering in the rightful duties and responsibilities of elected local authorities."

For some time now we have been pressing for a number of items to be incorporated in Government policy and to be implemented in this State, such as a public accounts committee—

**Hon. L. W. POWELL** (Isis—Leader of the House) (3.01 p.m.): I move—  
"That the House do pass to the next business."

Question put; and the House divided—

AYES, 46		NOES, 39	
Ahern	Hynd	Ardill	Schuntner
Alison	Katter	Beanland	Scott
Austin	Lane	Braddy	Shaw
Berghofer	Lester	Burns	Sherlock
Bjelke-Petersen	McCauley	Campbell	Smith
Booth	McKechnie	Casey	Smyth
Borbidge	McPhie	Comben	Underwood
Burreket	Menzel	D'Arcy	Vaughan
Chapman	Neal	De Lacy	Warburton
Clauson	Nelson	Eaton	Warner
Cooper	Newton	Gibbs, R. J.	Wells
Elliott	Powell	Goss	White
Fraser	Randell	Gygar	Yewdale
Gately	Sherrin	Hamill	
Gibbs, I. J.	Simpson	Hayward	
Gilmore	Slack	Innes	
Glasson	Stephan	Knox	
Gunn	Stoneman	Lee	
Harper	Tenni	Lickiss	
Harvey	Veivers	McElligott	
Henderson		Mackenroth	
Hinton	<i>Tellers:</i>	McLean	<i>Tellers:</i>
Hinze	Littleproud	Milliner	Davis
Hobbs	FitzGerald	Palaszczyk	Prest

Resolved in the affirmative.

## QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

### Support for Premier by Government Members

**Mr WARBURTON:** In directing my first question to the Premier, I refer to the vote in the House early this morning, in which honourable members saw all the National Party Ministers and back-benchers give full and loyal support to him. We even heard Mr Hinze and Sir William Knox heaping accolades upon the Premier. I ask: does the Premier see this unanimous party support at the parliamentary level as a kick in the teeth for Sir Robert Sparkes, John Stone and others who attempted to humiliate him in Townsville last week?

**Government members interjected.**

**Mr WARBURTON:** Well, it is serious stuff.

In the circumstances, now that this loyal support has been given to the Premier by Ministers Gunn, Hinze, Ahern and Austin and all of his other National Party colleagues, and bearing in mind that the Premier has said that he does not want to leave this State in a deep black hole, could that signal a reassessment of his decision to resign in August next year?

**Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN:** The honourable member would know very, very well that I would not give him any indication of what it does or does not signal. Obviously, he heard the statement that I made a number of weeks ago in relation to the date of retirement—8/8/88. That is obviously the particular time that one has in mind.

As to the rest of the question that the Leader of the Opposition asked in relation to the vote last night—I think that it related to a situation that he created in the House by his motion, and it indicated very clearly to this House and to him that his motion did not have very much support. He only has the support of his own people. All of my colleagues on this side of the House supported me. Naturally, that is how I would expect it to be.

#### **Support for Premier by Government Members**

**Mr WARBURTON:** I direct my second question to the Premier, and ask: with further reference to what was perceived as the loyal support that he received from his colleagues in this House, can we be assured that he is now firmly in command as National Party Leader and Premier? Does that mean that Sir Robert Sparkes will be clearly told to deal with the Premier and not with Mr Gunn, as he indicated that he was going to do in Townsville? Does the Premier see this display of loyal support at the parliamentary level as an endorsement of his stand on issues such as AIDS education, condom vending machines and a foreign land register, which really remains at odds with the position pushed by Sir Robert Sparkes and others at the Townsville conference? Does he see that as an endorsement of his own beliefs in respect of those matters?

**Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN:** It is interesting that the honourable Leader of the Opposition is so interested in what this may or may not indicate and what Sir Robert Sparkes has got to do with the whole question. It intrigues me that the Leader of the Opposition is so interested. Bearing in mind the very big problems and difficulties that he has, I know that it must give him a little relaxation and a little relief to think that perhaps others have problems, too. However, be that as it may, this party and this Government make decisions as to what takes place in Government, not anybody outside the Parliament. Members of the National Party in this Parliament are the elected Government in this State and we make all the decisions. Any reference made by anybody else, whether it is made by Peter Beattie or the Leader of the Opposition, or any other person, is a matter that is considered and dealt with by members of this Government. It is supported or otherwise according to its merits and what Government members may think it deserves.

#### **Queensland Police Union Petition for Increased Funding and Manpower**

**Mr FITZGERALD:** I ask the Deputy Premier and Minister for Police: is he aware of a petition that has been circulated by members of the Queensland Police Union calling for increased funding and manpower? Is this attitude realistic in these tight economic and financial times? How does this compare with reported cuts being undertaken by the Victorian police force?

**Mr GUNN:** It is very interesting to read in the *Courier-Mail* this morning what the Victorian Government has to do. It is very unfortunate that members of the Queensland Police Union continue to adopt a head-in-the-sand attitude as far as budgeting is concerned. They ought to be very pleased that they do not work in Victoria, where police vehicles are being sold and patrols are being cut to assist in meeting budgetary requirements. Not very much has been heard from the Queensland Police Union members about what is happening in Victoria.

**An Opposition member:** Why would they?

**Mr GUNN:** Well, they are running around and talking about no-confidence motions. The Western Australian Police Union has just moved a no-confidence motion against the Western Australian Police Minister. What does that achieve? Absolutely nothing.

Any number of petitions or motions will not result in extra funding. What these people should be doing is going to the socialists on the other side of the House to get them to use their influence with the Canberra Government, because that is where the cuts are being made.

The article is very interesting. I will read its contents to Opposition members. The article states as follows—

“In Victoria, police services will be slashed dramatically from today because of a major cash crisis.

Police vehicles will be sold, patrols cut, and on some occasions, stations closed.

All major police functions will be slashed to save \$2.8 million following a nine-month battle over the police budget.

Senior police were told yesterday to start cutting services to make a 4.2 per cent saving in the operational budget.

Services which will be cut immediately include police patrols. An estimated 35 vehicles will be sold.”

So that will mean there will be 35 fewer patrols on the road in Victoria. The article continues—

“The Assistant Commissioner (Services), Mr Noel Newnham, said the cars would be sold at auction by the end of the month. Police will be told to”—

and this is what gets me; I don't understand this—

“run ‘interrupted patrols’. This means police will sit in their cars waiting to be given a job rather driving round looking for law breakers.”

Considering that this year the crime rate in Victoria increased by 1 000 per cent, the situation in Victoria will be interesting to note. The article continues as follows—

“Police overtime will be slashed by 12 per cent.”

That is the situation in Victoria; yet no noise is being made about that by members of the Opposition.

The fact of the matter is that that situation is occurring right throughout the Commonwealth of Australia. The blame should be nailed where it belongs. The Federal Government cut back revenue to all the States, not only Queensland, and that is the position in which the States find themselves. It is the situation not only in Queensland but also right throughout the other States in Australia.

#### **Appointment of Women to Senior Positions in Education Department**

**Mr FITZGERALD:** I ask the Minister for Education: is the Minister aware of the policy of the New South Wales Labor Government to the effect that 40 per cent of all senior appointments in the New South Wales Education Department must be women? If so, will the Minister be recommending to Cabinet that a similar policy be adopted in Queensland?

**Mr POWELL:** I am aware of that situation in New South Wales. No, I will not be recommending to the Queensland Cabinet—and ultimately to the Government—that a similar policy be followed in Queensland.

Honourable members might be interested in articles which appeared in the *Daily Telegraph* last Thursday, 5 November. The editorial is titled, “Fairness to the fair sex is unfair to men”. The editorial begins as follows—

“No industry—least of all the government service—should discriminate against women when it comes to jobs.”

Nobody in this Chamber would argue with that statement, I am sure; but that simple, fair statement falls a long way short of saying that Governments should discriminate against men. That is what is happening in the teaching service in New South Wales.

In the same newspaper an article is headed, "Teachers fume over 'unjust' promotions." Honourable members might have read today that, because of problems they are having with the New South Wales Government, teachers in New South Wales are going on strike tomorrow. The Education Minister in that State, Mr Rod Cavalier, said some unkind things about them on television this morning. I will quote a couple of statements from that particular article which very clearly gives the information.

**Mr Davis:** You are a boring person.

**Mr POWELL:** I am so boring that every time I get up to speak I get to the nerves of honourable members opposite.

The article states—

"Teachers are furious because relatively junior women are being promoted over more senior male staff under a new Education Department policy of equal employment opportunity.

. . .

John Murphy, who taught at Bomaderry High for almost 20 years, has been on the seniority list for 10 years.

. . .

He was 266th on the list, yet the head teacher's job went to a woman 600 rungs below him.

. . .

He said south coast teachers would meet next week to consider bans and stopwork meetings in protest against the policy."

The article continues and refers to another teacher, a long-term teacher at Coonamble, Mr John Whitney, who was passed over for the deputy principal's job by a woman much lower on the seniority list. The article states—

"Mr Whitney is 240th on the list; Ms Brenda Smith, from Northmead, is 610th."

This Government, and particularly my department, has been very careful to make sure that we make promotions and appointments on the basis of quality and on the basis of ability. We have never fallen into the trap that other Governments in Australia have of this nonsense about equal opportunity and anti-discrimination.

**Opposition members interjected.**

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Row):** Order!

**Mr POWELL:** It is always interesting to hear the noise that comes from the Opposition whenever—

**Opposition members interjected.**

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! I have called the Chamber to order three times. Shortly I will warn someone under Standing Orders.

**Mr POWELL:** Some Opposition members do not like hearing the truth. This Government has not fallen into that trap. What it has done and will continue to do is to appoint people according to merit and according to the way and where they apply for positions. A number of senior positions in the department are held by women. They are not held by women because they are women; they are held by women because those people obtained and had the qualifications to be able to do the job and were able to win the job by competing equally with other people within the service

There is no chance of this Government ever changing the policy that it has at the moment. We will continue to appoint people according to merit. In that case, those people who have the qualifications and who have the seniority will get the jobs.

### Coal Deals with Romania; Threat by Mr Lang Hancock

**Mr BURNS:** I direct a question to the Premier and Treasurer and I will ask it nice and quietly so that I do not wake up Russell Hinze. I refer to the reported threat by the Premier's old mate Lang Hancock that if the Premier goes there will be no coal deals for Queensland with Romania and eastern Europe. I ask: is this report true? Do those reported deals depend upon his remaining Premier? How many Queensland jobs will be threatened if this deal fails? Has Mr Hancock expressed any views on the suitability of the pretenders to the Premier's job and their ability to handle such big deals?

**Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN:** Obviously a question of that nature involves quite a deal of detail and it has quite a number of angles. I cannot just get up and answer it yes, no or whatever. I would say to the honourable member that the deals that have been mentioned, particularly those involving Mr Hancock in the first instance and myself when I met that particular delegation over there—I take it that the honourable member is referring to Romania—still stand. Nothing has changed. On the other hand, it does depend on a deal of continuity, association, contact and so on, on my part.

Naturally I hope, after the conclusion of this session—probably early in the new year—to again renew not only those contacts but also others in Spain, Czechoslovakia and Hungary.

**Mr Burns:** Has anybody made any suggestion about any others taking your place to do the deal?

**Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN:** There is no need to go into that aspect, because the honourable member knows that I will be here attending to that myself. I am sure that he has heard that. I am sure that he has had his ear to the ground. If he has, he knows the answer.

### Photograph of Sir Robert Sparkes and Mr Vincenzo Bellino

**Mr BURNS:** In asking a question of the Premier and Treasurer, I draw his attention to the photograph of Sir Robert Sparkes and Vincenzo Bellino that was circulated at the National Party conference in Townsville. I now ask: will he refer this photographic—not hearsay—evidence of meetings between the Bellinos and leaders of the National Party to the Fitzgerald inquiry, which is investigating donations to political parties?

**Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN:** Quite obviously, everybody concerned with the inquiry would know of the existence of the picture. It has nothing to do with me in the sense of having to notify the commissioner or anybody else.

**Mr Burns:** Will you send it up, anyway? Don't you think it should be investigated?

**Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN:** No, I do not consider that it is necessary. An explanation has been given by Sir Robert. I would not imagine that anyone would want to take any action. Certainly I have no reason or justification for taking any action whatsoever.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! I remind honourable members that matters before the Fitzgerald inquiry are sub judice in this Chamber.

## PRIVILEGE

### Application of Sub Judice Rule to Fitzgerald Commission of Inquiry

**Mr BURNS** (Lytton—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (3.22 p.m.): I rise on a matter of privilege. Mr Deputy Speaker, I wish to speak to your ruling on sub judice. *Hansard* book No. 7, at page 1800—

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr BURNS:** I am raising a matter of privilege.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! I point out to the honourable member for Lytton that I made no ruling. I merely reminded members that I would make a ruling if the matter was pursued.

**Mr BURNS:** Right.

## QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

### Health Facilities, Caboolture

**Mr NEWTON:** In asking a question of the Minister for Health and Environment, I refer to the renewed speculation in recent times on the construction of a health facility in the Caboolture area. I now ask: will he inform the House of the Government's intentions? Have funds been set aside? What type of facility can the people of the area expect? When can the people of Caboolture expect to see that facility?

**Mr AHERN:** I am happy to advise the honourable member that funds have been allocated in this triennium for work to begin on a new health-care facility in Caboolture. Honourable members will be aware of changing directions in health care. In line with a worthwhile trend, the Government is moving towards greater community-based health care.

It has been decided that initial planning for the Caboolture hospital should focus on the development of a module to contain a range of out-patient services provided by the Health Department. I have recently approved that the initial stage include, on a full-time basis, community medicine, child health, a hospital dental service and a health promotion section. Psychiatric and alcohol and drug-dependence services will be available on a part-time basis.

The Redcliffe Hospitals Board has been approached to assume responsibility for the planning, construction and functioning of Stage 1 of the development. A planning group is soon to be formed to develop a long-term overall site plan. Finance to cover this project will be met from the Capital Works Loan Program.

### Westlander Derailment near Roma

**Mr COOPER:** In asking a question of the Minister for Transport, I refer to the recent rail accident west of Roma that ended in tragedy. I now ask: is he satisfied with the performance of railway personnel following the derailment and also with the performance of essential service people, namely, the SES, hospital staff and police?

**Mr LANE:** All honourable members would be aware of the very tragic derailment of the train west of Roma in the last few days. It was a very tragic incident. I am sure that all honourable members join with me and with the member for Roma, Mr Cooper, in extending our condolences in respect of the bereavement that occurred on this occasion. In addition, I join with the honourable member for Roma in wishing all those persons who were seriously injured on that occasion a return to good health. I can assure the people of Queensland that the Government and the the Railway Department have done and will do everything within their power to assist people affected by this accident.

The Railway Department immediately took charge of the task of finding accommodation in Roma for those people who suffered shock and other ill effects as a result of the accident, so that they were able to settle down and adjust to the circumstances. Senior railway officers, including the most highly qualified technical officers, were dispatched immediately to the scene, and an immediate investigation was established. A board of inquiry was set up headed by Mr Kevin Neil, the General Manager of the Central Division of the Railway Department. Mr Neil is a very experienced officer in these operations.

In addition, the Government acknowledges the good work carried out by the essential services, that is the SES, the hospital and other people associated with this

traumatic incident. I join the honourable member for Roma in thanking all those people who assisted at that accident.

Unfortunately, there is an aspect to the incident to which I have drawn attention publicly, that is, the likelihood of sabotage or some interference with the switch mechanism and the points at that particular location on the line. That is under the closest examination not only by Queensland Railways scientific people but also by people from the University of Queensland. The matter is very firmly in the hands of the police. I can assure the people of Queensland that if any person is found responsible for interfering with the points, the full force of the law will be brought to bear under these circumstances.

#### **National Party's Policy on North Queensland**

**Mr McELLIGOTT:** In directing a question to the Premier and Treasurer, I draw his attention to the interview of National Party president, Sir Robert Sparkes, by journalist Norman Beck published in yesterday's *Townsville Bulletin*, in which Sir Robert Sparkes refers repeatedly to the party's new regime after the Premier is gone and says that modern communications are a boon towards helping to crack the Premier's overshadowing image. I have a copy available to table in this Parliament.

I now ask: is the Premier aware that Sir Robert Sparkes said that the new regime would give the National Party a higher profile in north Queensland and ensure that State National Party members are competent to convey the thinking of the north when issues arise? Is this an admission by Sir Robert Sparkes, after a week in the Townsville casino, that the policies of the Premier's State Government on northern matters, coupled with the presence of northern Ministers, have been inadequate and that the region will stay neglected until there is a change of Premiership?

**Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN:** I want to say that I am not particularly interested in any supposed statement by Sir Robert or anybody else in relation to north Queensland. That is okay. All I want to say is that north Queensland has fared very, very well at my hands and at the hands of my Ministers and the local member.

The Queensland Government has spent a great deal of money in Townsville, and the honourable member knows that as well as I do. Townsville and the surrounding district have prospered very, very considerably. Indeed, north Queensland will continue to grow and expand under the policies of my Government—the space station and many other aspects of policy.

The fight against the honourable member for Thuringowa, his party, his Federal colleagues and the World Heritage listing of north Queensland rainforests is being led by myself. If the honourable member asks the people of north Queensland who is their main champion in trying to seek retention of their jobs and their livelihood, the freehold of their properties and so on, they will tell him that it is Joh Bjelke-Petersen.

**Mr McElligott:** No, they don't.

**Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN:** The honourable member is quite wrong. To suggest otherwise is quite wrong.

The Queensland Government is always on the alert, and it will continue to do what is necessary and within its power to assist north Queensland safeguard its mighty potential.

#### **Extravagances in Public Hospital System**

**Mr McELLIGOTT:** My second question without notice is directed to the Minister for Health. Tomorrow night at the Princess Alexandra Hospital 180 people will attend the annual black-tie dinner for the visiting specialists and their guests at a cost to the hospitals board of \$7,000. The annual cost of functions at the Princess Alexandra Hospital is approximately \$80,000. I ask the Minister: how widespread is the practice of wining and dining among the State's hospitals boards and how does the Minister allow such

extravagances in the public hospital system at the same time as he is asking public patients to pay for drugs?

**Mr AHERN:** I will be attending the function tomorrow night as well. Queensland's State hospital system is run in a very lean way in comparison with those in other States of Australia. When one considers all the indices involved, such as staffing, administration, capital costs, the economies in this State reflect great credit on those who are able to make it work. When one looks at the results of the hospital system in terms of sickness and the indices in relation to mortality and so on, Queensland does very well in comparison to the other States of Australia.

I do not see why from time to time a very large hospital such as the Princess Alexandra Hospital should not offer hospitality and bring together people who have contributed in a very substantial way during the year. The role that they play should be recognised and they should be offered the opportunity to get to know each other socially and have an informal exchange of views. This happens throughout the State and Australia, and in private industry and it is okay.

### North Queensland Coconut Industry

**Mr ALISON:** I direct a question without notice to the Minister for Northern Development and Community Services. Given the importance of coconut-shell activated carbon to the gold-processing industry, I ask: does the Minister see prospects for the establishment of a long-awaited north Queensland coconut industry?

**Mr KATTER:** I must say that the honourable member has worked very hard in keeping areas open for gold exploration in and around the hinterland of his own electorate. The development of a gold industry in that area will be of very great benefit to Maryborough and the old gold-mining town of Gympie. The importance of the onrush of the gold industry, which was held up by the honourable member——

**Mr Scott:** Gil, are you listening to this?

**Mr KATTER:** It is a pity that the honourable member for Cook did not listen, because he might find that this is an industry that would be extremely useful to him on the Cape York Peninsula. I strongly urge him to listen, because at long last he might be able to do something for his area.

The development of the gold industry in north Queensland was held up for three years by the gold tax. Now that operations have commenced in 30 mines in north Queensland, which are producing one million ounces of gold, Queensland has an industry that can be developed. I like to think that my department has played a very big part in setting the stage for the development of this industry.

Coconut husks can be burnt and used to process out the copra so that no energy input is needed to produce the end-products. One of the three end-products is the carbon from the shell, which is the substance used in gold-winning. Another end product results from pulp-processing. The shell is used for carbon for gold production in north Queensland. Seventeen million coconuts per year are consumed in the gold-mining industry in Australia. Most of those coconuts are imported from Ceylon. Very great opportunities are being created.

It has just been discovered that copra can be used for cattle feed. Although it has the same protein value as cotton seed meal, it is only half the price. I thank very much my colleague the Honourable the Minister for Primary Industries for the land-breaking and great establishment work that have been done in this field.

Finally, I point out that an end-product of coconuts is coconut oil. At present, Australia imports yearly about \$160m worth of vegetable oil, its derivatives and various other substitutes for vegetable oil. At present in north Queensland there is an opportunity for the establishment of an industry that would yield many benefits to a whole range of other industries and certainly to the economy of north Queensland. I thank the honourable member for his question.

### **Works Department Contracts, Assessment of Tenderers**

**Mr SLACK:** I have two related questions without notice for the Minister for Works and Housing. My first question is: what steps are taken to ensure the viability and capacity of tenderers to complete contracts before those contracts are awarded to tenderers by the State Works Department? Does the Minister want my other question now?

**Mr I. J. GIBBS:** During the recess, I was given notice of the honourable member's questions. I have a considered answer to give to the honourable member.

My Department of Works takes comprehensive steps to ensure the viability and capacity of the tenderers in question. These include a range of inquiries and assessments made by departmental officers. They look at past performance on previous contracts available to them from written reports or from their own personal experience with the tenderer. Confidential information is obtained from industry sources in respect of performance on non-departmental contracts. Information is also obtained from the Builders Registration Board.

An assessment is made of the tenderer's financial capacity by reference to information provided by the tenderer himself and by reference to confidential information from his bank-manager—with his authority. Other sources of information are the Building Industry Credit Bureau, White Mercantile, subcontractors used by the tenderer and building supply firms.

Technical aspects are also assessed by reference to the tenderer and his ability to suggest time and cost savings, and to contribute information relative to the suitability or the particular type of construction or building type. An assessment is made of the ability of the tenderer's foreman and construction manager.

My officers also check on the tenderer's administrative ability by reference to past performance in general contract administration, co-ordination of subcontractors, planning works in construction programming, scheduling work activities and attitude to contractual claims. Quality of workmanship is assessed by reference to past performance. Previous readiness to rectify defects is another means of assessment.

Departmental officers take into consideration the tenderer's current volume of work by reference to information provided by the tenderer and to information obtained from other Government departments and from industry sources.

Furthermore, subcontractors and tradesmen who undertake work for a contractor on a State Government project are protected, in terms of payment for their work and materials, by a number of factors. These include—

Legislation in the form of the Subcontractors' Charges Act. This applies to subcontractors but not to suppliers.

National public works contract conditions of contract clause 43 requires payment of award wages and conditions. This requirement has been exercised by my department.

Requests for direct payment to a supplier can be considered by my department and made via a deed of assignment.

Statutory declarations from head contractors can be requested to the effect that workmen have been paid wages and that nominated subcontractors have been paid all amounts due.

When liquidations have occurred, my department provides every opportunity for the subcontractors and suppliers involved to be used in the completion of the works, thus minimising any losses.

Any subcontractor, supplier or tradesman, whether working on a Government or private-enterprise project, makes a commercial decision to do so and has the protection of common law rights and statutory rights under the legal system.

### **Kalkadoon State High School, Air-conditioning and Examination Conditions**

**Mr R. J. GIBBS:** In asking a question of the Minister for Works and Housing, I refer to the shocking situation in Mount Isa, where students from the Kalkadoon State High School have been forced to sit for their end-of-year exams in a local hotel because the State Government refuses to air-condition their school against the 40-degree heat. As the Minister's office has stated that no funds would even be considered for air-conditioning the school until next financial year, I ask—

(1) Can the Minister explain why young Queensland students are being forced to sit in a pub to take their final exams?

(2) Why can this Government not find the \$800,000 needed to air-condition the school when it can find tens of millions of dollars to splurge on Government advertising, ministerial expenses and the Premier's jet?

(3) Can the Minister give an assurance that the Kalkadoon school and other schools in the very hot Mount Isa region will be air-conditioned as a matter of urgency?

**Mr I. J. GIBBS:** On the basis of annual spending, this Government has a great record for air-conditioning schools. As to the problem that has occurred in Mount Isa—the Minister for Education should take a careful look at the principal of that school if young people are doing their final-year examinations in a hotel. I believe that that is the principal's management; and, if the decision to hold the examinations at a hotel was not made properly with proper judgment, the principal has something to answer for.

The Opposition is trying to make political capital out of something that has probably been managed correctly. I am quite sure that the Minister for Education will consider this matter and will give due notice to this House in an attempt to expose the fact that the Opposition is trying to make political capital out of young people.

### **Kalkadoon State High School, Air-conditioning and Examination Conditions**

**Mr MACKENROTH:** I ask the Minister for Education: does he believe that the principal of the Kalkadoon State High School acted correctly in shifting the students from that high school to the local hotel so that they could undertake their examinations in an air-conditioned atmosphere?

**Mr POWELL:** When this issue was first raised by the media, I took steps to investigate exactly what was going on. What appears to be going on is, in fact, not going on. The students will be undertaking some of their examinations in a conference centre that is adjacent to the hotel.

I would like to place on record my thanks to the licensee of that establishment for offering—

**Mr Underwood:** You mean it is part of the hotel complex.

**Mr POWELL:** It is part of the hotel complex; that is correct.

I thank the licensee of that hotel for offering his facilities to the school free of charge and for ensuring that no alcoholic liquor will be served while the children are on the premises.

As the Honourable the Minister for Works and Housing said, this Government has an upgrading policy under which all schools west of a certain line and north of a certain line are being air-conditioned. Kalkadoon State High School is yet to receive that facility. Therefore, the students of that school were the only students in Mount Isa who would have been required to sit for their Year 12 examinations in a non-air-conditioned building.

Although the way in which the media presented the action that was taken by the principal of the school looked very bad, I believe that it was a reasonably sensible procedure for him to follow.

### Proposed Closure of Child Protection Unit

**Mrs NELSON:** I ask the Minister for Family Services: is she aware of rumours circulating in the Brisbane area that the Child Protection Unit is to close? Will she advise this House of the true position regarding that unit?

**Mrs CHAPMAN:** I have heard many rumors about the Child Protection Unit closing, so I have with me some information for the honourable member.

The Child Protection Unit is not being disbanded. All that has occurred is that I have given my in-principle approval for an examination to be made of whether its functions could be better regrouped with those of the Child Protection Register and the Co-ordinating Committee on Child Abuse. If anything, that examination will result in an upgrading of my department's child protection resource services and a more consistent service to the two hospital-based SCAN teams. I would stress that no decision has to come from that examination.

### Petition for Relocation of Railway, Mackay Area.

**Mr CASEY:** In directing a question to the Deputy Premier, I refer to a statement in the *Daily Mercury* on 10 November, made by a spokesman for the Minister for Transport, Mr Lane. He said that a petition containing 8 000 signatures from people in Mackay, opposing the proposed Lagoons railway relocation route—presented personally to the Deputy Premier almost three months ago—still has not been passed on to Mr Lane. The allegation made by Mr Lane's spokesman was that the Deputy Premier had not passed on the petition. I ask: in view of the Deputy Premier's new-found interest in democratic process, as shown by his actions in Townsville last week, will he present this petition immediately to the Minister for Transport and explain to him the need to follow Sir Robert Sparkes' instruction regarding public opinion, that is, acknowledge the need for the Railway Department to relocate the line around the Mackay urban area, away from both the existing and Lagoons routes?

**Mr GUNN:** I did receive a deputation from the people of Mackay on this subject. It is news to me that the petition was not sent on to Mr Lane. In due course, it left my office. I sent it by courier. I will have that matter looked into and attended to as early as possible.

### Nerang Police Station

**Mr HYND:** I ask the Minister for Works and Housing: can he inform this House of the present position in relation to plans for the development of the new Nerang Police Station, and what stage has been reached at this point?

**Mr I. J. GIBBS:** I was given notice of this question during a recent break.

I am happy to advise the member for Nerang that plans are well in hand for the development of a new police station for what is one of the newest electorates in our State, Nerang. Tenders have been called for this project and these tenders will, in fact, close on 17 November 1987.

Together with the new State primary school and pre-school which opened in the honourable member's electorate earlier this year, the new police station is yet again a sign of the progress and development of this part of the State. It is, as many members may already be aware, part of that south-east corner of the State which is developing at a far faster rate than other areas of the State. So it is an area that demands new facilities, such as a police station.

What we are planning for the Nerang Police Station is a cavity-brick building with a gross floor area of some 630 square metres. It will house a range of facilities, including office accommodation for uniform, CIB and juvenile aid personnel. It will have a public foyer, administration facilities, an exhibits and lost property store, a breath-analysis area, staff facilities and storage areas. The office area of the building will be air-conditioned.

These areas will also be carpeted. The site will also be landscaped as part of the project. The new police station will be another community asset for Nerang.

### Opposition Leadership

**Mr STONEMAN:** In directing a question to the Deputy Premier, I refer to the Opposition's attempt last night to divert attention from the continuing and ongoing attempts to topple the lame-duck or temporary Opposition Leader following a no-confidence motion against Mr Warburton at a regional party meeting, and I ask: what significance does the Deputy Premier see in comments made by Mr Errol Hodder of the powerful AWU and the emergence of a new independent group that supports the member for Logan as leader, allowing for the continuing abstention of the member for Townsville East from any matter requiring decision?

**Mr GUNN:** It is intriguing to watch the Leader of the Opposition try to divert attention away from his own major problems. I say that they are major problems because they worsen each day.

I have here a copy of the statements made on the ABC's 7.45 State news on 30 October 1987, in which the news-reader said—

“The Queensland secretary of the Labor Party has appealed to factions to settle differences and work to win Government. Mr Peter Beattie says there has to be a re-examination of where the ALP is going, covering both problems of the State Parliamentary wing and the organisation.”

Beattie replied—

“Frankly, I think it is time there was more unity and I'd appeal to all sections of the party to make certain that our first priority is winning Government and that we put any other consideration behind us. And we make absolutely certain that we don't disappoint those hundreds of thousands of Queenslanders who expect us to put forward an alternative Government to win. It's not good enough to play games. I'm not interested in that. I know that the people who support aren't either. They want us to win.”

The news-reader then said—

“Meanwhile the Australian Workers Union has made it clear it will push for a change in party direction. The State Secretary Mr Errol Hodder was asked if his package would include a change in the Labor leadership.”

Hodder—and, I might say, he is not a friend of the Leader of the Opposition—replied—

“Well, not necessarily. What I'm talking about is possibly a change in direction in terms of the way that we're currently pursuing matters. They are matters which I believe are appropriate within the party forums, and that is the place in which I will continue to raise those questions.”

That remark could have been excused if things did not continue. As I say, the position is worsening day by day for Mr Warburton.

Only this morning on the ABC's 7.15 State news the news-reader said—

“A new alliance is forming among Labor MPs amid claims that the party State leadership is still under threat. Labor MPs known as the Independents met yesterday with socialist Left members and agreed to meet regularly. Camille Fennel reports.”

Camille Fennel said—

“The meeting comes after most socialist Left MPs failed to support Mr Wayne Goss,”—

and didn't he come a thud—

“one of the Independents, in his attempt to bring on debate of the Labor leadership. While that's been styled as a humiliating defeat for Mr Goss”—

which it was—

“socialist Left members now believe Mr Warburton could still be under threat. The key of the crucial meeting next week when Labor's National Secretary Bob McMullan

will discuss research into the Labor leadership that's believed to compare the public appeal of Mr Warburton with Mr Goss and is believed to favour Mr Goss."

It is intriguing to note also that the split has temporarily insulated Mr Warburton from moves to dump him in favour of Mr Goss. Mr Warburton can count on 16 of the 30 votes. It is a pretty thin line. It means that only one member has to cross the floor. I might say that any of the members opposite could be bought with Monopoly money. The Leader of the Opposition is in a dangerous situation. However, he turns around and trumpets in this House about problems on this side. I remind him that many members on this side of the House have seen six Opposition Leaders come and go. I make a prediction that he will not remain much longer as the Opposition Leader in this State.

### Remote Commercial Television Service

**Mr STONEMAN:** My second question raises the spectre of another faction of the ALP and it is directed to the Minister for Industry and Technology. I refer to a statement in yesterday's *Courier-Mail* wherein the ATEA State secretary, who also happens to be the president of the ALP, Mr McLean, describes the announcement of a package by which a remote commercial TV service might finally be brought to rural areas as a "crazy business" and I ask—

(1) Does the Minister see this statement as indicating opposition by the ALP to the RCTS?

(2) Does it confirm that the ATEA and the ALP are interested only in maintaining a monopoly by the media gaints via a national beam service?

(3) What is the current position in respect of negotiations to finalise this long-awaited and vital service for rural and remote Queensland?

**Mr McKECHNIE:** The attitude of the State president of the ALP is absolutely shocking. Despite the fact that the problems of providing remote commercial television in Queensland have been caused by changed Federal Government policies, which allow for aggregation and that sort of thing, the Government has said that it will work closely with the Federal Minister, Senator Evans, to try to solve the problems. The Government expects joint co-operation with the Federal Government in that regard. The State Government will judge Senator Evans on the results. The Queensland Government has said what it is prepared to do. I am waiting for him to declare what he is prepared to do.

In speaking about divisions, I should talk about the divisions in the ALP. The State president of the ALP is criticising this State Government for wanting to allocate a subsidy to provide remote commercial television for the bush when it is the actions of his own Government in Canberra that have caused the necessity for the subsidy. I just want to know what is the division between the State president and the parliamentary wing in this State. What do members opposite say? Do they support the Government? Do they want to help people in the bush. Do they want State Government funds used to fix up the problem that their Federal colleagues have caused? I would be interested to hear what the Leader of the Opposition has to say about that. I will take an interjection if he will make one. No, he will not make one.

It is very plain to me that the State president of the ALP, Mr McLean, is linked to the Bonds and the other media magnates who have got so many favours from the Federal Government, and that he is trying to do what he can to get a national beam out of Sydney rather than local broadcasting out of Queensland. That is part of the pay-off, and the State president must be part of that deal. That that is happening is a shame.

In the three parts of his question the honourable member asked about the current state of play. The state of play on this side of the House is very clear. The National Party conference unanimously—every man and every woman—supported the State Government's initiatives to try to bring together a package to provide remote commercial television to people in the bush. The Government is also united with the party in this

regard in that last Monday, on the deal that I took to Cabinet to try to provide a package for the people out in those isolated areas, there was not one dissenting voice. The deal was approved unanimously. Of course, nothing can be finalised until the attitude of the Federal Government is known. The State Government is waiting with bated breath for that. The State Government offer is there; it is clear. I have put it in writing to the buyers of Q-Net. I believe that with goodwill on all sides it will come to fruition fairly quickly although now the proposal is being torpedoed by the State president of the ALP.

I just hope that for once in their lives members opposite will display a little bit of political courage and get out and publicly attack their State president, who is putting the monopoly interests of Telecom and the media barons ahead of the interests of the people in isolated areas.

#### **Use of Hale Street for Route 20**

**Mr DAVIS:** In asking a question of the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing, I refer to his answer to a question from me in this House about the devastation that would be caused by the use of Hale Street for the proposed Route 20.

**Mrs Chapman** interjected.

**Mr DAVIS:** Because this question deals with the lives of people, it is an important one.

The Minister answered on that occasion that he would have good news for the residents.

**Government members** interjected.

**Mr DAVIS:** Mr Deputy Speaker, I am asking a question about residents who will lose their homes, but all I can hear is the rabble opposite.

The Minister told the House that he would have good news for the residents. From his statement last week, the good news appears to be that he will suggest to the Brisbane City Council that it change the route so that it will take over the Petrie Terrace State School. Does he call that good news, or is it a sweetheart agreement between him and the Brisbane City Council?

**Mr HINZE:** In reply to the prince consort——

**Mr Davis:** Never mind the jokes; just give me an answer.

**Mr HINZE:** I will come and give out some tickets for the honourable member. It might help.

**Mr Davis:** Make a big joke of it. Forty houses are going to be devastated.

**Mr HINZE:** The honourable member for Brisbane Central reminds me of Groucho Marx. Honourable members should take a look at him some time.

The Main Roads Department, in consultation with the Brisbane City Council engineers, has given sufficient consideration to the project in Hale Street. It is necessary that a decision be made in the interests of all concerned. I do not think that one can justify holding up any longer those people who wish to sell their properties. A decision has been made.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Row):** Order! The time allotted for questions has now expired.

**BILLS: REMAINING STAGES****Allocation of Time-limit Order**

**Hon. L. W. POWELL** (Isis—Leader of the House) (4.06 p.m.), by leave, without notice: I move—

“That so much of the Standing Orders and Sessional Orders be suspended to enable the following Bills to be passed through all their remaining stages on this sitting day. At the times so specified Mr Speaker or the Chairman, as the case may be, shall put all remaining questions necessary to pass the Bill including clauses en bloc and any amendments to be moved by the Minister in charge of the Bill, without further amendment or debate—

Harbours Act and Other Acts Amendment Bill: second reading at 5.30 p.m., report from committee and third reading at 6 p.m.;

Superannuation Acts Amendment Bill (No. 2): second reading at 9 p.m., report from Committee and third reading at 9.30 p.m.”

Question put; and the House divided—

AYES, 46		NOES, 37	
Ahern	Hynd	Ardill	Schuntner
Alison	Katter	Beanland	Scott
Austin	Lane	Braddy	Shaw
Berghofer	Lester	Burns	Sherlock
Bjelke-Petersen	McCauley	Campbell	Smith
Booth	McKechnie	Casey	Smyth
Borbidge	McPhie	Comben	Vaughan
Burreket	Menzel	D'Arcy	Warburton
Chapman	Neal	De Lacy	Warner
Clauson	Nelson	Eaton	Wells
Cooper	Newton	Gibbs, R. J.	Yewdale
Elliott	Powell	Goss	
Fraser	Randell	Gygar	
Gately	Sherrin	Hamill	
Gibbs, I. J.	Simpson	Hayward	
Gilmore	Slack	Innes	
Glasson	Stephan	Knox	
Gunn	Stoneman	Lee	
Harper	Tenni	Lickiss	
Harvey	Veivers	McElligott	
Henderson		Mackenroth	
Hinton	<i>Tellers:</i>	McLean	<i>Tellers:</i>
Hinze	Littleproud	Milliner	Davis
Hobbs	FitzGerald	Palaszczuk	Prest

Resolved in the affirmative.

**HARBOURS ACT AND OTHER ACTS AMENDMENT BILL****Second Reading**

Debate resumed from 15 October (see p. 3315).

**Mr D'ARCY** (Woodridge) (4.16 p.m.): It is a disgrace that a Bill as far-reaching and as important as the Harbours Act and Other Acts Amendment Bill is to be forced through the House without members being given a proper opportunity to speak to it. Privately and all round the State, the Minister has been threatening to square up with some of his former National Party mates who hold positions on harbour boards and whom he wants to get rid of. Those persons are aware of that.

As I said, the Bill is wide-ranging and covers large sections of the existing Act. The most important change that the Bill will bring about is the reorganisation of harbour boards in Queensland. When one looks at the overall management of Queensland waterways, one has to divide it into the sections covered by the port authorities, the

harbour boards and the water authorities, and then, of course, the Harbours Corporation of Queensland.

In real terms, the waterways authorities—the harbour boards and the port authorities—do exactly the same job for the Government as do statutory authorities. Including the Gold Coast Waterways Authority and the Port of Brisbane Authority, there are only eight such authorities. All other harbours and waterway areas in Queensland are controlled by the Harbours Corporation of Queensland, which is under the control of the Director of the Department of Harbours and Marine, Mr John Leech.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The Chamber will come to order. I ask those members standing in the aisles to resume their seats or to expedite their departure.

**Mr D'ARCY:** In an overview of what the Minister is doing, the Opposition is very unhappy with the legislation and intends to oppose some clauses of it. The Minister proposes to remove local authority representation from the harbour boards. I will explain later my reasons for opposing that. The Opposition will be opposing clause 11, which is the major clause in the Bill, and which integrates that procedure.

**Mr Tenni:** You wouldn't do that, would you?

**Mr D'ARCY:** Of course the Opposition is going to oppose it. The Opposition will not be given a chance to do that. Although there are many provisions in it with which the Opposition obviously agrees, the Opposition will probably be placed in a position of having to oppose the total second reading of the Bill.

I do not think it is that important that the Minister has reduced to seven the number of people who can participate on harbour boards, as has been the case with the Gold Coast Waterways Authority, which has not been very successful.

**Mr Tenni:** It has been very successful.

**Mr D'ARCY:** Why does it owe so much money? Perhaps the Minister can explain that in his reply.

A major part of the Bill deals with the reorganisation of the number of people on harbours boards, their type of representation and how they are appointed to new harbour boards.

The other clauses of the Bill deal with the reclamation of land that is resumed by private companies and used for waterways; for example, canals and harbours land that is already freehold will be allowed to be the property, within the freehold, of the developer or the owner. In the past, that was not so. Land that became waterways was ceded to the authority and generally leased back by the authority to the owner. The Opposition is concerned about that provision because it gives the developer too much power.

The next area covered by the Bill relates to advertising by-laws. It is obvious that the Government intends to introduce by-laws by publishing them in a Green Paper. That seems to be a standard procedure these days. Interested people will at least have an opportunity to study the Green Paper and the by-laws that might be introduced by the Department of Harbours and Marine. They can then have a proper say. I think that will be an improvement to the Act. It is something that is long overdue. Too often by-laws have been introduced in Queensland, appeared in the gazette and the next thing people realise is that the by-laws are in operation. Where a major review of by-laws is undertaken, people should be given plenty of notice so that they have a chance to object to them.

The Bill will streamline the way in which reclamation procedures are laid down. Although I have been given assurances by the Minister and by the director that those procedures will be used only in trivial matters, the Opposition is concerned that some rights in relation to waterways objections will be taken away. If one goes one step further, one realises that at the court level that does not occur and that people still have the right to object to the court. It is for the court to determine whether the objector has a

reasonable interest in the reclamation. In objecting to a reclamation, the objector has to show the court that he has a reasonable interest in the reclamation.

The Bill also makes it a lot easier for the department to reclaim and sell land. Under the system that has existed in the past, land that was reclaimed was generally reclaimed in situations in which the Government claimed ownership of the land and then sold it at auction through the Land Administration Commission or to a developer. This Bill will now allow the port authorities to negotiate with a lessee in relation to reclaimed land. That has some potential for danger, and I intend to refer to the problems that are being experienced on the Gold Coast with the lease that was granted Andys and Griffin Islands under a scheme that involved a peppercorn rental. Later the islands were worth millions of dollars. If that was the intention of the developer, the Government should have looked after its own interests. The Opposition will be opposing the provisions in the Bill between clauses 42 and 47.

This Bill also has a provision that is a little difficult to come to terms with. Obviously, waterways authorities that allow a jetty to be built for private purposes are now to make sure that that jetty cannot be used for commercial purposes. It appears that trawlermen, for example, who buy expensive real estate blocks with the idea of tying up commercial boats would have to apply for a commercial jetty for that purpose.

Because of the way in which the development is occurring, commercial activity should not be carried out on a jetty in a private area. I am still concerned about a man who is unable to keep his boat—for example, a trawlerman who has a boat that is in good condition but is tied up for five or six months of the year. That provision will have to be supervised with some sympathy.

Probably the next major change that affects the interests of the Government relates to levies. The port authorities have operated largely without paying a levy except when the Government sought to impose one. Because of the situation in Bowen and Rockhampton, where the harbour boards were left with a debt of half a cent per ton on non-agricultural products, a levy has been imposed by the Government. It now appears that harbour boards will pay between 5 and 6 per cent of their gross income in levy to the Government. Although that is obviously an economic measure, it could create overcommercialisation. In real terms, developers should be managers of the very vital facility of Queensland's waterfront lands. The Opposition will be opposing clause 71, which makes it easier for the Government to enforce a levy on harbour boards.

Before this Bill was mooted, great concern was expressed by some harbour boards—

**Mr Tenni** interjected.

**Mr Prest:** Be quiet, you mug.

**Mr D'ARCY:** I ask the Minister to shut up and cop it. I have plenty for him today.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Row):** Order! The honourable member for Port Curtis will withdraw the uncomplimentary remark that he made against the Minister.

**Mr Prest:** I reckon that it was complimentary.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member will withdraw the remark.

**Mr PREST:** I withdraw.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I will not tolerate any further cross-fire in the Chamber.

**Mr D'ARCY:** As I was saying, concern was expressed by some of the harbour boards in their reported meetings with the Minister as early as July of this year. In one such meeting, the Minister advised the chairmen that, in keeping with his promise and in good faith, he wished to advise the chairmen in advance of proposed amendments to the Harbours Act that would affect the constitutional make-up of port authorities and payment of levies by port authorities to the State Government.

At that time the Minister advised that there would be no good news. In fact, he advised that there would be very bad news. Dealing with the bad news—the Minister advised that, based upon a consultant's report from which recommendations had been made after consultation with all boards and Government departments, it was proposed to change the format of the boards to restrict them in size and the manner of appointment of representatives. The Minister said that it was agreed that boards in excess of seven were excessive, and it was proposed that membership of the boards would vary from three to five or seven. Henceforth, there was to be no official representation from local authorities. Obviously, the Minister had already discussed that matter with the president of the Local Government Association, Sir Albert Abbott.

Cabinet had already made its decision. However, before the matter was finalised, the Minister had been instructed to have formal discussions with local government and port authority chairmen. The make-up of the board should comprise all Government appointees, businessmen and those associated with port authorities; for example, in the Cairns area, someone from the sugar, fishing, tourism or airport industry.

At the suggestion of one member of Cabinet, there could be one variation and consideration should be given to the appointment of a representative from an adjoining local authority. It makes one wonder how Cabinet arrives at its decisions. It appears that the interpretation of that decision was to ensure that all representatives did not come from a closely knit group.

This House can see at a glance the danger in this Government's appointing all representatives to boards that are administering large amounts of money and large amounts of land in the most sensitive and environmental areas of Queensland. Their record to date has been appalling. We are aware that there is no real coastal management, that development has occurred willy-nilly at the whim of developers, and that this Government's record of personnel on boards is shocking. The Minister's argument that the number of board members be decreased so that the number of members on quangos could be reduced is ludicrous. When we realise that there are only seven boards in Queensland—seven boards with only up to 11 members on each—it is ridiculous if he thinks he is going to affect the 1 300 quangos in Queensland. One wonders why he did not do something about the unruly situation when he ruined the portfolio by doing something about the fire brigade boards. Perhaps he did not have so many scores to settle with people in local government in that area.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! I ask the honourable member to maintain relevance to the subject under discussion.

**Mr D'ARCY:** It is a disgrace that we are starting at the wrong end of the ladder in attacking the quangos. But the danger of taking local authorities away will be that development will be jeopardised. Local authorities or their representatives on harbour boards are well aware of what local development had to take place and what the provisions were for planning on the long-term for the area. That development will be carried out by the Minister's appointees in Brisbane. The harbour board areas today—Cairns for example—encompass hotel areas, a large section of the airport and a large number of tourist facilities. It is, as I said, most sensitive and vital, both economically and environmentally, for Queensland. It has been the Opposition's intention for a long time to have all the departments involved in long-term strategies of managing the Queensland coast. This Government keeps promising it, but nothing ever happens. What happens in this State is that a developer pops his head up and somehow steamrolls through local authorities and every department his right to a particular area of waterfront land of Queensland. What actually occurs in the end is that the developer in most cases destroys the most valuable asset in the areas and the beauty is gone for all time. The buildings age very quickly.

Queensland has the worst record of this type of tourist development anywhere in the world. Quite frankly, after the turn of the century we will find that we will be left behind because the beauty spots will be destroyed. The very things that brought the

tourists to these waterfront lands and beauty areas are being destroyed by big buildings—they will be old buildings then—and big complexes, instead of being left intact. The Government should find an area that is acceptable to the various departments—the National Parks and Wildlife Service, the Department of Harbours and Marine and the local authorities—and then make that area the lease area. The environmental people want to see that the best forefront lands are protected so that they can be used by those tourists. Instead, we cut out our harbours, dredge everything up and put big buildings all over them.

New South Wales has had in the north coast a solid plan and has been able to protect its areas. In a century's time, the people of the north coast of New South Wales will be laughing at the depleted and sadly used areas in Queensland. It has been this Government's legacy to the people of Queensland that it has been able to sell out to its developer mates the best and the most useful land, and have this land used for tourist purposes. I predict that in the long term, they will drive the tourist away from these magnificent areas which they are in the process of destroying. We need a change of Government so that we can eventually in this State see a real strategic plan; particularly for the waterfront and the harbour areas.

This Bill, of course, does nothing but bring the guide-lines back under the control of a Minister of this Government. We are all aware of the tremendously bad record that this Government has in protecting the environment and in protecting the dollar of the Queensland public. In his second-reading speech, the Minister had the cheek to suggest that the proposal to increase the levy is based mainly on the rationale that the port authorities are occupying Crown land obtained in most cases at no cost to the authority concerned. And then he has the audacity to say, "Frankly, I think that it is only fair that the State Government should expect a return for the use of such a valuable and scarce resource as this Crown land." I could not agree with him more, except that what he is saying has not been the practice of this Government. I intend to pursue that point at a future time in my speech, when I will point out some disastrous effects of the Government's giving away both the environment and the economy of Queensland to developers.

I go back to the original way that the Minister introduced this Bill. One chairman was so disgusted that he wrote a paper about what the effects would be. When asked as to when it would take effect, as it was felt that there should be a phasing-in of this change, particularly if it was made up of new boards which had all new representatives, the Minister mentioned that in all probability some of the existing board members would still remain but he should emphasise that the new structure would take effect immediately it was proclaimed through Cabinet and not deferred until March 1988, that is, obviously, when this Bill will be passed through Parliament. When questioned on the timing, the Minister replied that he was to report back to Cabinet on his discussions with the chairman and he first envisaged this would take place in August, but later suggested that it should all be finalised in September. It is now being rushed through in November, of course, because the Minister is desperate to settle with some of his friends—former friends—before the House rises for Christmas.

Although the Minister did not comment on the manner of the appointment of the chairman and deputy chairman—and this was not asked—I assume that the Cabinet at the time of appointing the actual board would designate the chairman and deputy chairman. Of course, under this Bill, that is the case.

The Minister went on to say that there would be a number of amendments to the Harbours Act and these would give more direct autonomy to local boards—such as in dealing with small areas of reclamation.

Another matter of concern was leased land vested in the port authorities. It is proposed that all this land would be handed back to the Lands Department, which would negotiate lease rentals. I do not read the Bill this particular way, but I take it that it is intended to give the lessee a chance to be able to maintain reclaimed land. As I said earlier, I see a danger in this.

The Minister said he did not go along with this proposal but would go to bat for port authorities so that land vested and leased out, such as the Hilton land, should remain under the control of port authorities—so I suppose port authorities had a win on that matter—but that a lease-back fee may have to be paid to the Lands Department. The chairman said that he drew to the Minister's attention that port authorities would have spent many thousands of dollars in reclamation and development costs of these parcels of land and that the Lands Department should bear this in mind when setting lease rentals.

The very bad news is that port authorities, when preparing their budget for 1987-88, are to provide for the levy payment to the State Government of an amount of four to six per cent of gross revenue and this is to cover all funds. The minister advised the chairman to work on 6 per cent. Naturally this brought about a considerable amount of discussion and the Minister said that he would elaborate in more detail at the special meeting. The Minister has given a direction, and, as he said himself, an emphatic direction, that this levy is to be included in the budget without any increase in charges, as the department will not approve of these. It is a dictatorial attitude that the Minister has adopted.

The Minister said that it is a case of having to pull our belts in, as all Government departments have to. The Minister mentioned that he would be looking at a reduction of 200 in his departmental staff. He told the board chairman that they would have to curtail costs, review staff numbers and look at all ways in which savings can be made. The Government will not accept increased charges to cover the levy. There was considerable discussion on what is general revenue. The Minister said it included all items of income, including interest on investments, even though these funds were loan funds for which work had not been completed, although boards are paying interest and redemption on the loan amount once the loan fund has been raised.

The section of the chairman's report that concerned me related to staffing levels. These boards, for example, employ some 800 persons throughout Queensland. If the Minister, by introducing these levies and these methods, intends to reduce services by cutting staff—and that is what it would boil down to—it means that the people of Queensland are not only going to pay into consolidated revenue through the harbour boards, but also they are not going to get the service they have been getting from them in the past.

The Minister then opened the meeting for questions. The chairman expressed concern over the airport revenue and items such as reimbursement and dredging for the navy. The Minister then said he was prepared to look at airport revenue, and that the chairman would have to now prepare a submission. The Minister has also invited the chairman to make any comments on the proposal of levying and gross income revenue.

The board's officers were instructed immediately to prepare a case within seven days, as the Minister was going back to Cabinet fairly quickly. It was not his wish for this matter to drag on before getting to Cabinet. Of course, as it happened, it is obvious that this Minister made up his mind about the way that this was going to occur well and truly before any of these submissions even reached his desk. It was a foregone conclusion.

The Parliament can see from this port authority chairman's report of the Minister's handling of this original proposal to cut the number of board personnel that it was not based on the rationale of what was good for Queensland or what was good for the port authorities of Queensland; it was what would look good for the Minister. He was able to go to Cabinet and say he was going to reduce the port authorities and he was also in the position to say, "I'm going to appoint every chairman, deputy chairman, and port authority board member in Queensland."

When one looks at the ramifications of that, and the way that that could work to this Government's advantage but to the disadvantage of the people of Queensland, I am terribly concerned that local authorities do not necessarily have a right to representation on the new boards. There may be some sops, where National Party members will be

put on the boards, but if we look at the boards as they are at the present moment, with Government appointees, we must ask: what advantage—and I don't intend to draw conclusions—have personnel, the same old hacks who keep coming out, brought to Queensland quangos and to development in Queensland?

If one adds the Government's record to the statements made by the Minister about this particular Bill, one could be even more concerned, because in the *Gold Coast Bulletin* on 13 October, the Minister is quoted under the headline "Business-like running of ports sought" as saying—

"Queensland port authorities should be run by business people capable of handling multi-million dollar commercial operations, the Queensland Harbour Board's Association conference at Gladstone has been told."

I am sure that Ron Camm, Max Hodges, Llew Edwards and Claude Wharton and others make a tremendous contribution to the development of Queensland.

**Mr FitzGerald:** They do, that's right.

**Mr D'ARCY:** Of course they don't. They are sinecures.

**Mr FitzGerald:** You're being facetious. It's hard to get that into *Hansard*.

**Mr D'ARCY:** I am being facetious, yes.

**Mr FitzGerald:** I know you are.

**Mr D'ARCY:** The honourable member has helped me to get it in. I thank him.

The article continues—

"Maritime Minister Martin Tenni said proposed amendments to the Harbours Act would mean smaller port authority boards would be run by a maximum of seven members.

All would be selected on the basis of their skills in running major business organisations.

He said the system had already been successfully adopted by the Gold Coast Waterways Authority. . ."

If the finances of that organisation are looked at, they leave a bit to be desired. In fact, my colleague the member for Bundaberg has handed me a copy of the annual report of the Commissioner of Water Resources. It shows that the assistance given to the Gold Coast Waterways Authority by way of authorised borrowings in 1986-87 ran to \$5.5m, and in 1987-88 it will run to \$7.924m.

The Port of Brisbane Authority could not even manage the Cairncross dock, despite the fact that it was getting work, because it did not know how to go about it.

**Mr Tenni:** Don't make a fool of yourself.

**Mr D'ARCY:** It is the Minister who made a fool of himself. What he did in relation to the dock is an absolute disgrace. In real terms all he did was to allow people to be sacked from jobs when the port authority was mismanaging the dock to such an extent that it could not keep it operative. It was not even looking for work. The Minister has heard that argument before. I do not intend to go into it again.

The article continues—

"It will replace the present system where port boards are overwhelmingly comprised of local authority representatives. Mr. Tenni told the conference that port authorities had a vital role to play in providing employment and prosperity in Queensland in the 1990s.

He said this goal could be better achieved if the membership of port authorities was placed on a 'sounder business-like footing'."

Those statements sound very much to me as though this Government is going to again sell out the most vital environmental areas on the coast of Queensland under the guise of sound business.

**Mr FitzGerald:** Oh!

**Mr D'ARCY:** I will give some examples.

As I said, there is no talk of putting on local authority reps who know something about the development of the area; there is no talk of imposing environmental controls. The Government is going to have a set of developers and business people willy-nilly trying to raise money for it by selling off Queensland's best and most valuable land.

The Minister has other problems within this department. He is the Minister who left the fire service levies in this State with massive problems, as a result of which the State's fire services are in a mess. He ran away from that portfolio and now he is attempting to bring the Department of Harbours and Marine undone.

I have a copy of an internal memo from the Minister's department. Obviously somebody within the department was quite disgruntled. The memo contains several comments. I presume it dropped off the back of a truck. That memo states—

“The Department has recently reorganised the following internal reviews carried out by senior members of the department. Although the review and the reorganisation were well researched and implemented, several issues have arisen. Knowledge of these issues have not become public. The current Minister has ensured that the new organisation is headed by people who are sympathetic to his views, and although the Minister and the Director do not always see eye to eye on every issue, the new department managers, that is, the assistant directors are well known to Mr. Tenni and have proved to be of assistance to him in the past.”

That is very interesting. The memo says also—

“It is even rumoured that the current Director does not have a long-term future in the organisation.”

Perhaps the Minister has fallen out with him, too. The memo continues—

“Following the appointment of the new managers several decisions have been made which must be questioned. The Marine Operations Branch now covers areas such as navigational aids, boating and fishing patrols, surveys, piloting and the Marine Board. Yet the Marine Board is supposed to be an independent body whose task is to maintain the safety standards of marine activities in the State. These activities range from hire boats on the Nerang River to berthing of huge coal carriers at Hay Point.”

The memo states also that other members on the marine board are drawn from industry and that the most notable member is Keith Williams of Hamilton Island. The memo says that in his role as a Marine Board member he has been instrumental in altering the safety standards and has reaped the benefits of those changes for his own fleet of vessels on Hamilton Island.

**Mr Tenni:** He doesn't own any—

**Mr D'ARCY:** I was about to say that personally I am not aware that Mr Williams now owns the vessels, but they certainly operate out of that island, and he did own the vessels at one stage.

The Marine Board minutes of 1 July show that standards were changed so that charter vessels are now able to cruise to the outer reef in winds in excess of 30 knots. That is much the same as the conditions that prevailed during the incident off Townsville. The minutes also show that, when cruising in these so-called sheltered waters, the vessels are capable of carrying large numbers of tourists and that they are often manned with a minimum number of crew, some of whom have only minimal safety training.

This department, which has just seen the Reef Link II come unstuck with a fire, has not properly handled what happened with the Noel Buxton. The Marine Board takes a long time—sometimes it is months—to produce its reports, yet these same types of catamarans are operating off the Queensland coast. Obviously they will put to sea in conditions even worse than those mentioned in those Marine Board minutes.

I believe that the Low Island operators have also expressed an interest in the operation of similar catamarans. Because I have seen the Wallaces' operation up there, I know what it is about and I have no complaints with it. However, 400-odd people are taken on cruises to the outer Barrier Reef in virtually gale-force winds. That could be a recipe for an absolute disaster.

The information from the department points out several other things that the board has been involved in that have to be cause for concern in Queensland. The board is not adopting world standards or even normal standards. It is granting limited licences and certificates to people who are totally colour blind. It has also received pressure from oil companies to allow the Brisbane River to be used by oil tankers for passage at night. As I said, according to this document, which is a copy of the minutes of the meeting of 1 July 1987, Keith Williams was also present at that meeting of the Marine Board. Those minutes state—

“A request from Hamilton Island Cruises for approval to operate the vessels ‘QUICK CAT II’ and ‘TASSIE DEVIL 2001’ in Class G limits during operating times of strong wind warnings and in other than daylight hours.”

The board's response to this was—

“With regard to the operations of ‘G Class’ vessels, the Board has previously required that operations of these vessels be not allowed when the Bureau of Meteorology has issued a strong wind warning for the area.

Coastal areas for which these warnings are issued are quite large in extent and may not reflect local conditions in a limited area. The Board will, in future, require cessation of operations by ‘G Class’ vessels only at such times as a gale warning is current. The Board takes this attitude expecting that ‘G Class’ operators will at all times exercise due care and the practice of good seamanship to ensure the safety of their vessels and the safety and comfort of their passengers is assured.

Accordingly the Board amends its requirements by deleting the term ‘strong wind warnings current’ where it appears in Clause 3.2.1 and inserting in its stead the term ‘gale warning current’. The Board further amends its requirements by deleting Clause 3.2.3.”

**Mr Tenni:** You have created a real storm, haven't you?

**Mr D'ARCY:** It is up to the Minister to handle the storm that is now raging outside. No doubt, in his impeccable style, he will.

The Noel Buxton is back in operation despite the fact that the inquiry has not yet produced its full report on the shortcomings of that vessel. Advertisements for passengers have been placed in the *Australian*. The Minister wants the House to believe that he will appoint the right people and that they will be the right ones for the development of harbour boards on the Queensland coast. From the internal memo from his own department, obviously he is not trusted. The department does not trust the Minister's judgment and does not trust the personnel that he is placing in some of these positions. The department is virtually saying that the Minister is placing in these positions people who owe him favours to gain total control over the department.

If the National Party wants to review its style of government and say that Joh has gone too far, surely the Minister, Mr Tenni, has also gone too far. His dictatorial style involves the barter and pay-back system.

Let me return to what is the crux of the Bill, that is as it deals with reclamations. The Minister said that, quite frankly, he thinks it is only fair that the State Government should expect a fair return for the use of such a valuable and scarce resource as Crown

land. He was referring to waterfront land in Queensland. That almost makes me laugh, because when I entered this place in 1972 I held the view that the State's most valuable resource was the waterfront leasehold land that the Government was in a position to control. That view was correct. One of my crusades as the member for Albert involved what are known as Andys and Griffin Islands on the Gold Coast. In fact, I ended up being issued with many writs and falling out very badly with the Land Administration Commission. One of the writs was from the then commissioner, Brian Heffernan.

I want to refer to that area and to a speech I made in the House on 13 December 1983, which relates to Andys and Griffin Islands, which are at Paradise Point at the northern end of the Gold Coast. I will now acquaint honourable members with what actually occurred. Andys and Griffin Islands are small mangrove islands just off the base of Paradise Point on the Gold Coast. This Government granted a lease of those islands. Under that lease the lessee was required to pump the islands up. In other words, he pumped sand all over the mangroves and destroyed the islands. In fact, those two small islands on the northern end of the Gold Coast, which were well known for their fish habitat, were turned from mangrove islands into large sand mounds. In fact, one sand mound joined the two islands together, which destroyed the natural flow of the water at the southern part of the Coomera River. The Gold Coast City Council then allowed the land to be subdivided.

It is well known and documented that Jim Hansford, one of the partners of the present member for Albert, Mr Ivan Gibbs, who was then the alderman for the area, was involved in that development. Approvals were sought by the Government, granted by the Government and then organised through the Gold Coast City Council.

I have gone too far in this place to start pointing fingers. However, what I want to do is outline the end result, because I feel that I was justified in saying what I did in the late 1960s and the early 1970s. The fact is that today a large part of the environmental areas at the southern end of Moreton Bay and the northern end of the Gold Coast has been destroyed. What was done went against every recommendation of every department in this Government. It went against fisheries, Harbours and Marine, the original Lands Administration Commission proposals, the Beach Protection Authority, the National Parks and Wildlife Service, and the legislation that was passed in this Parliament and which was supposed to prevent the destruction of mangroves.

This is the same Government that not only lost the environment that was necessary to keep tourists in those types of areas—the fishing and the natural beauty—but also cost the tax-payers of this State millions of dollars. What sort of incompetence is that? I wonder whether the real sordid story of Andys and Griffin Islands—the developers and the people in the department who were instrumental in granting those approvals—will ever come out. I cite this as an example of what the Queensland Government is doing to Queensland as a whole. As I have said, not only has the environment been wrecked but also this State has lost millions and millions of dollars.

The Government cannot have it both ways. This Government cannot be the major developer of our frontal lands at the expense of the environment. It has to do one of two things. The point that I make is that Queensland needs development, and nobody would deny that. However, the natural beauty has to be maintained so that the people of Queensland will benefit financially and otherwise from the sale of that asset.

As I have said, I believe that it is time that a proper coastal management plan was developed for Queensland, involving all departments. That is the crux of what the development should be. It should include areas from Coolangatta to Cape York and back across the Gulf of Carpentaria. There would then be a long-term plan that would enable the Government to save the natural and the most accessible beauty spots. In that way the tourist resorts could still be built and people would still have access to those foreshore areas. That is not what is happening in Queensland. The coastal management that this Government allows to take place is a developer's dream and an ecologist's nightmare.

Every development that is taking place in Queensland is designed to fill the pockets of some wasteful, short-term developer who has no interest in the long-term development of Queensland. He is interested only in getting quick quids or quick dollars in the pocket. I cite the Ariadnes, the Skases and the Williamses. What this Government has done to the most valuable asset in Queensland is an absolute disgrace. The National Party Government will be cursed by the future generations for the vandalism that it has carried out of Queensland's environment.

On 26 September 1973, I said in this Chamber—

“I was very pleased to hear the honourable member for Mount Coot-tha admit just now that land is a scarce commodity. In the very portion of the State to which he has referred, his Government”—

and he was a member of the Government at the time—

“has given away special leases to developers at great cost, financially and otherwise, to the people of Queensland.”

A regular visitor to Parliament House and a former member, Mr Armstrong, is recorded in *Hansard* as saying—

“That's a lot of rot!”

I went on to say—

“I shall cite some instances of the giving away of leases to illustrate that what I have claimed is not a lot of rot. In 1969 a special lease of an area of 150 acres on islands near Paradise Point was sold by the Government for \$7,500.”

I might add that it was not even payable at that time. At a later time the \$7,500 was to be paid by the lessee.

At the time I said that the Government as a whole, particularly the Lands Department and the Department of Harbours and Marine, must stand condemned in the eyes of the people for going against its own policies. Because those two departments eventually made recommendations in favour of the development of 150 acres on Andys and Griffin Islands, as well as the 510 acres on Woogoompah Island. At the time I went on to say—

“These islands lie in a prolific fish-breeding area. Even prior to 1969 biologists had warned of the destruction of fish habitats by estuary development. For years the local amateur and professional fishermen have been reaping large harvests of fish and the older residents of the area claim that it contains the best fishing grounds in South-east Queensland. But, in spite of that, the Government, through the Lands Department, has permitted the areas to be pumped up, thereby destroying not only their recreational value but also their tourist potential.

Future members of the boating fraternity and the public in general should be able to use the Southport Broadwater as a playground. However, they will find the level of the islands has been raised by pumping and the land has been rezoned for regional and urban development. The hundreds of thousands of people who will eventually live in urban areas between Brisbane and the border of New South Wales will not be able to enjoy these recreational areas . . .”

In 1973 I said that it was a good area for real estate development. The people will not be able to enjoy those recreation areas, because the Government has failed to shoulder its responsibilities. It has a duty to safeguard the heritage of the people of Queensland, but this area, which is a part of their heritage, is being ruined and given away to greedy land-developers.

I then said—

“On the facts, it is obvious that the Government is allowing the ecology of the area to be destroyed by development, which will mean that it is not available for posterity. It seems that the Government's actions are premeditated in that it is permitting these leases to continue. The leases granted over Andy's and Griffin and Woogoompah Islands state that the developers must commence work within 12

months. I point out to the Minister for Lands that inquiries from the Department of Harbours and Marine about dredging permits revealed that the company concerned with Griffin and Andy's Islands, according to a memo placed on the file—and goodness knows when that happened—started work a week before the year elapsed. However, I can get statutory declarations from people in the area, including professional fishermen and JPs that the work did not commence at that time.”

A week before the lease was supposed to be in place the company broke every condition of that lease. At that time I called on the Minister to cancel the lease and I made a long speech covering those islands. In my speech I referred to the fact that the Gold Coast City Council had dissociated itself, prior to Ivan Gibbs becoming the alderman, from any development in the area, and yet when he became the chairman of the health committee he pushed it through.

From 1969 when I first complained about the granting of a lease for \$7,500, which was never paid, until 1974 when I lost the seat of Albert—I continued to complain about this matter up to that time—the Government could have redeemed those leases for less than \$1m. In fact, it could probably have redeemed them for about \$15,000 or \$20,000 from the companies to which the leases had been granted.

The fact is that today, after approximately 15 years, we are not too far down the track. We are looking at land on the coast of Queensland and we are talking about 150 acres of land on those islands which the Government sold to the developer for \$7,500. That land is currently divided into 1 000 square metre residential blocks, and they are selling for between \$250,000 and \$300,000 each.

**Mr FitzGerald:** If you are so smart, how many did you buy?

**Mr D'ARCY:** It is a shame that the Government Whip cannot understand what I am saying. The Government gave this land away. If the honourable member for Lockyer wants this explained to him again, I will do so.

The Government allowed this company to go ahead and pump sand all over an ecological area. It then sold the land to the developer on a lease-back arrangement for \$7,500. Since then these blocks of land have been sold several times. One cannot blame the later developers for that, but one can blame the Government.

Each of those blocks of land are now selling for between \$250,000 and \$300,000. In fact, that island that the Government sold——

**Mr FitzGerald** interjected.

**Mr D'ARCY:** Of course I do.

**Mr FitzGerald:** How many blocks did you buy in that area at that time?

**Mr D'ARCY:** I bought some, but not in that area.

According to the *Courier-Mail* of 15 June 1987, Australia's most prestigious private and secure residential address will cost more than \$100m. The *Courier-Mail* reported that the first of 49 allotments, each with an average area of more than 1 000 square metres, was expected to go on sale in August. That did not happen. Land prices keep increasing. Lewiac Pty Ltd and the Gold Coast Waterways Authority have planned to fill in, freehold and sell new land. This is in addition to the 150 acres that had already been granted. That development company asked the Government for permission to reclaim more land because of the good prices that it was able to obtain for it. Fortunately, the Gold Coast City Council stood on its dig and knocked back the application. Had the matter been left to the Minister, he would probably have steamrolled it through for some of his mates. If the Bill is going to allow such companies to reclaim extra land on Crown leases, and if the Minister says that they are just trivial pieces of land, we are absolutely routing the conservationists, the economics of the people of Queensland and our heritage by allowing the passage of some clauses of the Bill.

I might add that the island on the Gold Coast has become known as Sovereign Island. The developer wanted to increase the size of the island from 60 hectares to 110 hectares by pumping sand from the Broadwater. That has already been done. Admittedly, the Gold Coast City Council refused to accept the proposal that would have created an additional 100 to 150 blocks. It must be remembered that those blocks are selling for between \$200,000 and \$300,000 each.

**Mr Burreket:** How many have you got?

**Mr D'ARCY:** Had the honourable member listened, he would have found out.

The report states that had the proposal been accepted, extra land worth a net value of \$100m would have been created. In his speech the Minister said, "Frankly, I think it only fair that the State Government should expect a return for the use of such valuable and scarce resources." I hope that my speech is given some value by the media because in 1973 I was able to prove to the Government that the ecological and financial value of the land that it allowed to be sold for \$7,500 would one day be sold at a net profit of about \$300m and that at the same time that development would destroy the tourist potential of the northern end of the Gold Coast and perhaps the whole southern end of Moreton Bay.

Today, the Andys/Griffith/Sovereign Island story is a sordid one. One wonders whether the truth will ever be told. Wally Rae, the former Minister for Lands, received his appointment. I got him out of the House because of the pressure that I applied.

The matter really comes back to the incompetence of the Government to do business. The absolute incompetence of Ministers, such as the Minister for Water Resources and Maritime Services, particularly in the current situation, has been revealed. The Minister for Works and Housing was part of a plot to sell off one of Queensland's most valuable assets and one of the most valuable areas of this State. As a member of Parliament, I am disgusted and distressed that, despite the experiences in the development of the Queensland coastline, a regional plan has not been developed. It is an absolute disgrace that a coastal management plan has not come to light. Developers are running rampant along the Queensland coastline in every waterfront area. Since the tourist development, which I predicted would be the most important aspect of economic development in Queensland during this decade, has come to pass, the Queensland Government has found itself in the hands of every small-minded developer and every small-minded tourist facility developer in this State. There should be a grand plan, but one does not exist. As I said earlier, such a plan should allow the development of the frontal lands for tourist resources and at the same time protect the natural beauty spots, the fish habitats, the estuaries, the reef and all the other attractions that tourists in the next century will come to see. Otherwise, Queensland will be denuded of its most famous and prolific beauty spots while, at the same time, small-minded developers will be allowed to build second-rate and third-rate resorts that will become tired, lazy and non-visited areas.

I intend to table a couple of documents that show the large number of resort proposals that were already approved. I served in this Parliament with Sir Bruce Small, who believed that everything he touched would turn into a development. In terms of his dream for the Gold Coast—he was a johnny-come-lately. He used to bring me plans on a weekly basis and then run off to the Premier. At times he had some horrendous ideas for the development of the Gold Coast, particularly the Southport Spit. Because many of the proposals that Sir Bruce put forward have been adopted, he must be turning in his grave. Many of his proposals were saner than the ones that have been adopted in that area. The Government has chewed away at that natural asset of the people of Queensland.

It makes me sick to hear my ex-school friend Mick Veivers, the member for Southport, say that he is going to protect the Southport Spit. The Lord knows that there is nothing left to protect from this Government. When there was something to protect, I was the member for Albert. I tried my darnedest to make sure that that area was

protected from the ravages of the National Party in the south-east corner of Queensland. The people who live on the Gold Coast have brought a fair bit on themselves by continuing to vote for the National Party members in that area. Eventually they will wake up to themselves.

The people who live on the Gold Coast must realise that it is a city. When it became a city, this Government offered it no assistance whatsoever. During the late sixties and early seventies this Government ignored the Gold Coast as a tourist resort and as a city. In fact, it was provided with probably the poorest quality services of any area with its population anywhere in Queensland. The Government has really raped the Gold Coast. We wanted it to become a city so that it would have the potential to continue to attract tourists far into the next century because of its natural beauty. I despair of the Gold Coast. Its waterways have become sewers, its land has become tremendously expensive, and the frontal areas have been reserved for only the very, very wealthy. In the future, the real residents of the Gold Coast will be forced further and further away from the water. In the future, those people who are now voting for Mr Veivers will have very little access to the area that he claims he wants to protect.

What this Government has done is a joke. I condemn the Minister and his department for their handling of the foreshores. They are always introducing Bills that talk about reclamation of frontal lands; of development, selling off, leasing of frontal lands; of changing personnel in various departments—and particularly on those particular boards so that the Government has more control. Does the Government believe that, by doing so, it will become more efficient? Is that what the Minister is trying to tell us? The Minister is always telling stories about how the Government is going to become more efficient. This is not an isolated story; it is a story about the development of Queensland. This Government ought to hang its head in shame and run for cover.

It is time that Queensland had a Labor Government with policies that would allow honest public servants to co-ordinate a real development plan for the State of Queensland by which our lands—our most valuable asset—can be used for financial long-term gain, not a short-term, money-grabbing Treasury gain. I am talking about a long-term financial and tourist gain for the people of Queensland so that the natural beauty and natural environment of those waterfront areas will be preserved.

This Bill does absolutely nothing towards achieving that objective. If the Opposition gets the opportunity, it will be opposing clauses 11, 42 to 47 and 71.

If the Minister will not take cognisance of the advice that has been given to him in relation to the changing of particular factions, I will be recommending that the Opposition also opposes the third reading of the Bill.

**Mr FITZGERALD (Lockyer) (5.04 p.m.):** This Government has a vital interest in providing efficient and safe harbours for the movement of products in and out of our ports. This Bill is an attempt to streamline Queensland's harbours.

I have read the Bill thoroughly and I am a member of the Minister's committee. This Bill is necessary to bring about changes that are needed to modernise some of the old structures that have been in place for a long time.

**Mr BEANLAND (Toowong) (5.05 p.m.):** I rise in this debate to express in the limited time available my concern about and very strong opposition to three proposals that the Government is putting forward this evening. First of all, the legislation is clearly an attack on local government. Secondly, the Minister has very cleverly hidden in the Bill taxes similar to those it has hidden in coal freights.

**Mr FitzGerald interjected.**

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

**Mr BEANLAND:** The Minister is giving sweeping powers to the Gold Coast Waterways Authority. I will examine those powers one by one. Firstly, I look at the local authority representation in relation to that harbour board. Naturally, the National

Party Government is very concerned about this. That can be seen by the number of interjections. This legislation is a direct attack on local government—nothing more and nothing less. What the Government is really saying is, “Look here, local government cannot be trusted to agree to collect these hidden taxes. What we really want to do is to centralise power in the Minister.” Of course, that is what the Minister is doing. The Minister knows that he is centralising power. That has been seen in other Bills that have come before the House. Every Minister of the Crown is attempting to centralise power in his particular area of jurisdiction. Today it is the turn of the Minister for Water Resources.

The removal of local authority representatives from harbour boards will enable the Minister to dictate his terms clearly to the harbour boards. If the harbour board members do not agree with what the Minister wants, he will be able to bring pressure to bear. If they continue to disagree, he will be able to sack them. Under the present arrangements, he is unable to do that.

However, many of the local authorities do not go along calmly with the Minister's proposals. Local authorities throughout the State are shocked that the Government would sweep them aside in this manner and remove their representatives from the boards. Local authorities are concerned about what is happening with harbour boards. It is a sensitive issue. Harbour boards control large areas of land, normally in provincial cities. They have a significant effect on the economy of the towns, cities and regions in which they operate.

**Mr FitzGerald interjected.**

**Mr BEANLAND:** Because they are large areas, it is a sensitive issue.

I can understand why the Minister wants to gain additional powers in this regard. However, to just wipe local government aside in this manner is just not good enough.

**Mr Tenni interjected.**

**Mr BEANLAND:** What the Minister has tried to imply is that 11 board members are more than what is required. In his second-reading speech, he indicated——

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! I suggest that the Honourable Minister might confine his remarks to the appropriate time when he is replying. Some of the other interjections in the House are rather on the loud side. I ask the House to come to order.

**Mr BEANLAND:** I am sure that I am cutting the nerve a little. I thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker.

When the Minister introduced the Bill, he indicated that the boards were too large to be effective and to allow for effective participation and decision-making. I ask, “Does that mean that State Cabinet is too large with 18 members? Does that mean that State Cabinet is not an efficient decision-making process? Does it mean that it is a shambles, or what is the position?” Clearly, that is what the Minister is saying in his second-reading speech.

If honourable members look at the Minister's proposals, they will see that he is proposing a three-year term, which is the same as the period between local authority elections. Obviously, in his second-reading speech the Minister was attempting to point out all sorts of logistical problems by saying that members had to travel long distances and that that had caused problems in their attending harbour board meetings. At some time in the future, nothing will prevent the Minister from appointing people who have great distances to travel. Members of various boards, such as fire brigade boards and hospital boards, naturally have to travel long distances as well. The Minister is trying to prop up a very weak argument. I am surprised at this Minister, because he would not usually come at that sort of thing. Obviously he is under some kind of pressure; obviously he has noticed that some of the other Ministers have been able to centralise power within Cabinet, and, of course, he wants to gain some power for himself.

To say that local authority representatives do not have the skill to run port authorities is another assertion that is too much for the imagination. Local authority representatives on fire brigade boards and hospital boards are representatives on a whole range of boards and organisations, not to mention the local authorities themselves. Naturally, a number of senior officers are employed to help them and provide assistance similar to that provided on various other boards, as the Minister would be fully aware. That is what makes the Minister's whole argument so poor. No doubt the Minister will get stuck into me in his reply and make all sorts of wonderful statements; but the point is that the Minister's statements do not need opposition for them to fall. The Minister's statements fall of their own accord.

The Local Government Association is strongly opposed to changes to the method of appointing representatives to these boards. The Local Government Association believes that it is absolutely essential to have local authority representatives as members of the boards, particularly representatives from adjoining local authorities, because a great deal of co-ordination is involved in day-to-day operations of local authority areas.

The activities of harbour boards and local authorities are very much intertwined. Naturally, local authorities want to have the right not merely to have representatives on the boards but to nominate the representatives, which is vitally important. The Minister will probably indicate later that he might consider appointing one or two local authority representatives; but in some cases he might not. Some areas may cause more concern than others. I notice that the Minister seems to be having a bit of trouble in Townsville lately—something that has obviously concerned him a great deal.

At the National Party convention in Townsville, the National Party organisation indicated to the State Government that it ought not attack local authorities and whittle away their powers. An urgency motion was moved to that effect. Yet, after only a few days, the Minister and others who were involved in that whole discussion at the conference have brought forward this kind of legislation which attacks local authorities.

**Mr Borbidge:** You are a fool. You are the biggest fool in this Parliament.

**Mr BEANLAND:** I know why members of the National Party get very upset. They want to be able to say that they are the friends of local authorities. However, the people involved in local authorities throughout this State know what is going on and are aware of the ramifications of this legislation.

I turn now to examine the hidden taxes which are of major concern to harbour boards in terms of the provisions of this legislation. The Minister indicated in his second-reading speech that charges amounting to 6 per cent of the revenue of port authorities would be imposed. I am not sure whether the charge will be calculated on gross revenue, net revenue or some other kind of revenue.

By virtue of clause 71, the Minister will be able to set a levy to be imposed on harbour boards in whichever way he wishes. It is a particular form of hidden taxation. The Minister can set a levy that is based on volume of goods or harbour board revenue, or the amount can be fixed by reference to specified harbour works. The provisions of clause 71 leave the amount to be charged and the extent of the levy very open indeed. In spite of the fact that the levy starts at 6 per cent, I have no doubt that before long, as the Government coffers dry up over the years, the levy will be increased.

**Mr Tenni:** No.

**Mr BEANLAND:** It will happen. Perhaps the present Minister will not be responsible at that time, but another Minister will come along and increase the levy. That is why port authorities are very concerned.

Port authorities are concerned that the levy will have to be met either by cutting back on harbour board works or by passing the increased costs on to the consumer. They fear that the consumer will have to end up footing the bill, which is what usually happens in cases such as this. The end result is that the consumer has to pay more. The

Government has moved to impose a hidden tax in much the same way as it did in respect of coal freight.

I notice also that the Australian Chamber of Shipping has indicated that it is strongly opposed to this iniquitous hidden tax that the Government is imposing. It can see that industry—the consumers or the exporters—will have to pay. It can see that they will have to foot the bill for this tax. No doubt the Government will use this levy to prop up its revenue.

Because of the shortage of time I will not go over many of the points that I want to make. However, I will refer to the Gold Coast Waterways Authority. This legislation certainly gives that authority enormous powers—sweeping powers—to take away the rights of the Gold Coast City Council. The Mayor of the Gold Coast has already resigned over this particular issue. The Government will ensure that the powers of the Gold Coast City Council as well as the rights of individuals are ridden roughshod over.

I am sure that in this debate we will hear from the new member for Southport, because so often during the recent Southport by-election he was heard to say how he would stick up for the rights of the individual. He said that he would not set about having the Broadwater encased in concrete even though the Premier said that the Government's policy in relation to it was set in concrete.

That is exactly what will happen in relation to the powers that are being given to the Gold Coast Waterways Authority. The Government knows it; the Minister knows it; the National Party members on the Gold Coast know it. Over the forthcoming years they will have to live with it. I am sure that the white-shoe brigade will love it because they will be able to hop in and make a feast of it. They will be able to look at doubling the size of Sovereign Island, getting stuck into the Broadwater and, of course, raising islands within the Broadwater, carrying out development on those islands and so on.

It is most interesting to note that the Gold Coast Waterways Authority can undertake joint ventures. The National Party is now entering into joint venture arrangements with the Gold Coast Waterways Authority. I would have thought that that was more of a socialistic activity. However, the Government seems to be intent on getting involved in those sorts of activities through the Gold Coast Waterways Authority. It is something that not only the council on the Gold Coast is extremely concerned about, but also the people of the Gold Coast. Over a very short period, the very things that I have mentioned will come to pass.

**Mr Gygar:** Didn't the National Party promise not to do these things?

**Mr BEANLAND:** As I have already stated, in the Southport by-election the National Party indicated clearly that it would not let that occur. Yet in fact that is the very thing that these amendments will allow the Gold Coast Waterways Authority to do.

Because of the time I will close on that particular note. I do know that the people of the Gold Coast are very concerned about their area and about the Broadwater and the effects that this particular legislation will have on them.

**Mr HINTON (Broadsound) (5.18 p.m.):** It is with pleasure that I rise to support this Bill which, I might say, is a great Bill as far as streamlining the efficiency of our ports in central Queensland is concerned.

**Mr Borbidge:** It is good to hear someone speaking the truth about it.

**Mr HINTON:** I will certainly speak the truth about it. I was very disturbed to hear the rubbish that has been spoken this afternoon by the member for Toowong and the member for Woodridge. One would think that some terrible monster was going to be placed in the ports. I listened closely to the member for Woodridge. He thought that by changing the structure of the board all the environment of the Queensland coast would be destroyed. I suggest that that is absolutely ridiculous.

**Mr Gygar:** They broke a few election promises.

**Mr HINTON:** Actually, I am very proud of my election promises. I promised about \$25m-worth of benefits, and in 10 months I have fulfilled them all. I am sure that is something of which the member of Stafford could not boast.

I turn now to the structure of the boards. The boards are being streamlined by having appointed to them people who have necessary expertise, not necessarily those people who received jobs for the boys from local authorities. I point out that in many instances people from local authorities are not the most appropriate or relevant people for the job. At times they are also very expensive people to appoint to such boards. For example, I point out that one central Queensland board brings a member all the way from Longreach for meetings. In fact, it costs \$500 to get him there for one day for one meeting. I have no doubt that he is a man of great ability, but that is not the way that boards should be run.

They should be run with the minimum administrative cost and the greatest efficiency. The way to do that is not to appoint to boards people from local authorities. They may be good, well-intentioned people. I have no doubt they are just that. However, the Government wants people who have the expertise in the commodities with which the boards are dealing. If salt is being exported from Port Alma, that board needs on it people who know about exporting salt from that port. A board dealing with the export of beef needs on it people who know about that subject. The boards do not necessarily want people who were elected to some local authority by Mrs Jones and Mrs Brown. That point needs to be put into perspective.

I thought the member for Woodridge mounted a major attack on the past performance of boards. Quite frankly, I was disgusted that he attacked not only the integrity of their members but also their performances. By advocating the streamlining of boards by the appointment of people with expertise, I am not suggesting that the job that boards have done in the past has not been up to scratch. I believe, however, that things need to be improved and that we cannot continue to live in the past. However, I was surprised and disappointed to hear the member for Woodridge suggest that these people who are currently on boards are of doubtful integrity and have performed poorly. I am sure those people will be very sorry to hear that and will remember the ALP for those comments.

The member for Woodridge in fact implied that the current members of boards are destroying the environment up and down the coast of Queensland and he even suggested that they were responsible for destroying national parks. I do not know how he worked that out, but that is what he said.

The member for Toowong referred to the revenue that will come from a levy on the existing major harbour boards of Queensland. Many of these boards are quite wealthy and have substantial deposits. The provisions of the Bill will not mean a major cut-back in their capital works; they will mean a cut-back in their funds which, in many cases, are being held in fixed-interest deposits.

When one looks at the fact that in the last 12 months the ALP Federal Government has cut back the State Government's funds by \$68m one can appreciate that either services must be reduced or taxes must be increased. When harbour boards can create a source of income to promote the use of small boat harbours, boat-ramps and small-craft facilities around the State, I do not believe that the people of Queensland should be denied those facilities. In fact, the levy could bring some \$1.5m in additional income to a budget of about \$2m per annum. That is a substantial increase that will greatly improve things for small boat owners.

**Mr De Lacy:** Do you support boat-ramps?

**Mr HINTON:** I certainly support them.

I have a small boat harbour in my electorate at Rosslyn Bay. I am very, very proud of it. I thank the Minister and his staff for the tremendous job in upgrading that small harbour that has been done in the 12 months that I have been here. When I first went down there, quite frankly it was little more than a silt trap that, because it was unsafe,

was visited by very few tourist yachts. Now \$5m has been allocated for the upgrading of that harbour. The north-west wall will be enclosed to make it into one of the best and safest harbours in Queensland. I am sure the member for Port Curtis will appreciate the fact that it will certainly be the best small boat harbour in Central Queensland.

Shortly a marina will be built inside that wall at a cost of \$22m. That marina of 350 berths will be a yachting Mecca for central Queensland. Honourable members have to appreciate that there is no reasonable yachting facility between the Whitsundays and Maryborough. There is no doubt that the Gladstone Harbour Board is putting in a marina of some note. However, that is a day's sailing from the main channel. The Rosslyn Bay harbour is right on the channel and will become the Mecca for yachties throughout central Queensland. It will also add a considerable dimension to the improvement of tourism on the Capricorn Coast. In that regard I congratulate and thank the Minister, because it has certainly been appreciated by the people of central Queensland. These small craft facilities and boat-ramps that are needed up and down the coast cannot be provided if the revenue is not available. The major harbour boards are in a sound financial position to provide that revenue.

I want to mention also some of the other streamlining effects of this Bill. However, before I do that, I will turn to Keppel Sands and the need for a boat-ramp there, which will be provided with this increased revenue.

Keppel Sands, a small town near Rockhampton, has a great need for a boat-ramp. It services not only that centre but also all the small boat operators in Rockhampton, the surrounding coal towns and the hinterland. I am very pleased to be able to tell honourable members that the Minister has advised me that the funds for a ramp at Keppel Sands will be provided. I can assure the Minister that that will certainly be appreciated by the local people.

One aspect of the Bill that has not been mentioned while I have been in the Chamber is the ownership of land under high-water mark. Under the provisions of the Act, when land is excavated and comes below high-water mark, it becomes the property of the Harbours and Marine Department. However, under the Bill, that land will be able to be freeholded under the ownership of the owner of that particular block. That is a very important aspect of the Bill.

The Bill is an excellent one. It will streamline the efficiency of our ports. It is not, as the member for Toowong said, an attack on local government or an attack on any particular area. In fact, I have talked with the harbour boards in my electorate. They are quite happy about it. I have no doubt that when the provisions of the Bill are implemented, it will be of great benefit to this State.

**Mr CASEY (Mackay) (5.27 p.m.):** I am one of the few members of this Parliament who are former members of port authorities in this State. I can speak with the voice of experience on just what relativity these amendments have to the Harbours Act. I am strongly opposed to three new principles contained in the Bill. Like the shadow Minister, I have qualified support only for the other sections of the Bill.

In regard to membership of the boards—it has gone the full circle. Harbour board members used to be elected by the people. Now we have gone the full circle to selection by the Government. That is typical of the way in which the National Party operates.

My second objection relates to the section dealing with levies. The port authorities used to use any additional funding for the benefit of their own areas. A beautiful park was built in the Mackay area. The Minister would not deny what the port authority has been able to do on the foreshores in that area. A good road system has been built in and out of the port in Townsville. The Cairns Port Authority has beautified its area. The same applies to Gladstone. The harbour boards play a big role in tourist promotions and so on.

All of the harbour boards used to put any spare money that they had back into the local scene. As a result of this legislation, that money will be grabbed by the central

authority in Brisbane. It is centralisation. This is centralisation legislation. That is exactly what will happen.

**Mr Tenni:** It is in the Act now.

**Mr CASEY:** Yes. All the Government is doing is using the Act to pay off long-standing debts in Bowen and Rockhampton.

I am fearful that clauses 42 to 47 that relate to land are deliberately being included in the Act in an endeavour to try to sort out the problems of Pioneer River Developments, which is trying to develop the mouth of the river in Mackay. These amendments will leave the way wide open for that company to do exactly what it wants to do. A new mouth will be developed in the Pioneer River. A large portion of land can be obtained that can be freeholded. The developers can sell off the developed land, take their profit and move out. The consequential damage that will occur will have to be paid for by the people of Mackay in the future.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Row):** Order! In accordance with the motion carried by the House, I shall now put the question.

Motion agreed to.

#### Committee

Hon. M. J. Tenni (Barron River—Minister for Water Resources and Maritime Services) in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—

**Mr TENNI (5.31 p.m.):** I take this opportunity to stress a few points that were put forward today which I believe are totally wrong and misleading to the people of this State. This is not a fair go for the people of Queensland whom the members in this Chamber supposedly represent. I refer to the comments made by the honourable member for Woodridge.

**Mr D'Arcy:** I thought you liked what I had to say.

**Mr TENNI:** I thought it was great, and I am sure the people outside will like it too and will know how dishonest the honourable member has been in representing them.

I completely reject the claims made by the honourable member. He made the comment that there is a pay-back against present members of port authority boards. There is no pay-back to any member of any port authority. Most of the port authorities have operated reasonably well. This Government has a philosophy and a policy of going ahead. It does not want to stay 100 years behind the times. Anything that the Government did yesterday or will do today or tomorrow is updated and modernised. It is a matter of good and sensible management.

**Mr Prest:** You did that with the fire brigades.

**Mr TENNI:** There are constant interjections from the honourable member for Port Curtis. He nearly got belted during the last election and he will get belted in the next one, that is for sure.

The honourable member for Woodridge ignored the very sound reasons for introducing a higher standard of expertise and business sense in the operations of the ports. That is an absolutely vital point. Like the rest of the members of the ALP, Mr D'Arcy is advocating an out-of-date system which dates back to the turn of the century. This confirms that he knows very little about such port operations as Cairns, where decisions involving millions of dollars have to be made concerning the seaport and airport. In the not-too-distant future this Government will be making some very big decisions in that area.

**Mr De Lacy:** Why do you have to have National Party appointees to make decisions?

**Mr TENNI:** Who said that there will be National Party appointees? That comment shows the kind of mind that the fellows in the ALP have. The honourable member for Cairns is saying that now he wants me to make sure that all future appointees are National Party appointees. If he wants that, why does he not say it?

As far as I am concerned, this Government will make a decision based on the ability of the person. This Government will not follow the actions of Mr Hawke throughout this country. When he took office in Canberra he sacked every National Party and Liberal Party person on every board throughout this nation.

**Mr McElligott:** Name one.

**Mr TENNI:** Telecom is one, and John Littlemore was put in place of the member there.

**The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr Alison):** Order! The Minister will return to the clause.

**Mr TENNI:** This is really part of the Bill, Mr Temporary Chairman. The ALP is accusing this Government of putting National Party members on the boards of the port authorities, when in fact their colleague in Canberra has done just that by appointing John Littlemore, who is a self-confessed communist. All members opposite know that. He is a great supporter of the Labor Party, and that hurts. Many other boards were involved also.

I will be looking at port authorities in exactly the way they are spelt out under the Bill and I will ensure that the port authority boards of the future contain men with common sense, not men like the honourable member for Port Curtis. They will be men of ability. There are many men of ability currently on the boards. If by any fluke a member of the Liberal Party or the Labor Party is currently on one of those boards and has any brains and the ability to handle that position—and I have doubts about that, because one only has to look at the other side of this Chamber to appreciate that fact—I assure the Committee that he will remain on the board. Alternatively, such a person will be brought in.

The member for Woodridge and other Opposition members have jumped to conclusions and made stupid statements. They are only following in the footsteps of the socialist regime in Canberra. They have adopted a stupid attitude. It is clear that the member for Woodridge is not familiar with port authorities. It is absolutely ridiculous to suggest that the election of a person to a local authority position is automatic proof that he is an expert in port management. People employed by councils do not necessarily have the expertise that is necessary to manage port authorities. One has only to look at the Port of Brisbane Authority and the Gold Coast Waterways Authority. The members of those authorities were not appointed by councils; they were appointed by the Governor in Council. Those officers do an extremely good job. It is wrong to say that a member of a port authority needs to have had council experience to be capable of managing a port authority. The Port of Brisbane Authority has shifted Brisbane's port from a location in the river to Fisherman Islands. Although it has spent in excess of \$300m in doing that, not one cent of tax-payers' money was used. That authority has been very successful.

The member for Woodridge said that the Cairncross Dock Yard will be greater than anything that has happened there in the past. It will not cost tax-payers millions of dollars each year in losses. The infiltration of communist unions that have operated at that dock in the past and supported by the socialists in this House will not be tolerated. Cairncross Dock Yard will be operated by private enterprise and it will make a profit. In the future it will employ between 1 000 and 1 500 people. That is what Government members are all about. Opposition members are supposed to represent the little bloke and create employment for him. In fact, Opposition members are born knockers of society. Development projects along the coastline of this State, whether they be in ports or anywhere else, are knocked constantly by members of the ALP.

A week or two ago the member for Cairns made a statement in this Chamber. He knocked the developments that were taking place in the Cairns area and in other parts of Queensland. At the same time, he knocked employment. By doing that, he is creating unemployment for the people he supposedly represents. It is a pity that he did not belong to the old Labor Party, which thought of the working man, instead of belonging to the socialist party, members of which drive around in Jaguar motor cars and own \$300,000 homes. If the honourable member changed his thinking, perhaps we would get somewhere in this State. One day he will wake up and go back to the old Labor Party system.

Mr D'Arcy's claim that Queensland's coastline will be raped because of a change in the structure of harbour boards is absolute madness. It is unbelievable that a man could make such a statement. Obviously, Mr D'Arcy is completely ignorant of the fact that the tourist industry is aware of the importance of preserving the environment. After all, tourists are attracted to a region because of its beauty. If a developer destroys the environment, he cannot expect his development to show a return on his investment. Common sense tells me that good management must be retained in any development that takes place. Part of that good management is the management of the environment so that people are attracted not only from this country but also from other countries. The honourable member made a very silly statement. He was equally off the beam when he lumped all tourist developers in one basket as quick-quid merchants. The tourist developments to which he referred are creating thousands of jobs in this State. It is obvious that the ALP is not interested in that.

**Mr Simpson:** The Labor Party doesn't believe in profits.

**Mr TENNI:** The honourable member is dead right; members of the ALP do not believe in profits. Of course, if profits are not made, they cannot be reinvested in developments so that larger and better developments are created, thereby providing more work and more profits and, in turn, more jobs. If members of the Labor Party cannot see the reasons for that, they must have a very low mentality. I could go on and on about some of the comments that were made by Mr D'Arcy.

**Mr Burns:** Please do.

**Mr TENNI:** If the honourable member wishes me to carry on, I will.

In recent years a boom has occurred in tourist boat operations without any reduction in safety. The honourable member for Toowong incorrectly stated that that was not the case. The Marine Board of Queensland acted promptly and decisively in dealing with the very serious fire that occurred on the Reef Link II, in relation to which a report was tabled in this House. Even Tom Burns can handle fires on board his own boat. Sometimes, he even generates a lot of heat on it.

It is a disgrace that the honourable member for Toowong puts his head in the sand and ignores the very sensible decisions that have been made with a view to improving the safe operations of our cargo and passenger catamarans. It makes me sick to death to hear the member for Toowong talk about a so-called assault on local government. That just proves that members of the Liberal Party are outdated and that their thinking is along ALP lines.

**Mr Burns:** That's an insult.

**Mr TENNI:** I am terribly sorry if that is an insult. Perhaps I should withdraw that comment.

Last night, during a division, the House witnessed members of the Liberal Party trying unsuccessfully to get into the toilet, so they all stayed in a little bunch outside the bar of the House. That was unbelievable.

Some of the comments that were made by the honourable member for Toowong were practically word for word with comments that were made by members of the Liberal

Party during the Southport by-election campaign. I remind honourable members that the Liberal Party received 25 per cent of the vote in that by-election. One would think that Liberal Party members would have learnt their lesson after comments such as that were used during a by-election in which they received only 25 per cent of the vote. I believe that Mr Gygar was the campaign director, so the Liberal Party members should ensure that they appoint someone else at the next election.

The member for Toowong referred also to members of hospital boards and fire brigade boards who are required to travel long distances to attend board meetings. Apparently the honourable member is unaware that port authority boards meet mainly on the waterfront. A member of a Mount Isa fire brigade board or hospital board is very close to where board meetings are held. It appears that the honourable member is unaware that harbour boards are situated on the coast. He probably thinks that they are in the west of the State and that board members are required to travel long distances. In the future, when time permits, I will show the honourable member where the coast is and where Mount Isa and Longreach are so that he can appreciate and understand that people who belong to fire brigade boards and hospital boards in those areas are not required to travel great distances to attend board meetings. However, a member of the Port of Brisbane Authority who lives at Longreach has a long way to travel to attend board meetings, because those meetings are held in the board rooms of the Port of Brisbane at Brisbane. Apparently the honourable member for Toowong was unaware of that fact, otherwise he would not have made that stupid statement.

A levy has already been imposed upon port authorities. In the past, by agreement with the boards, a levy has been set. At times, that has been done with great difficulty, because if one or two boards do not agree to paying a particular levy, which will assist boards that are in financial trouble, that can make things very difficult for the Government or the Minister of the day. That system has just been changed so that the levy can be determined by the Government.

The member for Lockyer made some brief comments, but they were truthful and direct. He is a member of my committee and he knows what he is talking about. He does not have to engage in a lot of filibustering, as has happened in the House this afternoon.

The member for Broadsound knows what is happening in Rosslyn Bay and throughout his electorate, mainly because from the time that he was elected as the member for Broadsound he asked me very forcefully——

**Mr INNES:** I rise to a point of order. I realise the farcical nature of time-limit allocations. However, in debating the clause, the Minister is making a reply that is usually made at the end of the second-reading debate. Because only one-quarter of an hour remains to discuss the other clauses, it is wrong that the time should be taken up by this harangue to win favour in the National Party. I ask you, Mr Temporary Chairman, to direct the Minister to return to a discussion of the clause.

**The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr Alison):** Order! In response to the point of order, I rule that the Minister should be addressing the clauses. I ask the Minister to conclude his remarks.

**Mr TENNI:** Thank you, Mr Temporary Chairman. I am just about there. I appreciate your tolerance.

The member for Mackay spoke about the appointment of members of harbour boards. I believe that is a good proposal. He referred to the beautification of the area. I agree with him that the harbour boards——

**Mr CASEY:** I rise to a point of order. I thought that you, Mr Temporary Chairman, had just ruled that the Minister should cease speaking; yet he is being allowed to continue.

**The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN:** Order! The Minister has concluded his speech. Clause 1, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 2 to 10, as read, agreed to.

Clause 11—

**Mr D'ARCY (5.48 p.m.):** During the debate at the second-reading stage, I indicated that the Opposition was opposed to this clause, which changes the personnel on the boards to the Minister's satisfaction. It is a move by the Government to centralise power in the hands of Government appointees who, whether the Minister likes it or not, in this State have a habit of being members of the National Party. In fact, it is almost a prerequisite that one has to be a member of the National Party to receive any type of appointment in this State. The National Party is entirely different from the old Country Party that we used to know in this State. The new-broom Nationals, with their heavy-handed centralisation, have allowed the State to be governed by the National Party Government and its minions on the 1 300 quangos throughout Queensland.

It is a disgrace that the local people will not be represented as of right on harbour boards. In earlier years, members of harbour boards were actually elected at local council elections. They actually stood for election. In latter years, councils were given the right to appoint certain people from the areas that the board serviced. That practice should continue. It allowed people who had the respect of the local people to be appointed to the boards. The people whom the Minister proposes to appoint to the boards will be, supposedly, business-people. Because of the constraints imposed by clause 71, pressure will be placed upon them to develop certain areas.

Representatives of local authorities, who know about the planning and the future of areas, are needed on the boards. They know what the development plans are for the whole city and for the area surrounding the harbour board land. They are involved in the local scene and they have town-planning experience in the areas. If such people are not appointed to the harbour boards, the local people will not have proper representation when the boards attempt to pump up land and destroy the natural environment and then sell off the land, which has occurred in the past.

**Mr Casey:** The members of the old Country Party knew and understood the local trade, didn't they?

**Mr D'ARCY:** It is pretty obvious that bright young fellows from the city, who have no ties with the bush or areas that were part of the National/Country Party's background, now are the major influence in the new National Party. The Country Party understood the local trade and the local council and all that went with them. The Country Party knew the requirements of the community, and members of that party realised what had to be done. The centralisation of power in the National Party has left behind that kind of representation.

Members of the Opposition can foresee that, as time goes on, developers will be appointed to these boards. The Minister keeps referring to the sound business practices of these people. The Minister's argument is that their expertise will be introduced into the operation of harbour boards. The Minister cannot argue that he is reducing the number of quangos because they are inefficient. If that were the case, why has every Minister not begun to cut back on the 1 300 quangos that operate in this State? Why did the Minister not cut back on fire brigade boards when he was Minister for Administrative Services? The reason is that these statutory authorities are among the most successful quangos in the State of Queensland. Members of harbour boards have acquired experience in developing facilities. They have the interests of the people who live in the area at heart, and some have been tremendously successful.

By virtue of his intention to control appointees to the positions of chairman, deputy chairman and member, the Minister will create a situation whereby these people will be directly responsible to him and to this Government. The appointees will be indebted to the Minister for these sinecures, and they will make decisions accordingly.

**Mr Casey:** The people of Queensland will pay for that.

**Mr D'ARCY:** In the long term, the problem will be that the people of Queensland will pay for it. The people of Queensland will not benefit in the long term from Government policy of this kind.

**Mr BEANLAND:** As I indicated earlier, the Liberal Party is strongly opposed to clause 11.

The attack made earlier by the Minister on current board members was unwarranted. It was totally disgraceful for the Minister to say that he doubted whether any members on the boards who were Liberal or Labor Party representatives would have any brains. His remarks were totally uncalled for. The way in which a member of a board votes is a matter for the board member.

The point is that harbour boards in this State are run efficiently and effectively. Most of them make profits—something that the Government seems to have lost sight of. The Government talks about a need to replace local government representatives as though those representatives are inefficient and unable to cope with matters at hand. Clearly, to date, those local government representatives have done a very good job. That is probably one of the reasons why the Government has moved to replace local authority representatives on harbour boards.

I have to direct a question to the Minister. How could a person in Longreach be a representative on the Brisbane Port Authority? Earlier, I clearly heard the Minister indicate that somebody from Longreach could be representative on the Brisbane Port Authority. He could only be a representative of the Brisbane Port Authority—not of a local government authority—because the Minister could make such an appointment.

I believe that the Minister has abused the privileges of this Parliament by wasting the time of the Committee this evening. Many clauses still have to be examined. Clearly, following the National Party conference in Townsville, nothing has changed in respect to this Government. The same people are still in power and they are still doing the same things.

This legislation is another attack on local authorities in this State. The Jandowae junta's attempt to put a new face on the National Party has clearly failed. Another instance of that failure has occurred this evening.

**Mr SMITH:** I am amazed that the Minister could be responsible for the provisions of clause 11. In 1982, he had this to say about the subject of representation—

“I like the way in which they are elected—and not, as was suggested by Opposition members, from a political point of view. The council representatives on say, the Cairns Port Authority are extremely well chosen. In fact, they are virtually chosen by the electors of each board area, because at each council election a certain number of people are elected and the council then elects one of those people to represent the area on the harbour board. I do not think anything could be fairer than that.”

That is what the Minister said in 1982.

**An Opposition member:** What a hypocrite!

**Mr SMITH:** Exactly. The Minister went on to say—

“For example, the top people representing the Cairns area are appointed to the Cairns Port Authority. It makes no difference whether it is a Labor-controlled council or a National Party-controlled council; the appointee is elected by majority vote at the first council meeting. That is an extremely good provision and it should be retained.”

That was also said by the Minister in 1982.

The Minister speaks about representation and the difficulties of distance. I tried to raise the point before that the Government saw quite fit to appoint Franz Born, who was living in Brisbane, as a member of the North Queensland Electricity Board, and

Kel Griffiths, who lived in Brisbane, as a member of the Townsville Abattoir Board. That spikes the sort of argument that the Government has been putting forward.

**Mr De LACY:** The Minister has just been exposed as a hypocrite. He was a hypocrite in 1982 and he remains a hypocrite.

This particular clause, because of the changes that it will make, is probably the most important in the Bill. It is one that I cannot agree with. I could never agree with it. As the Minister knows, things are happening in the port of Cairns that are very disturbing and are causing a lot of concern to the bulk of the population in Cairns.

**Mr Tenni:** They are making a profit. Is that the disturbing point to you?

**Mr De LACY:** Exactly. I am pleased that the Minister interjected. The only thing that ever concerns him is making a quid.

The large majority of the people of Cairns are concerned about the port. In a variety of ways the port of any town is very important. It is important in a visual sense, in a recreational sense, in a commercial sense and in a variety of other ways. However, the only thing that ever concerns the Minister and the people that he will appoint to the boards is making a quid. The people of Cairns have just about had enough of that. At the next election the Government will pay the penalty, just like the council will pay the penalty at the local authority elections to be held next March.

**Mr PREST:** In speaking to clause 11, I want to state the feelings of the people in my area in relation to the appointment of Government appointees to the board. When a Minister such as Mr Martin Tenni is in charge of port authorities, we think of the type of people who will be appointed as Government appointees to those boards, especially if one takes into consideration the type of persons that he had gathered around him within the State fire services. Presently fire services are in dire financial straits.

Like other harbour boards, the Gladstone Harbour Board is very financial. It is managed in a wonderful way by Mr Reg Tanna, the engineer/manager, and Brian Jordan, the secretary. If the Government appoints people to boards, more people such as National/Liberal Party members who are on the board now will be appointed. Presently there are people on the Gladstone Harbour Board who should not be there, although they are Government appointees. They would not be appointed under any other circumstances.

Presently on the board is one person who has said that he will be appointed as manager—Bellet. He now calls himself a professional board member. He is a Government appointee on the hospitals board; he is a Government appointee on the fire brigade board; he is a Government appointee on the CEB; he is a Government appointee on the harbour board. He was manager of the radio station in Gladstone. He could not hold that position. He lost it because of inability. He tried hard to get another job. Competent people are required for appointment to harbour boards. Bellet could not get another job in radio stations throughout Australia so he became a Government appointee—a professional appointee—on boards within the area of Port Curtis. It is people such as that who will be appointed by Mr Tenni and made chairman of the board. That is a disgrace. Another appointee has been Mr Moore, who has an engineering firm. He plays a great part within the Liberal Party.

**The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr Alison):** Order! In accordance with the resolution agreed to by the House earlier today, I will now put all remaining questions in Committee.

Question—That clauses 11 to 123, as read, stand part of the Bill—put; and the Committee divided—

## AYES, 42

Ahern	Lane
Austin	Lester
Berghofer	McCauley
Booth	McKechnie
Borbidge	McPhie
Burreket	Menzel
Chapman	Neal
Clauson	Nelson
Cooper	Newton
Elliott	Powell
Fraser	Randell
Gately	Sherrin
Gibbs, I. J.	Simpson
Gilmore	Slack
Glasson	Stephan
Harper	Stoneman
Harvey	Tenni
Henderson	Veivers
Hinton	
Hobbs	<i>Tellers:</i>
Hynd	Littleproud
Katter	FitzGerald

## NOES, 38

Ardill	Palaszcuk
Beanland	Prest
Braddy	Schuntner
Burns	Scott
Campbell	Shaw
Casey	Sherlock
Comben	Smith
D'Arcy	Smyth
De Lacy	Vaughan
Eaton	Warburton
Gibbs, R. J.	Warner
Goss	Wells
Hamill	White
Hayward	Yewdale
Innes	
Knox	
Lee	
Lickiss	
McElligott	
Mackenroth	<i>Tellers:</i>
McLean	Davis
Milliner	Gygar

Resolved in the affirmative.

Bill reported, without amendment.

## Third Reading

Hon. M. J. TENNI (Barron River—Minister for Water Resources and Maritime Services) (6.08 p.m.): I move—

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

Question put; and the House divided—

## AYES, 43

Ahern	Lane
Alison	Lester
Austin	McCauley
Berghofer	McKechnie
Booth	McPhie
Borbidge	Menzel
Burreket	Neal
Chapman	Nelson
Clauson	Newton
Cooper	Powell
Elliott	Randell
Fraser	Sherrin
Gately	Simpson
Gibbs, I. J.	Slack
Gilmore	Stephan
Glasson	Stoneman
Harper	Tenni
Harvey	Veivers
Henderson	
Hinton	
Hobbs	<i>Tellers:</i>
Hynd	Littleproud
Katter	FitzGerald

## NOES, 38

Ardill	Palaszcuk
Beanland	Schuntner
Braddy	Scott
Burns	Shaw
Campbell	Sherlock
Casey	Smith
Comben	Smyth
D'Arcy	Vaughan
De Lacy	Warburton
Eaton	Warner
Gibbs, R. J.	Wells
Goss	White
Gygar	Yewdale
Hamill	
Hayward	
Innes	
Knox	
Lee	
Lickiss	
McElligott	
Mackenroth	<i>Tellers:</i>
McLean	Davis
Milliner	Prest

Resolved in the affirmative.

Sitting suspended from 6.14 to 7.30 p.m.

## SUPERANNUATION ACTS AMENDMENT BILL (NO. 2)

## Second Reading

Debate resumed from 29 October (see p. 3715).

Mr BURNS (Lytton—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (7.30 p.m.): Sir Ernest Savage, the chairman of the Government-appointed Public Sector Review Committee

at a Royal Australian Institute of Public Administration meeting on Thursday, 22 October, said that the four major recommendations of his committee were rejected without consultation with the committee. The four most important recommendations were—

- the establishment of a Cabinet economic committee to oversee Government economic policy;
- the separation of the departments of the Premier and the Co-ordinator-General;
- the establishment of an economic strategy unit outside of Treasury; and, most importantly to tonight's debate,
- a complete review of the State Government's superannuation schemes.

Sir Ernest was diplomatic, but he left no doubt in the minds of his audience that he was astonished that the State Government could set up such an important committee as this and allow its most important recommendations to be scuttled by senior public servants and, in particular, by the Under Treasurer, Sir Leo Hielscher, without obtaining the views of the committee that presented the report.

Sir Ernest's report on the Government superannuation schemes makes very interesting reading. The first observation was that the current benefit structure of the State Service Superannuation Scheme was designed for a career service when employees joined the service early in their careers and stayed until retirement. In this day and age such a superannuation structure is totally inappropriate because staff, particularly the more highly qualified and able, are much more mobile in their careers and often move between the public and private sectors.

The superannuation schemes as they are currently structured do no service to either the Government as the employer or the public servant because they act to lock employees into the system. Amendments in April this year improved the situation somewhat by introducing an employer subsidisation preserved benefit option, known as vesting, but that benefit is low and the schemes are still regarded as inequitable to persons who resign from the service before retirement to take up employment elsewhere.

The committee also commented that the lack of retrenchment provisions in the scheme hampered management decisions. Other comments were that, because of their complexity, the schemes are difficult to comprehend. Anyone who has seen the Bill before the House would agree with that. In fact, if the Deputy Premier returns to the Chamber, I intend to question him on some of the formulas in the Bill. His reply should be interesting.

**Mr Powell:** If he does not come back, I will do it.

**Mr BURNS:** If he does not come back, the Minister for Education, being a man of high learning, will be able to give me, off the cuff, complete details and full explanations of those formulas!

In recent years private funds have gone to extreme lengths to ensure that members fully understand their benefit entitlements. No such attempt has been made with the State's superannuation schemes. I will deal further with that later in my speech, but I wish to continue with the recommendations of Sir Ernest Savage's committee, which also recommended that, as the State service and police schemes are virtually identical, administrative savings could be made if they were amalgamated. Other comments included the fact that, although the Government seems to have a relatively high declared rate of employer contribution of \$2.31 for every dollar contributed by the employee, the real beneficiary is consolidated revenue, because the Government is paying less than market interest rates to the funds.

In conclusion—the committee firmly believed that there was an excellent case to be made for an in-depth review of superannuation arrangements in the Queensland State public sector involving investigation of contribution levels, methods of funding, vesting, investment management, pensions and lump-sum benefits, retirement, retrenchment and redundancy provisions and the merging of individual schemes. The Opposition has been

saying the same thing for years. But what did the Government do? It merely stated that it had only recently completed a review and that any further review would be unnecessary. What a joke!

Members will recall that the recent so-called review of the superannuation schemes succeeded only in pushing the top public servants into the millionaire bracket. The so-called review the Government talked about gave the Co-ordinator-General, the Under Treasurer, the Auditor-General and the then Chairman of the Public Service Board an extra \$200,000 in superannuation overnight, taking their payments to approximately \$830,000. Sir William Knox, the longest serving politician in this place who is entitled to superannuation, is a pauper when his entitlements are compared with those of the State's top public servants.

None of the substantive points raised by Sir Ernest Savage about the State superannuation schemes have been reviewed at all and I want the Deputy Premier to explain why these most important recommendations were swept aside purely on the back-room advice of the Under Treasurer. It is typical of this Government that it sets up inquiries of all sorts and then fails to take action.

The current amendments are largely designed to lower the retirement age from 60 years to 55 years from the beginning of next year. The Opposition fully supports early retirement at age 55, but I am not at all sure that the amendments make early retirement very attractive financially. I counsel members of the State service superannuation schemes to think very hard before they decide upon early retirement. A person who decides to retire at 55 on 79 per cent of the financial benefit he would receive at 60 years of age could easily face another 20 years for which he would have to manage on a relatively small lump sum.

A number of anomalies have already become apparent with this legislation. People who join the public service relatively late in life are severely disadvantaged by the buy-back provisions available now. The buy-back provisions work in such a way that maximum benefits accrue close to the maximum retirement age of 65.

Under existing arrangements, early retirement for these late starters in the public service will be very unattractive indeed financially. As the Opposition has said before, and as Sir Ernest Savage has pointed out, these late starters are often the high achievers and the highly qualified, and the Government is doing both itself and these people a severe injustice by not addressing this problem.

Other anomalies have been pointed out by the Professional Officers Association in a letter that I think has been circulated to all members. I have made arrangements with you, Mr Deputy Speaker, to table and incorporate in *Hansard* the letter from the POA. I seek leave to do so.

Leave granted.

*Whereupon the honourable member laid on the table the following document—*

QUEENSLAND PROFESSIONAL OFFICERS' ASSOCIATION  
Credit Union House, 349 Queen Street, Brisbane 4000. Ph: 221 0316  
G.P.O. Box 116, Brisbane, 4001  
Telex: AA4Q472 BR519  
Answer Back PUBTLX

28th October 1987

Mr T. J. Burns,  
108 Berrima Street,  
Wynnum Qld 4178

Dear Sir,

During the present sitting of Parliament, the Government proposes to pass legislation amending the State Service Superannuation Act 1972-85 to incorporate age 55 retirement.

The Queensland Professional Officers' Association congratulates the Queensland Government on this move in line with the Association's policy. However incorporated in the amendments are a number of injustices the Association believes that the Government has not given sufficient attention to. To highlight these I have incorporated two examples. The first is an actual example of an Association member whilst the second is a hypothetical situation.

*Example A*

Joined Public Service as a Draftsman	18th February 1950
Resigned to gain private sector experience	15th February 1974
Rejoined Public Service as a Registered Architect	2nd September 1974

Presently employed as an architect and total service as of 1st January 1988 will be in excess of 37 years.

In accordance with the provision of the Public Service Acts and Regulations for an Officer who leaves the Public Service of his own accord and is re-admitted thereto within a period of 12 months, the member received credit for that previous service for recreation, sick and long service leave provisions.

There were no provisions for such recognition in the State Superannuation Act and the member was forced to receive a refund of contributions of \$3,090.29

Upon rejoining the State Superannuation Scheme on 2nd September 1974, the member sought full cover and opted to "buy back" under the provisions then available. This equated to a contribution level of 13.59% of gross salary as compared with the normal rate of 6.5% of gross salary.

The following table illustrates the anomalous level of benefits presently available to the member if he were to retire on 1st January 1988 under the early retirement provisions.

	CONTRIBUTIONS	BENEFIT
Actual	\$47,789.31	\$289,410
Unbroken Service	<u>\$26,647.42</u>	<u>\$252,000</u> approx
Cost of approx. 6½ months in private industry	<u>\$21,141.89</u>	<u>\$ 37,410</u> approx.

*Example B*

Two officers were appointed on the same day to the same Department and both on the same classification. Officer A was 35 years of age and officer B was 40 years of age.

Both officers never received further promotion and retired on the same day twenty years later after both having contributed the same fortnightly and subsequently gross amount to the State Superannuation Scheme.

Officer A will receive less than 90% of what Officer B will receive.

The Queensland Professional Officers' Association urges all Members of Parliament to support the provisions for Age 55 retirement whilst respectfully requesting that immediate investigations be undertaken with the intent to determine amending legislation to remove such anomalies that will result with the proposed amendments.

Should you require further information, please contact Peter Wilson on 221 0316.

Yours faithfully,

DON MARTINDALE  
General Secretary

QUEENSLAND PROFESSIONAL OFFICERS' ASSOCIATION  
 Credit Union House, 349 Queen Street, Brisbane 4000. Ph: 221 0316  
 G.P.O. Box 116, Brisbane, 4001  
 Telex: AA4Q472 BR519  
 Answer Back PUBTLX

29th October 1987

#### ADDENDUM

Please note that in the recent letter concerning amendments to the State Superannuation scheme example A should read:

	CONTRIBUTIONS	LUMP SUM BENEFITS (to nearest \$1000)
Actual	\$47,789.31	\$252,000
If service was unbroken	\$26,647.42	\$290,000
Cost to member of approx. 6¼ months in private industry	\$21,141.89	\$38,000

TOTAL COST \$59,142

**Mr BURNS:** I am sure that the Deputy Premier has sighted those anomalous examples, and I would like to hear his comments on them.

Example A given by the Professional Officers Association was of a draftsman employed since 1950. He left the service for six months to gain private sector experience and register as an architect. It is claimed that the cost to that member of 6¼ months' employment in the private sector is \$59,142. If that is true, the present scheme is a major disincentive to public servants to move to the private sector for temporary experience.

The second example given, example B, is of two officers appointed on the same day to the same department on the same classification. One officer was 35 years of age and the other was 40 years of age. Assuming that both never receive any further promotion and resign on the same day after exactly 20 years' service, the officer who joined at age 35 will receive less than 90 per cent of what the other officer will receive.

Clearly that example highlights the severe disadvantage that early retirement provisions impose on some officers, despite the fact that they may have made exactly the same contributions to the scheme. That is a further example that Sir Ernest was correct when he urged a complete overhaul and review of these Acts. It is very clear to all except the Government that these Acts should be consolidated and simplified.

I do not accept at all the claims of the Deputy Premier that these early-retirement benefits will not affect the financial viability of the scheme. What rubbish! Obviously the Deputy Premier was not present when Sir Leo Hielscher gave his briefing on the Budget to journalists. Sir Leo was at no pains to hide the fact that early retirement at age 55 would wipe out entirely the \$300m surplus that is presently in the State Service Superannuation Fund within 12 months.

**Mr Gunn:** Shouldn't they have it?

**Mr BURNS:** I am saying yes, they should have it. The Minister is saying that it will not affect the scheme financially. I am saying that it will.

The Minister can go back and read in *Hansard* that I have argued for age 55 retirement. In the last superannuation Bill that was debated in this Parliament, the Minister told me he would take on board my comments and that age 55 retirement was at that time being investigated.

I am not arguing with the Minister about the scheme. What I am saying is that I do not believe the Minister's argument, as outlined in his second-reading speech, that the fund will not be affected financially by this scheme. I think that in 12 months' time the Minister and I will debate this matter again. If at that time I am proved right, the Minister can apologise and if the Minister is proved right, I will apologise.

**Mr Gunn:** Fair enough. We are doing the right thing.

**Mr BURNS:** I agree with that. I just think that in some cases it is simply not good enough. The Minister and I agree in principle. It now remains to argue the fine tuning.

I repeat that Sir Leo was at no pains to hide the fact that early retirement at age 55 would wipe out entirely the \$300m surplus that is presently in the State Service Superannuation Fund within 12 months. If that is so, it does have a financial effect.

I suspect that Sir Leo is not too worried about it, because within 12 month's time I think he would have opted to take his handsome benefit entitlement and move to Suncorp, leaving the financial situation of the superannuation funds for somebody else to clean up.

I am also informed that the State Actuary reported privately that the fund cannot sustain early retirement on 80 per cent of financial benefit at age 55 but could do so only at age 56½. Given these facts, which I believe to be true, within 12 months State public servants will be facing a complete restructuring of the superannuation schemes because these changes will make the schemes actuarially unsound in the long term. No doubt the Deputy Premier will deny these claims. As I said, we will see next year. It is ludicrous for him to claim that early retirement will not affect these schemes. It is also ludicrous to claim that these initiatives for early retirement will create new public service job opportunities.

I am on record for the last 20 years arguing for the age of pension entitlement to be reduced from 65 to 60 years so that more people can retire early. When they reach 60 years of age most workers start to think of retirement. Many of them who have planned for their retirement for many years never get to enjoy it, because of ill health or accidents. I have always believed that the age of retirement should be reduced. I have always argued that this would create more employment. I find myself in a difficult situation today when I argue the next bit with the Minister, but I want to make the point that I thought that the Government had frozen all new appointments.

If the Government will let people retire at the age of 55—and people are talking about 10 per cent and all sorts of figures—snaffle the early money and leave and, if the Government is not going to make any new appointments, it will make a tremendous saving. These days many Government departments and bodies make the decision that when people leave they will not be replaced. If the Government continues with its decision to freeze all new appointments, no new jobs will be created through this legislation, but considerable savings will be made by the Government.

I thought that, because of budgetary cuts, the Government was not taking its normal intake of police recruits, teachers and nurses, and the Minister said that today in the House. If instructions have been given to rationalise positions and not to fill those which have become vacant because of resignations, retirements or transfers—and Ministers keep saying those things—it is obvious that many new jobs will not be created.

It is also interesting to speculate on the reasons why the Government is not taking this opportunity to amend the Act to introduce reduced employee contributions as announced in the Premier's Budget Speech. I understand other amendments to the Superannuation Act will be introduced next year to implement these reduced contributions, but it's strange that they are not done in this Bill. I wonder if it has something to do with the Under Treasurer's planned retirement, or is it more to do with the plan that the Government wants to abolish the 17.5 per cent leave loading through the court on 1 January, but not give the superannuation cuts until 1 July?

**Mr Gunn:** You have a suspicious mind.

Mr BURNS: The Minister is right, I do. And after looking at him across this Chamber for the last 15 years, no wonder I have a suspicious mind. After watching the operations of this Government for all that time, why wouldn't I? I am justified in having a suspicious mind.

In other words, it is six months' profit to the Government and another example of attacking the wages and conditions of the Queensland public service.

Other amendments in the Bill include changes to the composition of the board. The Under Treasurer is to become an ex officio member and chairman of the board and the Government now will have the right to dismiss board members at will. The Opposition is concerned that unions do not have the right to appoint their own representatives to the board. The reason why I am referring to unions is that they represent the contributors; the people who own this fund. The Queensland Teachers Union, the State Service Union and the Professional Officers Association have representatives on the board, but they do not have the right to insist that it is their nominated representative who has the right to a position on the board. The Government has the discretion to reject union nominations if it so desires, and I am told that this amendment was brought in because the Government did not want certain female union members to get on the board. It was thought that they might ask too many curly questions.

Members are entitled to a better deal from the board in terms of the information that they receive. Why is it not possible for members to receive an annual statement about the level of their contributions and their entitlements? Bank customers receive quarterly statements on their accounts, so why cannot members of the State Superannuation scheme receive annual statements? In this modern day, through the use of computers, it would be simple to collate and distribute this information, and it would give the opportunity for people to plan major loans or make long-term plans for their future and know exactly what their financial position is so far as superannuation is concerned. To most working people superannuation is their big nest-egg; it is the money that they have put away and they have planned the last part of their life on that superannuation. They are entitled to that information from the fund. This is another recommendation of Sir Ernest Savage in his report. I understand that for three years the Government has been promising to implement a similar scheme. I do not know if it is through its Ministers or its officers, but in typical fashion, the Government has done nothing.

A clearer definition is also required for persons who are eligible to join the superannuation funds. This is particularly true in the case of temporary employees. I am also advised that there are no provisions in this Bill for members who have more than 26 weeks' long-service leave accrued to receive any lump-sum payment for accrued leave over 26 weeks. The Deputy Premier should also explain this anomaly.

I am also advised that there are problems created with the taxation legislation because of the definitions used. Taxation treatment of the benefit payable differs according to whether it is described as an annuity or a lump sum. In the existing legislation, the financial payment as termed annuity contains provision for conversion to a lump sum.

In this proposed legislation, the definition is changed and the payment is defined as a lump sum, thereby causing additional problems and complexity for the superannuant. Those are all examples of lack of consideration and lack of thought by the Government.

It is very clear that the amendments to the Superannuation Acts have reached the stage at which Acts are complex, messy, give rise to numerous anomalies and possibly are even actuarially unsound. The Government's rejection of the Savage committee's recommendation is totally short-sighted and unjustifiable and, next year, members of the Government will be eating their words when they are forced to consider major changes to the Act.

It is clear that the Deputy Premier is not capable of supervising change in this area. Treasury more than any other department must be very much a case of "Yes, Minister".

I cannot imagine the Deputy Premier debating any economic or financial points with the Under Treasurer. The Government's rejection of outside advice as recommended by Sir Ernest Savage has left it open to embarrassment caused by the implementation of poor advice and poor recommendations. I look forward to next year when I believe a completely new Act will be introduced for our consideration.

Because a gag motion has been moved to limit the time for debate on Bills, I have kept short my comments on the Bill to allow anyone who wants to participate in the debate to do so. I have circulated an amendment that I will move at the Committee stage.

**Mr SHERRIN (Mansfield) (7.47 p.m.):** I rise to speak in support of the Bill, which has as its primary aim the lowering of the retirement age from which voluntary benefits are payable under the State Service Superannuation Scheme. From 1 January 1988 the minimum retiring age will be reduced from 60 years to 55 years.

The Bill must be viewed as part of a package of enhancement to the State Service Superannuation Scheme for our public servants. The honourable member for Lytton has already alluded to the amendments that were passed in this House earlier this year. Amongst other things, they provided for death benefits to be converted to a lump-sum payment so that benefits could be made payable to an estate. Females who contributed before 27 February 1984 are now able to contribute to death benefit cover. The lump-sum payment on retirement through illness is the same as that payable on death. Members leaving the scheme have their contributions refunded with 5 per cent compound interest. That represents an increase of 1.25 per cent in the rate of interest payable. For age retirement, promotional salary increases are now averaged over two years instead of the final year. For public servants, the rate of the benefit accumulated each year has increased so that the maximum benefit accrues after 42 years and six months, instead of 45 years from age 20. All existing pensions were increased by 6 per cent. It is important to understand that in the space of six months honourable members have witnessed enhancements to the State Service Superannuation Scheme.

The early retirement age provided for in the present legislation will apply to public servants, teachers, and employees of the Railways, hospitals boards and other major statutory authorities, including the CAEs. One point about the legislation that I wish to highlight is that it displays something of the democratic workings of this Government. Members are involved in Government committees. A number of Government members and I are on the Treasury committee chaired by the Deputy Premier, Mr Bill Gunn. I well remember a meeting earlier this year at which we were considering amendments to the Superannuation Act Amendment Bill when a number of committee members raised with the Deputy Premier the possibility of lowering the retirement age. At that stage he undertook to seek an actuarial study—a feasibility study—into the lowering of the retirement age under the State Service Superannuation Scheme. That was done. I understand that the actuarial investigation revealed quite clearly that retirement benefits could be introduced without the financial viability of the scheme being affected. I understand that the Deputy Premier took the proposal to Cabinet. Following endorsement by Cabinet, the Premier in his Budget Speech some months ago made an announcement about the proposed legislation. The actual legislation is now before the House for debate.

It is interesting to actually trace the path of the proposal through the parliamentary system: the Bills committee; the involvement of the public service in carrying out the investigations; the Cabinet process; the budgetary process; and, finally, the actual legislation. I am sure that honourable members will agree that this is the way that the Westminster system should operate. It provides an opportunity for all members of Parliament to contribute to and have an input into the workings of Government.

I wish to highlight five benefits that are associated with this legislation and that will result from the reduction in the voluntary retirement age from 60 to 55 years. I make these comments in the light of my being a former contributor to the State Service Superannuation Scheme for a period in excess of nine years. Six months ago when this matter was first discussed with the Minister in his committee, one of the significant

benefits that was raised was that it would create job opportunities within the public service, particularly for school-leavers and graduates from tertiary institutions.

At present we are witnessing a levelling off of primary school enrolments. A significant number of students are graduating from tertiary institutions; but, because primary school enrolments have been levelling off, we are no longer witnessing the large number of job vacancies that were available in the past.

By allowing senior school administrators, teachers and principals the opportunity to retire earlier, we are actually creating vacancies that can be filled by teacher graduates. That state of affairs is reflected through all Government departments, because positions will be created without actually increasing the financial burden on the Government. It is cost neutral and does not require a significant input from consolidated revenue.

During the hiatus between the original amendment Bill and this Bill, when I visited many of the schools in my electorate, one of the first questions that I was asked by teachers and other public servants was when early retirement was going to be introduced.

Although I am not aware of any definite figures that have been produced from within the public service, I believe that a significant number of public servants, teachers and other Government workers will grasp the opportunity to retire voluntarily at age 55. That will certainly be for the good of the service.

The Government has made it very advantageous for public servants to retire at age 55. They will receive 79 per cent of the entitlements that they would have received had they stayed in the public service until age 60; in other words, they will receive 6.67 times their final salary. A quick calculation reveals that it would be advantageous, in these times of high interest rates on investments of 13, 14 or 15 per cent, to retire at age 55. However, I would not advocate investing on the stock-market at the moment. In this period of high domestic interest rates, if a person takes a lump-sum payment at age 55, he can accumulate quite a significant entitlement rather than staying on in the superannuation scheme until age 60. I commend the Deputy Premier for this scheme. One of its great benefits is the creation of job opportunities whilst keeping the Government at the same size.

One of the great benefits of the early-retirement initiative is that it will free up promotional opportunities within the public service. One of the problems involved with limiting the size of Government and freezing Government establishment at one level is that it tends to slow down promotional pathways for many public servants. In the past, many people have experienced rapid promotion within the public service, particularly in the education sector. Because of the slowing down in the establishment of many Government departments, there has been a stagnation. Many of our brighter and more able public servants have been unable to achieve promotion. They have been locked into place and the motivation and incentive that were present in the past have tended to diminish. In the next few years, this initiative will free up many of those promotional opportunities and will rekindle productivity and incentive in the service. I predict that there will be significant opportunities for advancement within the teaching service and the public service over the coming years as a result of this Government initiative.

The feed-back that I have received from the many public servants in my electorate is that they are very supportive of this initiative of the Government on that ground alone—not only for the public servants who will take the immediate opportunity to retire early but also for many of them who are looking 20 or 30 years down the track. They are also looking at their advancement through the public service, which will be freed up by this initiative.

One point that has not been raised in the media debate of this issue is the opportunity that this initiative will provide to relieve the stress that is ever present in many of the senior positions in the teaching service and in the public service. We are certainly aware that it is prevalent in many of the senior executive positions in the public service, especially in the age group from 50 to 60, when many public servants occupy senior positions with heavy responsibilities. A stress load is occurring in that area. Even in

many of the positions that are not in the senior executive service of the Government, such as ordinary class room teachers, people are experiencing significant stress levels. However, the people who are more advanced in years experience greater stress than many of the younger teachers. The opportunity to leave at 55 will provide a great opportunity for the stress levels to be reduced. It is my belief—a belief that has been borne out in many figures—that it will greatly increase their life expectancy.

I have seen some very interesting figures that indicate that, if people were to retire at age 55, they could expect a significant increase in their life expectancy. If they had stayed on for the additional five years of pretty hard, intense and stressful work, they would have a life expectancy of 10 or 12 years. However, if they retire at 55, they can expect a significant increase in their life expectancy. That is one aspect of the legislation that certainly should be emphasised.

I believe also that the initiative of the Government in reducing the voluntary retiring age will improve job satisfaction on the part of many Government employees. The last five years go very slowly for people who are getting on in years, particularly if they are working in the one position for a long period. People tend to wind down and work becomes a bit of a drudgery and a bore. They do not receive the stimulation that they used to experience in earlier years. This Government initiative will improve job satisfaction on the part of many public servants. It will greatly improve productivity within the public service.

All honourable members can cite instances of people who just sit there for the last few years. They are worried about their health and do not want to have a heart attack. We could probably cite instances of a number of people who just want to sit there for those last couple of years to collect their superannuation. Their health may be on the decline but has not deteriorated sufficiently for them to be able to get out of the scheme. This initiative will significantly improve productivity in the Queensland public service.

As a consequence of the increased job satisfaction and increased productivity within the public service, we will see an improved delivery of service to the people of Queensland. The end users of the services provided to the public by the Government—the people of Queensland—will see as a result of this initiative—through the increased productivity, job satisfaction and so on—an improvement in the quality of service provided to them.

It is important to understand that retirement is optional. People who are handling work capably, who receive stimulation from work and who still wish to make a contribution—I can certainly think of many individuals like that, especially in the senior sector of the public service—have an opportunity to stay there and continue to contribute to the public service and to the people of Queensland.

Another advantage of the scheme is the opportunity for a cross-transfer of expertise. It could also be one of the disadvantages that I would cite of superannuation schemes because it tends to lock people into extended periods of service. Once a person has been a contributor to a scheme for a period of 10 or 12 years, he feels that he is committed to the particular job. A significant investment has been made by way of contributions and people feel that they have to stay in their positions to benefit at the end of their careers.

One aspect of the schemes that operate in the United States is that reduced superannuation payouts apply to earlier retirement. Instead of one life-long career, people sometimes have two or three careers during their life-time. They take the experience that they have gained in one particular career and, at the age of 40 or 50, they undertake a totally different career. By taking that step, they give themselves a total change in life's experiences. They also transfer their expertise in one field into a totally different area of expertise.

**Mr Vaughan:** What about portability?

**Mr SHERRIN:** That is a very good point, and one that the Government should look into.

**Mr Burns:** They have had that for years.

**Mr SHERRIN:** The Deputy Leader of the Opposition should wait a moment and remember that the Bill offers a total package of superannuation benefits that has been devised in the last six months. The honourable member should think about the benefits offered to people during the last six months from both amendment Bills. I think he will have to agree that they are very considerable. From my personal point of view, I believe that portability should be examined for the reasons I have advanced.

I believe that the provisions of this Bill will improve the quality of life for public servants during their retirement. All honourable members could probably cite public servants who have stayed in their employment until they reach 60 years of age and have suffered some degree of ill-health. Their years of retirement are not as beneficial as they could have been if they had left the service at the age of 55.

One point I wish to dwell on before I conclude my speech is treatment by the press of the early retirement proposal for public servants and the actual superannuation benefits that public servants will receive. As a former public servant, it used to gall me to read some of the comments that appeared in the *Courier-Mail*, which seems to have a vendetta against the initiatives contained in the Bill. I am sure that all honourable members can think of some pretty critical *Courier-Mail* editorials that attacked the Government and public servants and accused them of being fat cats, irrespective of whether public servants are those who hold senior executive positions or those who are Class I clerks. All public servants seem to have been so labelled by the popular press.

In many instances, the press implies that public servants receive greatly enhanced benefits, in excess of what might be expected to be received in the private sector. The implication is also that all of the benefits have been contributed by the tax-payer. Of course, all honourable members would certainly know that that is far from the case. It is important to recognise that benefits provided for many of the executives in the private sector are considerably greater than those benefits received by many public servants. The *Courier-Mail* published a very balanced article on 10 April 1987 that made a comparison between benefits provided for public servants and benefits provided for people who hold executive positions in the private sector. I give credit to the *Courier-Mail* for doing so. The article proved conclusively that people in the private sector who hold similar positions, with similar degrees of responsibility for similar numbers of employees, were receiving considerably greater benefits not only in superannuation payouts but also in other perks and lurks. I hope that once and for all the allegations that Queensland's public servants receive benefits far in excess of those received in the private sector can be put to bed.

As I have said, the provisions of this legislation will significantly improve the quality of life for Queensland's public servants by creating additional job opportunities; by freeing up promotional opportunities; by relieving stress on many public servants; by providing opportunities for the cross-transfer of expertise through early retirement; by improving the quality of life in general for public servants while at the same time further improving the quality of service provided by public servants to the people of Queensland.

I commend the Bill to the House.

**Hon. Sir WILLIAM KNOX** (Nundah—Leader of the Liberal Party) (8.05 p.m.): The Liberal Party supports the Bill. The legislation relates to quality of life, prudence and thrift. People who are contributors to the superannuation fund are obliged to do so by virtue of their employment. Of course, such people regard participation in a superannuation scheme as part of the support of their way of life and life-style.

As the previous speaker mentioned, in some quarters of the community public servants are treated as though they are some privileged group who enjoy benefits above others. To some degree they do enjoy a degree of security of employment, assuming that all other things are equal. In fact, during the term of their contributions to the superannuation scheme they do have to go without. Their standard of living is affected to that extent in order to be more than compensated, one hopes, in later life.

The principal aim of the Bill, of course, is to lower the age of optional retirement for public servants so that they are able to obtain benefits at the age of 55. I must say that I find that aspect rather interesting. I do not quite agree with the honourable member for Mansfield about people retiring and therefore increasing opportunities for other people. In fact, those who receive superannuation do not retire. As I have discovered, and as most people know, the majority do not retire. They go into other occupations. To suggest that they are making room for other people to gain employment is not quite right.

**Mr Sherrin:** Many of the superannuants I know provide voluntary services in the community.

**Sir WILLIAM KNOX:** They do that whether they are superannuants or not.

I would say that well over 90 per cent of people who retire from the public service on superannuation go into other forms of employment. That is simply an exchange of employment, not a retirement from the work-force. I am sure that many members of this House have known of superannuants who have simply retired from one job and gone to another job and taken their superannuation with them. Possibly that is why such a high percentage of them take lump sum payments.

**Mr Hayward:** If they go into their own businesses, surely they would be generators of activity.

**Sir WILLIAM KNOX:** They do not, of course. They go into a multitude of jobs.

**Mr Hayward** interjected.

**Sir WILLIAM KNOX:** I am all in favour of it. I am not knocking it. I am just identifying what is happening. I am not trying to have an argument with the honourable member for Mansfield, I just disagree that they retire and make room for other people in the work-force. They do not. They go into other jobs, not just businesses. Many of them go into other occupations right away from the public service and continue in employment because they are hale and hearty and they want to work. In fact, I find it very strange that anybody at the age of 55 would want to retire if he is hale and hearty. I find that extraordinarily difficult to understand. I am sure that the Deputy Premier has found that, too, because he is well over 55. At the moment he looks even older than he is. He is weighed down with the burdens of office.

Police officers are a very good example of people who retire and then find other employment. Every single police officer whom I know who has retired—and there would probably be about 20 to 25 of them whose circumstances I know well enough—would be in other occupations after having left the police force.

**Mr Gately:** You would say they are industrious types, wouldn't you?

**Sir WILLIAM KNOX:** There are well-known ones who are. There are others who have other problems.

That problem ought to be identified here, because it has been identified in other countries. The assumption that people take their superannuation and retire from the work-force is erroneous—quite erroneous. As one honourable member who interjected said, they do contribute to society. In whatever occupation they follow they are creators of wealth. They increase their standard of living. I am not knocking them.

It is about time that we in this State and, indeed, in this country, looked very closely at not so much talking about people wanting to retire early from particular callings or occupations, but finding ways in which they can continue to occupy those jobs, even though they may have reached what is regarded as, according to a consensus view or community standards, retirement age.

Many countries have discovered ways to have people continue in their employment even after they have received their superannuation benefits. It seems absurd to me that,

whether it be in private enterprise or the public service, people of senior years are lost to their employers and their talents are not retained simply because the superannuation benefits look so attractive that they want to cut and run. I think that is regrettable.

I am not suggesting that the superannuation benefits should be reduced. I am suggesting only that there should be ways of re-employing these people in the occupations and callings that they have been used to and in which they have expertise. It has been done elsewhere. In the United States, subject to medical certificates, many of these people are retained by the public service on a contract basis.

An interesting fact revealed in the report of the State Service Superannuation Board is that 95 per cent of employees listed in all the different categories elected to take lump-sum payments. Is it not extraordinary that such a high percentage would want to take lump-sum payments? A number of actuaries have pointed out to me that retirees would be much better off if they took annuities, but a great percentage of them continue to take lump-sum payments—and the superannuation fund loves it, because that is one of the ways the superannuation fund enhances its position. I know a very prominent citizen who has elected to collect an annuity and is now receiving an income that is greater than that received by the person who currently occupies the position that he left. That occurred because of the buoyancy of the superannuation fund to which he belongs. He is in good health and will live to a ripe old age.

**Mr Smyth:** That is okay if you're going to live for a while.

**Sir WILLIAM KNOX:** Sure.

**Mr Smyth:** It is a bit of a gamble.

**Sir WILLIAM KNOX:** Yes, it is a gamble. Tomorrow the honourable member could go outside and be run over by a truck. I hope that does not happen to him.

The majority of people are retiring from the public service in good health. The annual reports of the Public Service Board detail the number of employees who retire and the reason for their retirement. For instance, the report for 1985-86 reveals that 43 employees retired from ill health and only 45 retired at age 65 years. The number who retire in their senior years is very small. There were 725 employees who left for unspecified reasons and 792 resigned from the public service for other reasons. Many of these people receive very little superannuation. I do not think it is generally known that only about 30 per cent of Australian members of Parliament ever collect superannuation from their parliamentary superannuation schemes. That occurs because they do not qualify on the minimum time criteria. As honourable members would expect, a great number of public servants do not receive their optimum superannuation benefits because they do not last the distance. It is not compulsory for them to last the distance; there are lots of reasons why they leave the public service, police force and so on.

As the Minister hinted in his second-reading speech, the lowering of the retirement age to 55 years will not place a great burden on the funds at all. That has been proved by the actuarial report that has been published. So it is not a great burden on the funds to reduce the retiring age to 55 years, but I think there is a social and philosophical problem that sooner or later people in authority will have to address, that is that employment in the public service, the police force, the teaching profession or, for that matter, in the armed forces, because the same problem occurs there, should not be simply regarded as a way of joining some superannuation fund to get a lump-sum payment that will take people on to another stage of their lives.

The original concept of superannuation was simply that of thrift and prudence on behalf of the people involved and benevolence on behalf of the employer. I think that it has changed around. In the last 50 years in this country the whole situation has changed. Superannuation has gone from being something that is part of the employment package to something that will be a benefit to be acquired somewhere else. Sooner or later this country will have to address itself to what superannuation is all about.

That brings me to the recommendations contained in the Savage committee report. They are very important recommendations. I hope that the Minister will press to have the recommendations contained in the report of the Public Sector Review Committee implemented. Item 71 of that report recommends—

“That a Committee be appointed, to undertake an in-depth review of superannuation arrangements in the Queensland State Public Sector.”

I do not know whether the Minister is in a position to report on that. The terms of reference are listed. Item 73 of the report recommends—

“That such review be undertaken by a Committee comprising:

An independent Chairman from the Private Sector with wide experience in major superannuation schemes.

The State Actuary . . .

A person representative of employees.

An Actuary from the Private Sector.

The Manager of the State Service Superannuation Fund (as Secretary to the Committee).”

When an investigating committee examined the superannuation scheme of the Commonwealth public service it found some gross anomalies. It found very gross mismanagement—I think that was the word used at the time—of the fund.

I do not suggest—and it has never been suggested by anyone—that the superannuation fund in this State is in anything but good shape. However, there is a philosophical approach; there is information that needs to be known; and there are assumptions that have been made that may need to be recast and rethought. The recommendations of the Public Sector Review Committee should be taken very seriously indeed. I hope that the Minister pursues the matter because it could be very beneficial to the participants in the fund and it could lead to even more efficiency in the management of the fund.

The State Actuary has published a report, which I—and no doubt other honourable members—have read. The maximum time between reports, of course, is five years. It seems to me that that is far too long an interval between actuarial reports.

Times are changing. I cite the example of the stock-market crash in the last few weeks. I do not think that that could be taken into account by any actuary trying to forecast the future in the light of current experience. When incidents like that occur, it is time to have another look at actuarial reports, whether they relate to superannuation funds or other funds for which actuarial advice is sought. There is a need for actuarial investigations to be made more frequently in the light of the circumstances of the day.

The State Actuary has indicated that the next report on this fund will be compiled in 1990. I believe that that is far too long a period between reports in the present volatile circumstances of the financial world. Other information is changing rapidly because of pressures in the market-place. I make those suggestions to the Minister. The Bill, of course, is sound. The Liberal Party supports it. One hopes that the recommendations as a result of the review of the superannuation fund carried out by the Savage committee will be implemented as soon as possible so that even better provision can be made for employees of the State.

**Mr HENDERSON** (Mount Gravatt) (8.20 p.m.): It gives me pleasure to rise in support of this Bill. I congratulate the Deputy Premier on bringing this Bill forward to the party meeting and the Parliament tonight.

I recall the discussions that went on in the Minister's committee, particularly when the honourable member for Mansfield and I expressed considerable disagreement with the original retirement proposition that was put up by the Government at that time. The Deputy Premier challenged us to come up with a better scheme. I submitted my own proposal to him and asked that it be considered by Treasury. I note with a considerable amount of interest that the only difference between the retirement scales

that finally emerged in this Bill and the one that I put forward was that I said that at 55 years of age the retiree should receive 80 per cent and the Bill states that it will be 79 per cent.

This legislation is a step forward for Queensland and will have a very positive impact on the community. I was interested in the comments made by the Leader of the Liberal Party, Sir William Knox, that there is a retirement mentality in Australian society, that once a person reaches a certain age he retires. I find it incredible that this mentality is so pervasive in the Australian community, particularly when one compares Australia with overseas countries such as Japan, China and Germany.

**Mr Smyth:** Do you think the Premier should retire?

**Mr HENDERSON:** I think that any person who has a worthwhile contribution to society owes it to that society to make that contribution.

**Mr Smyth:** Do you think he should go fishing?

**Mr HENDERSON:** I will tell the honourable member one thing: if he keeps interjecting, he will be retiring early, but it will be to the intensive care ward of the Royal Brisbane Hospital.

**Mr Gately:** Are you going to soo Mr Burreket onto him?

**Mr HENDERSON:** No. I do not do things like that. I leave that up to the honourable member for Aspley, and I go about my own work.

A considerable number of benefits will flow to the community as a result of this Bill. There is no doubt in my mind that it will open up a whole series of new career paths within the public service and Crown employment in general. I am mindful of the fact that this will have a tremendous impact on teaching. I have taken the opportunity to talk to the teachers in many of the schools in my electorate, and I find that quite a number of them will take the early retirement option. These are people such as district inspectors, school principals, deputy principals and so on and, as these people move out of the service, career opportunities are opened up for others. This will be an extremely important opportunity for many people to advance through the system and accelerate their career paths. Many of these people have an extremely important contribution to make to education, the nursing profession and so on.

**Mr Vaughan:** Have they indicated what career path they are going to take when they retire?

**Mr HENDERSON:** As the Leader of the Liberal Party said—and I agree with him—these people are not retiring, and in a moment I will look at what some of them will do when they get out of the teaching service.

My major career interest is teaching. I notice that within the teaching service today there are a number of teachers who genuinely wish to retire early because they are tired and sick and feel that they have nothing positive to contribute to the profession. It is sad to see many of these people who, if they are unable to retire at 55, are faced with five years of work within the service. Their hearts are not in their jobs and they have nothing positive to contribute. I know that many of these people will welcome this retirement proposition with open arms.

**Sir William Knox:** Did you know that in the public service there are only 6.38 per cent of people over 55 years of age?

**Mr HENDERSON:** That is good.

**Sir William Knox:** My point is that the number of people likely to retire might not make a very big impact.

**Mr HENDERSON:** I have done a survey of the schools in my area and I know that a number of career opportunities will be opened up. Although the numbers may not be great, nonetheless they will be significant. That is a fact.

I have asked many of these people what they will do when they leave teaching and collect their superannuation. I have found that they fall into three categories. First of all, a significant group of them will go into small businesses in some form. One of the school administrators in my electorate aims to buy a newsagency and work in small business. He will be just over 55 when he retires and he is really looking forward to the challenge.

**Mr Vaughan:** He is going to knock off work to carry bricks.

**Mr HENDERSON:** That is right. He is going to stop one job to start another. If the honourable member knew this individual, he would realise that, if he did not keep himself busy and active, he would never be happy, anyway. He wants another job—another mountain to climb. He is really looking forward to it.

The second category of people I have noticed is the group who genuinely have an unfulfilled life ambition to travel or work with their family. I know that the total aim of one man who is retiring is to spend his retirement with his son who owns a business on the Sunshine Coast. His aim is to work with his son and to be close to his grandchildren. That is something that he has wanted to do. However, his work in the public service has kept him separated from his family. He now has an opportunity to bridge those gaps and he is really looking forward to his retirement.

The third category of people want simply to take their superannuation, invest it and live on the proceeds. I agree with the comments made by Sir William Knox on that matter. It is something about which I have thought very carefully. Honestly, I do not understand why so many people take lump-sum pay-outs. It is something that I really cannot understand, particularly if it involves someone who is going to retire at the age of 55. The life expectancy tables show that people who retire at 55 have quite a long life expectancy.

Interest rates are likely to fall. It is rather sad that a number of people who have taken lump-sum superannuation pay-outs have invested them and rolled them over. Twenty years later their income is not worth anything like the amount they received when they retired. I do not believe that the option of taking a lump-sum pay-out as opposed to a pension is the best path to follow. In fact, if a person has an option to take a pension, I think that it is best for him to take a pension, particularly if he retires fairly early.

Another matter I find interesting about the early-retirement principle is that most of the people who exercise that option genuinely believe that they will live a better life. I have noticed that, within their own life expectancy, they have definite plans. Because they have set goals for themselves and set out to achieve something, as retirement draws close many of them have shown very distinct improvements in their mental health and so on. Therefore the quality of their life must improve. The honourable member for Mansfield made the point, and I agree strongly with it, that some people look forward to retirement simply to stop work. A positive benefit that I see flowing to teachers in my electorate is that they have some idea of where they are going and what they are going to do. They are genuinely looking forward to it. I can see a positive impact in terms of their mental health.

Above all else, in terms of early retirement, I believe that the Government is opening up a scheme that is capable of even further improvement. I agree with the comment by Sir William Knox that, as we look at the impact of this scheme on the superannuation program in general, there will be opportunities to improve it. Those opportunities probably should be used to encourage more and more people to take pensions. Many people who are taking lump-sum superannuation pay-outs are, in my belief, misguided. Therefore, if we can look towards improving the pension system as

we move towards the 1990s, that is the most positive contribution that we can make in terms of early retirement.

In conclusion, I again congratulate the Deputy Premier for having taken this idea and run with it, of having had the courage to refer the suggestions back to the superannuation board, of having brought the idea to the party meeting and of having it endorsed. I am very pleased to have been a part of it. I am pleased to have worked with the Minister. I am certain that the legislation will be enormously successful.

**Mr HAYWARD** (Caboolture) (8.30 p.m.): I rise to support the Superannuation Acts Amendment Bill (No. 2), which has been introduced by the Deputy Premier. Mr Sherrin is not in the Chamber, but I commend him for his concern for public sector workers. I certainly hope that he reflects the very same support for private sector workers within our community. Mr Sherrin complained about the attitude of the press to proposed superannuation changes. Those changes must be seriously considered. We must not kid ourselves. A great nervousness about superannuation exists within the community. People are unsure as to what it is all about and what the future costs will be. We must consider the prospective payments that will have to be made by future generations. That is probably what Mr Sherrin was complaining about in relation to the sorts of problems that the press was highlighting.

I intend to draw the attention of the House to some of the problems that exist within the State Service Superannuation Scheme. In their own ways, all speakers in this debate have highlighted certain problems within the scheme.

Firstly, I would like to clear up some of the confusion that has arisen with the State Service Superannuation Scheme and the way in which it operates. Superannuation is a really complicated topic. I am sure that all honourable members who have prepared for this debate—particularly Mr Henderson—would agree with that. Superannuation has certainly proved to be highly contentious, especially in north America. One of the comments that stand out in my mind was made by Ralph Nader in 1973 when he was discussing superannuation liabilities and whether or not people in the future would be able to meet those liabilities. He predicted that of the 34 million Americans who are currently counting on pensions under the United States superannuation benefits scheme, over half will not receive any benefits at all because they simply will not be able to be paid.

There is no doubt that superannuation is on the political agenda in Australia. Much has been said about superannuation and the indexation of superannuation. Arguments have been put forward about tax deductibility relating to lump-sum payments. In various Parliaments around Australia, and probably in this Parliament, questions have been asked about financial mismanagement and inept investments that have been made on behalf of either private superannuants or public superannuants. In many ways this issue has been on the boil for a long time.

I intend to explain how the State Service Superannuation Scheme works. That scheme is known as a defined benefits scheme, which means that employees are guaranteed an exact benefit that is directly related to their age at retirement, their finishing salary, etc. That scheme contrasts to private and statutory authority schemes, which are generally referred to as accumulation schemes. They simply pay out on retirement the combined total of employees' and employers' contributions plus whatever investment income has been generated by those contributions over the contributing life of the employees.

The State Service Superannuation Scheme involves defined benefits; people know exactly what they are going to receive at retirement. Many private and statutory authority schemes are different because they do not offer a defined benefit but depend upon how profitably a scheme is operated. That is determined by many prevailing factors within the community—interest rates, the astuteness of investment management, etc.

The State Service Superannuation Scheme has three categories of employee contributors. The first category includes employees who are paid from consolidated revenue. That covers most departmental officers. The employee contribution is determined by

the Act. The employer contribution is paid by the Treasurer each financial year from consolidated revenue, which is determined by an actuary from time to time. The employee contribution is paid into the State Service Superannuation Fund. The employer contribution is paid into the State Service Superannuation Additional Benefits Fund.

The second category includes employees who are paid from the Loan Fund and any of the Trust or Special Funds. Those employees usually work in the Main Roads Department, the Public Trust Office, the State Library and hospitals. They have the employee contribution, which is determined by the Act, and the employer contribution, which is paid by the Treasurer monthly from the relevant fund. That is different from the other scheme. Again it is determined by the amount determined by the actuary from time to time. The employee contribution goes to the State Service Superannuation Fund; the employer contribution goes into the additional benefits fund.

The third category deals with employees of statutory authorities other than hospital boards. It talks about universities, colleges of advanced education, boards of advanced education, boards of teacher education, the Port of Brisbane Authority and the Golden Casket Office. The employee contribution again is determined by a formula in the Act. It is paid through the State Service Superannuation Board into the State Service Superannuation Fund. The employer contribution is paid by the employer each month. The amount is determined by the actuary, advised in this case by the State Service Superannuation Board, and is paid into the State Service Superannuation Additional Benefits Fund.

In all of these cases, there are two funds: the State Service Superannuation Fund and the State Service Superannuation Additional Benefits Fund. That is where a lot of confusion occurs in people's minds. Maybe it is me, but it has certainly taken some effort to sort through that material and find out exactly what happens.

The State Service Superannuation Fund receives all the employee contributions. It certainly pays all the benefits. Moneys standing to the credit of the fund are included in the cash balance held in the Treasury and may be dealt with accordingly. As the Treasurer knows, a fair degree of discretion exists. As it stands at present, the Treasurer pays to the fund interest at the rate of 12 per cent per annum. Certainly, that is what is said in the *Queensland Government Gazette* of 16 August 1986. That interest is paid out of consolidated revenue. That is the first part and that is where the employees' money goes.

The State Service Superannuation Additional Benefits Fund receives the employer contributions, as I said before, and it pays the Crown's proportion, which is five-sevenths of each pension or benefit payment made out of the State Service Superannuation Fund. It is fairly complicated as to how it is managed.

**Mr Davis:** If you find it complicated, imagine how difficult it is for the Deputy Premier.

**Mr HAYWARD:** No-one here would deny that it is complicated. However, the point that I want to make is that, simply, it is a defined benefits fund.

The important point for everyone to understand is that the State Service Superannuation Fund is a defined benefits fund. That means, as I said, that employees are guaranteed an exact amount of benefit on retirement. That certainly presents problems.

As I said previously, there are a number of complex provisions that I tried to simply define. However, they are very difficult to comprehend.

Sir Ernest Savage, to whom a number of speakers have alluded tonight, noted in his public sector review that the benefit structure of the State service scheme is seen by members to be inequitable to persons who resign from the service before retirement age to take up employment elsewhere. There is no doubt about that. It certainly locks them into a life-time within the State public service. We should look at portability so that public servants can go out into business and come back into the public service without

necessarily sacrificing their benefit. If we want to raise the standard of the public sector as well as that of the private sector, we need to have that flow and that portability.

As Sir Ernest Savage concluded, the lack of retrenchment provisions within the scheme certainly hampers management decisions. When he says "management decisions", I think that he is referring to decisions of individuals who may or may not wish to leave the scheme.

Sir Ernest Savage noted that the complex provisions of the scheme are difficult for members to comprehend, and that is certainly true. He noted that the complexity created very serious problems.

Another problem that pervades the whole Government is a lack of accountability. Nobody knows how the system works. The lack of accountability is certainly perceived by people who work in the State public service to be a significant problem.

Another point made by Sir Ernest Savage is that the real cost of Government funding of the State Service Superannuation Scheme under the existing arrangement is ill-defined and leads to misinterpretation by the public. I alluded to that earlier, and I hope that all honourable members in the Chamber are aware of that problem. The cost of the administration of the State Service Superannuation Scheme is not charged against the fund's earnings; therefore, under the existing arrangements, it does not seem possible to accurately gauge the performance of either the superannuation office or its investment policy. That is the kind of accountability problem to which I am referring.

Sir Ernest Savage also said that certain areas of administration lend themselves to rationalisation, particularly the overall complex nature of the present basis, and also the investment methods used by the fund. Honourable members will recall that I said there were three ways in which the fund operates. Certainly, some attempt should be made to look into investment methods. I notice in the Premier's Budget Speech that some of the recommendations made by the Savage committee regarding superannuation will be adopted within the scope of the Treasury function. That does not surprise me.

I turn my attention now to a topic that was referred to earlier—the State Service Superannuation Additional Benefits Fund. This fund is what concerns me most about the operations of the superannuation scheme for the public sector in Queensland. Put simply—benefits from this fund are paid from consolidated revenue with a notional interest rate that varies from time to time. At this time, the notional interest rate is 10 per cent. The point I made before about accountability applies also in respect of this fund. No-one knows what the real earnings of the State Service Superannuation Additional Benefits Fund are. I am sure that not one honourable member in this House knows what they are. No-one has any idea what happens to the money that is paid into that fund. There is absolutely no accountability. All kinds of allusions can be made about what happens to the money. Perhaps it is some kind of little fund for Sir Leo Hielscher.

**Mr Henderson:** How much is in that fund?

**Mr HAYWARD:** I have absolutely no idea what is in the State Service Superannuation Additional Benefits Fund. Nobody knows.

**Mr Henderson:** Which one?

**Mr HAYWARD:** I am talking about employer contributions. It is a very serious matter. When reference is made to employer contributions, it really means tax-payer contributions in the final analysis.

No-one knows whether the money is invested in capital works programs or recurrent expenditure. In spite of the fact that it is a defined benefit scheme, no-one knows whether or not there is an unfunded liability in superannuation as it applies to the public sector. No-one knows what the real rate of return is for the additional benefits fund. As I said earlier, at this time it is paid out notionally at the rate of 10 per cent. Honourable members can sit in this Chamber, think about it and talk about it; but at some time in the future Queenslanders could inherit a horrendous long-term debt.

In 1973, Ralph Nader made a point about accountability of superannuation schemes that existed in the United States. Honourable members should be honest with themselves. I think that each of us has a private fear. Although, in many ways, the provisions of this Bill will not affect us as parliamentarians, somewhere along the line someone will have to pay. Honourable members ought to know whether or not the additional benefits fund has an unfunded liability. I cite as an example of the need for accountability the case of statutory authorities. Earlier I spoke about accountability problems. Statutory authorities really exemplify the problems associated with a lack of accountability.

Either the honourable member for Mount Gravatt or the honourable member for Mansfield spoke about the Port of Brisbane Authority. In the report of that authority the employer contributions should be detailed under staff expenses. No-one really knows, but those figures should show up under staff expenses in the accounts of the relevant statutory authority. For the Port of Brisbane Authority the contributions are included in three categories of expenditure, namely, direct labour and expenses, indirect labour and expenses, and salaries. The point I am making comes back to the question of accountability, which is a real problem.

I will now refer to the situation that applies in New South Wales and what has happened there. Professor Bob Walker, the professor of accountancy at the University of New South Wales, made certain comments about superannuation in New South Wales. Nobody kids himself; there have been problems with superannuation-funding in New South Wales, particularly in the statutory authorities. The professor makes certain comments of which notice should be taken. He said—

“It’s heartening to see how responsive the NSW Government has been to the case for bringing information about the cost of superannuation out into the open. Recent Public Finance and Audit (Statutory Bodies) regulations require statements of income and expenditure to show the full amount of expense arising in the financial year in respect of superannuation and other deferred employee entitlements calculated by reference to annual estimates of the amount of unfunded past service costs using an accrued benefits method and the amount credited to each appropriate provision, which expense shall, in the case of a statutory body whose salaries and associated costs are not met from the Consolidated Fund, be shown separately in the income and expenditure statement and not by way of note . . .

Balance sheets of statutory authorities will have to disclose the amount of unfunded past service costs in respect of superannuation and other deferred employee entitlements, which amount shall, in the case of a statutory body whose salaries and associated costs are not met from the Consolidated Fund, be shown in the face of the balance sheet and not by way of note.”

Because New South Wales has had problems with unfunded liability, an attempt has been made to try to solve the problem and to also provide more information so that concerns that people have can be put to rest. I do not think that there is anyone in this Chamber who does not have concern about the dealings of defined benefits funds because those funds guarantee someone a certain payment. If a payment is guaranteed to a person, the money must be available to make that payment. The money has to be able to be paid when a person retires.

As I said before, many of the private schemes rely on the managers of those funds doing a good job. A person receives from a fund only what that fund has managed to earn. The manager of a fund must have the ability to be able to invest the money to ensure returns. No statements have been presented to indicate the real return in the additional benefit fund. As I said before, there is no accountability. With this Government it is not a question of more accountability on this issue, it is a question of no accountability on many things. This is just one. In the present instance it is more horrendous because future generations may have to meet intolerable financial burdens.

Many people do not question the operation of the funds because they argue that consolidated revenue will pick up any amounts outstanding. To me, that is an unreasonable

proposition. What is needed is increased accountability for the operations of superannuation funds. The question of whether or not there is an unfunded liability must be examined.

Another point that should be drawn to the attention of the House is that, although massive amounts of money are under consideration, the 1986-87 annual report of the State Service Superannuation Fund has not been tabled. It is now November 1987 and the report for the year ended 30 June 1987 has not been presented.

My concern is for the increased accountability of those funds to establish whether or not there is any unfunded liability. The accountability of statutory authorities must be examined with a view to increasing it. The member for Mount Gravatt, Mr Henderson, is a member of that committee. He should consider the operations of the Port of Brisbane Authority, which are a confused mess. The committee will really have to know what it is doing to be able to isolate the problem areas.

**Mr Henderson:** If you finish early, I will look at that tonight.

**Mr HAYWARD:** I assure the honourable member that it is a very complicated matter.

In conclusion, I wish to say that the Opposition supports the Bill, but I draw to the attention of the House, and the Minister in particular, a number of problems that I see with superannuation. One problem that was drawn to my attention by the honourable member for Mount Gravatt when he spoke was his concern about why many people take lump-sum pay-outs. Honourable members have to be honest with themselves when they address this question. Although individual superannuants may receive an increased benefit by electing to receive an indexed pension, from the point of view of the management of the funds, the problem for future generations of tax-payers will be exacerbated if more people are not encouraged to take lump-sum payments. Quite simply, we must try to ensure that people elect to take lump-sum payments.

**Hon. W. A. M. GUNN** (Somerset—Deputy Premier, Minister Assisting the Treasurer and Minister for Police) (8.53 p.m.), in reply: I thank honourable members for their contributions to the debate. This Bill, which provides for voluntary retirement from age 55 years for officers of the Queensland Government service, continues and extends my Government's policy of providing an adequate and appropriate range of superannuation benefits for Government employees.

The honourable member for Lytton and the honourable member for Nundah have referred to the recommendations of the Public Sector Review Committee on superannuation. The Government has given full consideration to the committee's recommendations and is continuing to do so. As announced in the Budget, further amendments to the Government superannuation schemes are proposed for July next year. Any judgment on whether the Government has had regard to the recommendations of the Public Sector Review Committee should be deferred until those amendments are put forward.

The honourable member for Lytton suggested that the introduction of early retirement will fully utilise any surplus in the superannuation funds. That is not so. The level of benefits proposed has been determined by the State Actuary as not to cause any additional costs to the funds. The major area in which surpluses will be used is in the reduction in the rates of members' contributions. That reduction will be equivalent to 1.5 per cent of salary and will apply from July 1988. That date of introduction was negotiated by the Government with public sector unions and was associated with the 3 per cent productivity proposal.

Contrary to the views of the honourable member for Lytton, the introduction of early retirement will provide further job opportunities for school-leavers in a number of areas. That has been pointed out by the honourable member for Mansfield.

The honourable member for Lytton tabled and incorporated a letter from the Professional Officers Association. That letter refers to a supposed anomaly in the legislation. No such anomaly exists. It has to be understood that the rates of contributions

for buying back additional service were ascertained by the fund's actuary so that the full buy-back would be completed by the payment of additional contributions through to age 65.

If a contributor elects to retire before the age of 65, he or she will have paid less than that required to buy back the additional service that would have been effected by contribution through to the age of 65. Thus the additional period of membership is discounted having regard to the shorter period over which the contributions were paid.

The benefits to which contributors who have bought back additional service will be entitled, should they accept the Government's offer of early retirement, will be those that have been actuarially assessed as an equitable entitlement having regard to the length of continuous service with the Government and the total amount of contributions paid to the scheme.

In the example raised by the Professional Officers Association of the two contributors retiring, one at the age of 55 and the other at the age of 60, with identical periods of service and salary, the age 55 retiree would receive 90 per cent of the benefit that would be received by the age 60 retiree. The level of benefit at age 55, as provided in this Bill, has been actuarially determined as an equitable early retirement value, having regard to what could be afforded within existing funding arrangements of the scheme.

To achieve a viable early retirement benefit for all members, it has been necessary to discount the entitlement on retirement before age 60. It must be borne in mind that the younger entrant retiring at age 55 has, for the period of his membership, had higher death and invalidity coverage owing to the fact that his potential years of membership—that is the insurance element—have been greater.

In regard to taxation of the age 55 early retirement benefit—the honourable member for Lytton's assertion that members will be disadvantaged is incorrect. Because the early retirement benefit will emerge as lump sum rather than a pension, which may be commuted to a lump sum, the end result will be that the retiree's tax bill will be less than it would otherwise have been.

The honourable member for Lytton has foreshadowed that he will move an amendment in relation to the manner of appointing contributor representatives to the State Service Superannuation Board. The question of the appointment of members to the State Service Superannuation Board as representatives of the various groups of contributors as prescribed by the superannuation legislation was fully debated in this Parliament in April 1985 at the time of the introduction of the Superannuation (Public Employees Portability and Acts Amendment) Act.

The amendments to the legislation at that time were made to ensure that all contributors to the scheme are eligible for appointment as members of the board responsible for administering the scheme. In my second-reading speech I assured honourable members that persons selected for appointment to the board would be representative of the contributors. Subsequent to the 1985 amendment, members of the State Service Superannuation Board were appointed for a term of three years from 1 July 1985. When considering members to be appointed as representatives of the various contributor groups, the Government took into account the nominations submitted by the various public service unions, and, indeed, the persons appointed were those nominated by the Queensland Teachers Union, the State Service Union and the Queensland Professional Officers Association. There are, however, many other associations that represent contributors to the State Service Superannuation Scheme.

The current provisions of the legislation ensure that members representing contributors may be appointed from any area of Government service, and the Government proposes to oppose the amendment to be moved by the member for Lytton.

In regard to the question of the current limitation on cash equivalent of long-service leave—the Government has given a commitment to remove this limitation for persons over the age of 55 years, and the necessary action is in train.

Finally, I thank my committee, which worked very hard to bring this Bill to fruition. Mr Henderson was correct in what he said. His advice, along with that of Mr Sherrin, Mrs Harvey and other members of the committee, contributed in no small way to the introduction of this Bill, which will be of benefit to the workers of Queensland.

Motion agreed to.

### Committee

Hon. W.A.M. Gunn (Deputy Premier, Minister Assisting the Treasurer and Minister for Police) in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 6, as read, agreed to.

Clause 7—

Mr BURNS (9.01 p.m.): I move the following amendment—

“At page 3, omit lines 33 and 34 and substitute—

“(b) five other persons appointed by the Governor in Council of whom—

(i) three shall be officers comprising—

one selected from the Teachers' Division and nominated by the Queensland Teachers' Union of employees;

one selected from the Professional Division and nominated by the Queensland Professional Officers' Association;

and

one selected from the Administrative, Clerical and General Division and nominated by the State Service Union of employees;

and

(ii) two shall be nominated by the Minister.” ’ ’

I do not need to speak to this amendment because the Minister has indicated that the Government will not accept it.

I believe that the contributors to the scheme not only are entitled to have their own person accepted by the Government to sit on the board and represent them but also should not have held over their heads that at any time the Government can use the provisions of the clause to reject their nominee. It is all right to say that at this stage the Government has accepted the nominees that have been put forward. It is clear that the Government has included in this Bill the right for it to object to anyone whom it feels is not acceptable. It means that a person sitting on the board, who decides to stand up and fight a particular issue publicly, could find that he or she is never appointed to the board again.

On behalf of the Opposition, I have moved this amendment and hope that it receives the support of the Committee.

Mr GUNN: This legislation has been debated fully in the House and everything pertaining to this section has already been discussed. I reject the amendment moved by the honourable member.

Amendment negatived.

Clause 7, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 8 to 24, as read, agreed to.

Bill reported, without amendment.

**Third Reading**

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

**QUEENSLAND INSTITUTE OF MEDICAL RESEARCH ACT AND ANOTHER ACT AMENDMENT BILL**

**Hon. M. J. AHERN** (Landsborough—Minister for Health and Environment) (9.05 p.m.), by leave, without notice: I move—

“That leave be granted to bring in a Bill to amend the Queensland Institute of Medical Research Act 1945-1984 and the Hospitals Act 1936-1984 each in certain particulars.”

Motion agreed to.

**First Reading**

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

**Second Reading**

**Hon. M. J. AHERN** (Landsborough—Minister for Health and Environment) (9.06 p.m.): I move—

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

In the 42 years since its establishment, the Queensland Institute of Medical Research has significantly expanded its operation to the extent that it is now recognised as a highly respected member of the international research community. Institute scientific staff are involved in projects which take them to all parts of the world in the quest for answers to the health problems afflicting mankind.

As the areas of scientific research have expanded, so too has outside funding, particularly by the National Health and Medical Research Council. Medical research organisations keenly compete for these grants and it says much for the institute that it has been so successful in attracting research moneys. The funding of these special project grants, over a period of some years, has increased to a level which, together with the annual State grant, now necessitates important changes to the Queensland Institute of Medical Research Act 1945-1984.

The main thrust of the amendments contained in this Bill is towards giving the institute's governing council more autonomy and flexibility in addressing the needs of medical and scientific research. In particular, new financial provisions will have the effect of making the institute a statutory body for the purposes of its financial functions. Overall, the Bill will effectively update legislation in line with present-day requirements, including those of the Auditor-General and the Treasury.

The Bill is designed, amongst other things, to facilitate the commercialism of the research carried out by the Queensland Institute of Medical Research. It is hoped that through the facilitation of this commercialism, extra funding will be able to eventually come back to the institute to provide further research money without any further cost to the tax-payer.

For the information of the House, I now turn to the key points of the Bill. Clause 4 of the Bill amends the preamble of the existing legislation by omitting what is now archaic terminology and substituting more appropriate terminology.

Clause 5 amends section 2 of Act to update definitions in line with present-day needs and meet the requirements of the institute under the amended provisions of the Act.

Section 3 of the existing legislation is brought into line with the needs of current-day research by the amendment proposed in clause 6. The amendment leaves the Act to be interpreted more widely in accordance with the current purpose of the institute in its medical research.

In widening the institute's base, clause 7 will amend section 5 by increasing membership of council from 10 members to 12 members. This will meet the requirements of the National Health and Medical Research Council's guide-lines for block grants in having representation on the institute council.

Membership of the QIMR Trust is also increased to allow for expansion as may be necessary from time to time. In amending existing section 8B, clause 10 will achieve the objective of widening membership of the trust from five members to a maximum of 10 members if so required.

Clause 12 repeals section 8J as annual financial statements by both the institute council and the trust, in future, will comply with Part IIA of the Financial Administration and Audit Act.

The amendment of section 9 of the Act by clause 14 will extend the power of the council to carry out agreements or arrangements to encompass all hospitals boards in Queensland and not be restricted just to metropolitan boards.

Clause 15, in repealing section 11 and substituting a new section 11, empowers institute council to select and appoint its own staff without referral to my department or to the Public Service Board, as was previously the case.

Two new sections are inserted in the Act by clause 17. The new section 11A is necessary to make it clear that appointees to joint research projects do not hold any official positions on the council or the trust and, by their actions, have no vested authority to bind the institute in any way. Section 11B clarifies the superannuation provision for staff of the institute.

By replacing section 13 with a new section in clause 18, this will formally replace outdated financial legislation and thus provide the institute with the autonomy to receive outside funding grants. The new section will also formally allow the council's participation in joint ventures and joint research projects. The new section 13A is a consequential amendment arising from the new section 13.

With regard to clauses 23 and 24—these are necessary to amend the Hospitals Act 1936-1984 by confirming the power of a hospitals board to enter into agreements or arrangements that provide for the joint participation in the ownership rights in discoveries, inventions, etc., made in a joint venture with a specified organisation and subject to my approval as the Minister.

Other proposed amendments are of a machinery or consequential nature and are necessary to bring the QIMR Act into line with present-day needs.

The Queensland Institute of Medical Research is an important part of the health service of Queensland, not only undertaking medical research itself but also contributing to research in hospitals and universities. These amendments are intended to provide the administrative support and financial systems that the institute requires to meet the challenges of modern medical research. In this age of rapid advances in computer and scientific technology, it is most important that the Queensland Institute of Medical Research has the administrative and financial support to meet these challenges effectively. It is intended that this Bill will achieve these objectives .

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate, on motion of Mr Prest, adjourned.

## **BUILDERS' REGISTRATION AND HOME-OWNERS' PROTECTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL**

**Hon. I. J. GIBBS** (Albert—Minister for Works and Housing) (9.13 p.m.), by leave, without notice: I move—

“That leave be granted to bring in a Bill to amend the Builders' Registration and Home-owners' Protection Act 1979-1983 in certain particulars.”

Motion agreed to.

### **First Reading**

Bill presented and, on motion of Mr I. J. Gibbs, read a first time.

### **Second Reading**

**Hon. I. J. GIBBS** (Albert—Minister for Works and Housing) (9.14 p.m.): I move—  
“That the Bill be now read a second time.”

A review of the Builders' Registration and Home-owners' Protection Act has been carried out. As a result, it is considered that some amendments are now necessary to the legislation. The amendments will allow the Act to be administered more efficiently and will provide additional protection for the home-buyer and will also clarify some sections of the Act.

The first is a change to the composition of the board. Presently it consists of eight persons representing various categories. Two of those eight positions are presently vacant—one due to the recent death of a member and the other because of a retirement by another member.

These amendments propose to reduce the number of board members to seven. It is proposed that that will be done by abolishing the architects' representative, the union representative and the building societies' representative on the board. It is proposed, also, to have a consumers' representative and an additional Government representative sit on the board. Having a consumers' representative on the board reintroduces a representation that was established when the House Builders' Registration and Home-owners Protection Act came into being in 1977. It is also proposed to allow duplexes, but not home units, to be included in the insurance scheme, together with single dwelling units on group title, to limit the liability of builders to six years and three months and to subrogate the rights of the owner to the board to enable action to be taken to recover moneys from negligent parties to faulty building work.

The board and industry are concerned about the action of some people trying to circumvent the Act by repeatedly seeking owner-builder permits. It is proposed to amend the Act to give the board discretionary powers in applications of this nature in order to uphold the rights of the genuine owner-builder.

Other minor amendments provide for additional terms and their meanings, increases in some penalties, rewording for clarity and simplification of the stop work order procedures, for the submission of an application for registration as a statutory declaration and for the increase in the time allowable for an aggrieved person to lodge an appeal with the Magistrates Court from one to two months concerning registration matters.

In the interest of the consumer, it is proposed to prevent an individual whose registration has been cancelled by the board from forming a body corporate and employing a nominee to overcome his cancellation or suspension. The amendments will also give the board the ability to reject an application for registration of a body corporate that does not have sufficient funds to operate as a builder, as it has with individuals.

Another step proposed in these amendments is the provision to register professionals such as engineers, architects and members of the Australian Institute of Quantity Surveyors or the Australian Institute of Building as house-builders. This is consistent with the general builder provisions of the present Act.

The amendments further provide for the removal of a requirement which is both time-consuming and delaying to those who must seek restricted registration. At present there is an anomaly whereby the Minister must approve restricted registration of a lesser effect than other cases which can be approved by the board without reference to the Minister. It is planned to remove the need to seek ministerial approval and allow restricted registrations to be handled by the board.

A further amendment will ensure that project managers, construction managers and the like must be registered builders unless they are in the employ of a registered builder.

Debate, on motion of Mr Prest, adjourned.

### REVOCATION OF STATE FOREST AREAS

**Hon. W. H. GLASSON** (Gregory—Minister for Lands, Forestry, Mapping and Surveying) (9.18 p.m.): I move—

- “(1) That this House agrees that the proposal by the Governor in Council to revoke the setting apart and declaration as State Forest under the Forestry Act 1959-1984 of:—
- (a) All that part of State Forest 60, parish of Rundle described as Area ‘A’ as shown on plan FTY 1140 prepared by the Department of Mapping and Surveying and deposited in the Office of the Conservator of Forests and containing an area of about 2 980 hectares,—and
  - (b) All that part of State Forest 154, parishes of Brigalow, Bulli, Vignoles, Waggaba, Western Creek, Wilkie and Yandilla described as Area ‘A’ as shown on plan FTY 1492 prepared by the Department of Mapping and Surveying and deposited in the office of the Conservator of Forests and containing an area of about 331 hectares,—and
  - (c) All that part of State Forest 34, parishes of Clemant and St Giles contained within stations 2-3-4-5 on Plan WG317 deposited in the Office of the Department of Mapping and Surveying and containing an area of 1.566 hectares,—and
  - (d) All those parts of State Forest 29, parishes of Barranga, Blackboy, Davy, Dromedary, Fairfield, Goomally, Waratah and Wooroona described as Areas ‘A’, ‘B’ and ‘C’ as shown on Plan FTY 1490 prepared by the Department of Mapping and Surveying and deposited in the Office of the Conservator of Forests and containing in total an area of about 11 150 hectares, be carried out.
- (2) That Mr Speaker convey a copy of this Resolution to the Minister for submission to His Excellency the Governor in Council.”

These proposals make provision for the excision of land from State forests near Gladstone, Millmerran, Ingham and Moura. I would like to mention at this juncture that all four proposals have been carefully considered by the Conservator of Forests and have his endorsement.

I turn now to the proposals before the House, the first of which involves the excision of about 2 980 hectares from State forest 60, parish of Rundle. The major portion of the land sought for excision from the State forest is proposed for reservation as national park. The subject area which lies westward of the Rundle Range has significant biological importance as it is the only remaining place in the State where intact belah forest and belah-dominated vine thickets occur in a coastal situation. Here tall belah forests, developed on gilgaied soil, occur right down to the salt flats and are, in places, the landward neighbour of mangrove thickets. Such area is a replica of typical inland forests and vine scrubs, and assumes unique importance, as it is found in a maritime situation. It is considered most desirable that this vegetation type be afforded permanent protection and that this could best be achieved by having such area declared a national park.

The balance area proposed for excision adjoins the southern boundary of the area recommended for national park purposes. Whilst it also has national park interest, the area has been excluded from the park proposal, as it may be required for the locating of water storage and diversion schemes associated with the Rundle oil-shale project.

To maintain the mining companies’ interest in this area as well as allowing management for nature conservation and recreation, it is proposed to have the area set apart as a departmental and official purposes reserve in terms of the Land Act, under the joint trusteeship of the Director-General of Mines and the Director of National Parks and Wildlife.

The next proposal provides for the exclusion from State Forest 154, parishes of Brigalow, Bulli, Vignoles, Western Creek, Waggaba, Wilkie and Yandilla of an area of

about 331 hectares. This area forms part of a much larger section of the State forest that, for a number of years, has been utilised for grazing under special lease tenure. It comprises mainly cleared country, and the lessees have made application to have the subject area converted to freehold tenure. The best future use of the area is considered to be for agricultural development.

Whilst the area carries some scattered stands of cypress pine, its excision from the State forest will have no adverse effect on the established sawmillers drawing Crown timber supplies from this region and will not impact on the management of the balance of the reserve. All costs associated with this proposal, including survey, will be the responsibility of the lessees. The lessees will also be required to make payment for the value of all merchantable timber presently standing on the proposed excision area.

The third proposal provides for the excision from State Forest 34, parish of Clemant of an area of 1,566 hectares. The proprietors of an adjoining freehold property described as portion 18, parish of Hinchinbrook recently acquired land for addition to this block that has been utilised for a number of years for the cultivation of pineapples.

When carrying out a survey of this increased land aggregation, it came to notice that a small section of the cultivation extended into the State forest. From an investigation by the Department of Forestry, it would seem that the subject land had inadvertently been cleared in the early 1950s by the present owners' parents and managed as part of the freehold since that time. Adjoining State forest land comprises open forest of poor quality. The area the subject of application is of little value for forestry purposes and its excision from the forest estate will regularise the position that presently exists. The proprietors will be required to meet all costs in this matter.

The final proposal provides for the revocation from State Forest 29, parishes of Barranga, Blackboy, Davy, Dromedary, Fairfield, Goomally, Waratah and Wooroona, of areas totalling 11 150 hectares. These areas form part of a much larger parcel of State forest land that has been utilised over a long period for grazing purposes under special-lease tenure.

In all, four special leases are involved, three of which are held in the same name. In each case, the respective lessees have sought to obtain a more secure tenure, although only a part of the total area involved is intended at this time for freeholding purposes. The balance will be retained in the Crown estate under grazing homestead perpetual lease. Forest products thereon will accordingly still be retained under Crown ownership.

The area located immediately to the south of the Dawson Highway, which is the subject of an application for conversion to freehold, has been extensively developed for grazing purposes and carries improved pasture. To provide for water facilities bores and dams have been constructed on the subject land. The balance area proposed for excision is also primarily grazing country and contains the lessee's homestead as well as other structural improvements.

When determining the boundaries of the excision areas, every endeavour was made to retain as much of the commercial timber stands as was practicable in the State forest. While some quantities of merchantable timber will be lost from the forest estate, such will have little if any impact on the availability of Crown timber supplies to the established sawmilling industry in this region. The lessees will, however, be required to compensate the Crown for such loss by payment of the assessed value of the timber.

Furthermore, the revocation of the subject areas from the State forest will have no significant adverse effect on the management of the balance of the reserve. All costs in the matter will be met by the lessees concerned.

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

Mr EATON (Mourilyan) (9.26 p.m.): The Opposition agrees entirely with part (a) of the motion, namely, the area being reserved for national park. The Opposition also compliments the Minister. On many occasions it criticises him for not conserving certain

areas that have significant value or for not protecting our wildlife. This is one example of the Government doing the right thing.

The other areas, with the exception of that mentioned in part (c), concern the Opposition because the Opposition does not believe in freeholding, particularly in freeholding large areas of land. I know that often the Opposition is criticised for its policy of allowing the freeholding of residential land, but in relation to rural and agricultural land the Opposition does not believe in freeholding. Over the years leaseholding has proved satisfactory. We are a developing nation. All that is happening is that large land-holders are becoming rich people, which is against the Opposition's principles of sharing wealth and having equity in all things in society today.

My main objection is that land is being converted directly from State forest to freehold. That has always been a sore point, and it always will be, with the Australian Labor Party. It is something that is objected to strongly whenever the Opposition sees it happening, as in the present instance. The land involved is good agricultural land. I am familiar with it. The Forestry Department will lose very little income, if any, from the sale of the timber in that area. A small block south of the Dawson Highway has already been excised. That block did contain some timber. I am pleased to see that because with the World Heritage row that is going on at the moment timber in State forests is a very touchy subject. The Government feels quite sure that it will win its argument. The Minister has dug his spurs in; he is going the whole hog. A big battle is looming.

Timber will be one of the more important products in Queensland. One of the cheapest and strongest houses available, is one that is made of timber. People often talk about building in brick, but they should go to a town after a cyclone has hit to see some of the roofs that have been blown off brick homes. With the personal experience that I have had in forestry over the years, I am a great admirer and a great advocate of timber.

I have not seen—nor do I like to see—any areas of State forest converted directly to freehold since King Ranch was granted freehold title in the 1950s. King Ranch sold areas of the original grant to banana-farmers in 200-acre lots for which it received well over \$1,000 an acre. I am aware that King Ranch and the other property in the Einasleigh area can be sold for \$45m, with some cattle thrown in as well. In the long term converting leasehold land to freehold will be like winning the casket. The value increases. People feel that they have more security with freehold land. Around the State, large areas of land, whether it be residential, agricultural, or grazing, have different tenures of leasehold. A property-owner cannot stop roads and power lines going through freehold properties. Many court cases have occurred over that. No doubt the Minister knows that at times in the courts the Government has to defend actions over the construction of easements or access to certain properties through freehold land, particularly when the road or easement would be in the public interest. I agree fully with the Government in that. However, when it gets down to the nitty-gritty, there is no difference between freehold and leasehold land.

**Mr De Lacy:** Yes, there is. The Japanese do not like leasehold; they want freehold.

**Mr EATON:** Yes, they like freehold title, which does have certain advantages.

However, leasehold title gives a false confidence because, if something can be done that is in the public interest and for the betterment of the community, the Government can act accordingly and take easements over certain areas or resume the land in total. The Government should always be able to do that. If any member cares to stand on any hill in Brisbane and look around at all the residences, I will bet him that three-quarters of the homes here in Brisbane are sitting on leasehold land. That leasehold title has come down through the years.

Outside the city areas there are miners' homestead perpetual leases. Because of the mining that was carried out in the early days in Queensland, many towns have MHPLs, even through now the areas have been worked out. I know that places in my electorate have MHPLs. In the adjacent electorate of Mulgrave, Babinda has a special township

plan which is, admittedly, handled by the Lands Department. However, in the early days that system satisfied the needs of the community.

The Opposition is concerned about the area of land south of the Dawson Highway that will be converted to freehold title. That is the subject of the Opposition's main objection to the motion. I have travelled through that area and know that it is good agricultural land. I have not actually seen safflower growing in that area, but I know there is sorghum and improved pasture there.

There is a great shortage of land now and, in the years to come, with increased population, that shortage of land will worsen.

Although the current state of the economy precludes the Government's buying back land under leasehold title, I think in the years ahead the Government will have to reverse its current trend of selling leasehold land and commence resuming it. At least, as leases are surrendered, the land will have to be cut up to provide smaller living areas to cater for increased population.

As I mentioned yesterday in the debate on the Primary Industries Estimates, today in Queensland and Australia the primary producer is a very competent and astute businessman as well as producer. If the Government and the marketing organisations can sell his product, he can keep up production. One of the big problems in society today is overproduction. The reason for that is that Governments cannot sell the goods produced. The farmers, agriculturists, the graziers and all others involved in rural industries—and even those in some manufacturing industries—suffer from problems caused by overproduction.

If the Government allows big companies and others to tie up large tracts of land, in the future it will make millionaires out of them overnight. Despite the fact that the economy is suffering from a bit of a downturn now, ups and downs do occur and, although it may take a while, eventually the economy will pick up and another land boom will occur. I think developers and similar people should be run out of the country. By tying up large tracts of land, they put a false value on it and make it very difficult for a family man to provide for his family the necessary comforts that they are entitled to. It is the family man who has to foot the bill. He is being robbed by high interest rates. Even though, as I heard on the news this evening, Suncorp has reduced its interest rate by a small percentage, the family man is in very difficult circumstances.

As I said earlier in the piece, the Opposition compliments the Government for the first parts of the motion for revocation because they preserve the wildlife and the national park area. However, it is Labor Party policy and my own personal view—I really support my own party in this whole-heartedly—that the freeholding of these areas of land should be opposed. Instead of carrying freehold title, the areas should be covered by long-term leases to cover those needs. In the past, in areas such as the Burdekin, there have been problems caused by the Government's actions. Many sensational and controversial issues have arisen out of the Government's actions in granting people freehold title or even, in some cases, long-term leasehold title when the Government knew at that time it would require that land for its own purposes in the future.

I most strongly object to the granting of freehold title on those last couple of blocks. However, I know it is a numbers game and that the Opposition does not have the numbers, so all it can do is object most strongly to the change in tenure from State forest to freehold in one go.

**Hon. W. H. GLASSON** (Gregory—Minister for Lands, Forestry, Mapping and Surveying) (9.35 p.m.), in reply: I thank the member for Mourilyan for his contribution on behalf of the Opposition. He made a couple of pertinent comments that I wish to canvass.

The member for Mourilyan said that there is no difference between freehold tenure and leasehold tenure. It is sad to see that quite obviously the honourable member has not had much experience in developing land in any shape or form.

I refer to the occasion on which I introduced amendments to allow for the freeholding of islands off the east coast. I see that the member for Toowong is in the Chamber. He supported the member for Stafford in saying that the Government would make millionaires of many people overnight. I have yet to see one move in that direction.

**Mr Beanland:** Give it time; it will come.

**Mr GLASSON:** Never mind about that. The honourable member's time will come. He is showing how ignorant he is.

As has so rightly been said, no more land is being made. Therefore, the use of every hectare of land that is available in the Commonwealth of Australia and indeed throughout the world has to be maximised. The only way to do that is to ensure the maximum improvement of land so that it can produce. There is a borrowing requirement on the part of the entrepreneur, the developer or the land-holder so that he can attain maximum production. The requirement of any financier, be it a bank or a wool-broker, is maximum security of tenure, and the ultimate is freehold title. There is no substitute for freehold tenure.

**Mr Eaton:** Why is it that all the multimillionaires today, such as the Bonds, started off as developers of freehold land?

**Mr GLASSON:** As the urban sprawl takes over the rural sector, there will be opportunity for developers. As the population grows, it has to be accommodated on land. As I say, no more land is being made. The population is growing and there has been a trend towards urban sprawl by virtue of condensed living, high-rise unit type accommodation, where the cost factor is lower. I correct the honourable member and say that there is no difference between freehold tenure and leasehold tenure.

The honourable member referred also to the land boom. God help us if ever the day comes when land becomes dearer and the boom is bigger than it is at the moment. That is what is stifling rural industry in this State and throughout the Commonwealth of Australia. All land is too expensive.

To prove my point—I defy anyone to move from the horticultural area of Redland Bay, which used to be the salad bowl of the Brisbane region, and work through the Lockyer Valley to the Darling Downs and then to the mixed farming areas, the wool-producing areas, the cattle-producing areas, the sugar-producing areas and the grain areas of the Central Highlands. I defy anyone to buy a piece of land today, equip it to produce and meet bank interest. The simple reason is that land is just too expensive.

**Mr Eaton interjected.**

**Mr GLASSON:** The Government cannot lower the price of land. Price is controlled by the market-place itself. Sadly, only a recession in those industries will bring down the price of land.

Sadly, the only area that I know of in which land values have depreciated in recent times is the Darling Downs. It has some of the most productive soil in the State of Queensland. Because of the grain recession, there has been a reduction in land prices on the Darling Downs. It is quite unique in this State.

The member for Mirani will be aware that there have been some minimal reductions in land prices in the sugar-growing areas. That is simply because commodity prices have put pressure on those industries. People had to forsake their land to remain viable. Those are two examples.

I appreciated very much the comments made by the member for Mourilyan in relation to the Opposition's feelings about the revocation. However, I repeat that revocations and matters affecting forestry reservations will be an ongoing saga till the end of time. There will always be a requirement for pieces of land to be excised from forests.

Motion agreed to.

**EDUCATION ACT AND ANOTHER ACT AMENDMENT BILL**

**Hon. L. W. POWELL** (Isis—Minister for Education) (9.40 p.m.), by leave, without notice: I move—

“That leave be granted to bring in a Bill to amend the Education Act 1964-1987 in certain particulars and the University of Queensland Act 1965-1987 in a certain particular.”

Motion agreed to.

**First Reading**

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

**Second Reading**

**Hon. L. W. POWELL** (Isis—Minister for Education) (9.41 p.m.): I move—

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

The Education Act was last amended in 1984. In the period since, changes to various aspects of education in Queensland have made it desirable for sections of the Act to be modified in order to ensure that the Act gives legislative expression to the current reality of education in this State and to ensure that education is as efficient and effective as possible.

On 1 April this year I introduced a Bill to amend the Education Act. At that time I called for public comment and submissions to be made on the basis that, if changes were justified, they would be made, even to the extent of withdrawing and rewriting the Bill.

On 1 June 1987 I established a working party to consult and report on aspects raised in the proposed legislation. These related to: constitutional responsibility; co-operation with industry; rationalisation of educational structures in the light of changing developments; a co-operative approach to curriculum development; and establishment of a non-government schools advisory council. The Bill was subsequently withdrawn for redrafting. The members of the working party were—

Dr Ken Robertson, Assistant Director-General (Schools), Chairman;  
Mr Norm Alford, Assistant Director-General (Post School);  
Dr Ray Barrett, Principal, Rochedale State High School;  
Mr Alan Druery, Director, Queensland Catholic Education Commission;  
Mr Cec Munns, President, Association of Independent Schools of Queensland;  
Reverend Les Percy;  
Mrs Bev Galtos, Vice President, Queensland Council of Parents and Citizens Associations; and  
Ms Mary Kelly, Queensland Teachers Union President, representing four unions.

It should be noted that the AISQ representative withdrew from the consultative process on 5 September and was not present for the final four meetings. I emphasise that.

As one of its first tasks, the working party, through a process of consultation with its members' sponsoring groups, developed a rationale for change. This rationale then guided members in their formulation of recommendations. The rationale for change is as follows—

**Introduction**

The primary function of education is to develop the individual potential of all students to its fullest extent to enable them to meet life's challenges and opportunities

successfully. Education should be accessible to everyone and should cater for all students, including those with special needs. The State Government has a primary obligation to develop and maintain a high quality public education system.

The education system must also address a variety of internal and external demands in order to retain relevance to changing community needs in a democratic society. Ensuring the views of all sections and groups within the education community and a wider community are reflected through an appropriate co-operative consultative process, leading to curriculum and/or other developments in education, is an integral part of the operation and development of the education system.

In this context the legislation is designed to define relationships, promote trust and goodwill, and facilitate partnership and balance among the Parliament, through the Minister for Education, parents, education authorities, Government and the non-Government sectors of education within the State. Education must be conceptualised in such a way that it is seen as an initiator as well as a reflector of social change.

The influence of education on society is not only gradual but also fundamental to further development and progress. Schools and colleges are essentially concerned with the longer term and, irrespective of the demands which arise at certain moments of history, they should be seen as evolving institutions with a continuing function. Schools and colleges cannot change policies and programs to adjust to specific and short-term changes in the economy. They can, however, provide a sound, challenging, general education, developing each individual intellectually to the greatest extent possible. It then follows that people well educated in this way will have the flexibility, initiative and adaptability to contribute productively and positively to the nation, culturally, socially and economically, no matter what new circumstances arise.

In education, the correct balance should always be maintained between those aims of formal schooling which are recognised as enduring and those which are being developed as responses to short-term, individual and societal needs. Examples of the former aims are: enrichment of the mind and spirit; fostering personal growth and self-development; increasing understanding of the societal, economic and political environment; cultivation of civic virtues and understanding of the rights and responsibilities of citizenship. Examples of the latter aims include meeting the individual's need to earn a living and the State's need for citizens who can contribute to its well-being.

Any proposed changes to the Education Act should embody these aims; be in the best interests of Queenslanders; and be consistent with the need for a broad, general education that will prepare and equip young people for adult life and for continuing education as adults.

### Social Context

In the continually changing world of the late twentieth century, the education system in Queensland is presently facing major challenges which require reappraisal of many aspects of education and the ways in which it has been administered. The circumstances today are different from those of the 1960s and 1970s, when current educational structures were introduced. Therefore, it is necessary to examine the provision of educational services and ensure that curriculum and administrative structures are flexible and responsive to change within the context of resource levels and their cost-effective use.

In Australia, increasing demands for educational reform are being heard from both within and outside education. Acceptance will be enhanced if reform emerges from a partnership among education and other sections of the community. Critiques of educational trends and directions have addressed a wide range of concerns and reflect a range of viewpoints. A number of well-known recent reports, at both the national and State levels, have identified and addressed these concerns. The following are examples of areas of concern and debate—

- the definition of the “basics” of education, appropriate standards, and levels of expectation;

- the involvement in an appropriate and effective manner of various groups within the community in education;
- the relationship of education to the world of work and to the economy in general;
- the role of education in creating a more equitable and democratic society;
- the role of education in individual personal development;
- the response of education to advances in knowledge, in particular in the areas of science and technology;
- the response of education to societal changes;
- the role of education in defining Australia's place in the "global village";
- the development of more efficient, less bureaucratised administrative procedures in education.

It should be recognised that not all concerns about education or demands made on education systems have equal validity or importance. In times of general social anxiety, in particular education becomes the focus of much critical attention.

Notwithstanding other constraints, there is a need to analyse claims carefully made for and against change in the light of considerations raised in this rationale.

#### A. Constitutional Responsibility

Within the Australian Constitution, education was one of the areas of responsibility retained by the States. In a system of parliamentary democracy, the Minister for Education is necessarily responsible to the Parliament, and through it to the people, for the administration of the Education portfolio.

As a consequence of this, the Minister for Education has a responsibility to ensure not only that the legislation enacted by Parliament is implemented, but also that Government policy is understood by the education and wider community.

The relationship between the community and the Minister is reciprocal. However, the Minister has the responsibility to ensure that Government policy endorsed by the community reflects the wishes and serves the best interests of people in this community.

#### B. Co-operation among Industry, Commerce and the Education sectors

Though education is not primarily about job training, it does have a role to play in preparing and re-equipping students for the world of work. A population with a broad, general education is better equipped to adapt to changing economic circumstances. For this reason, it is appropriate to improve communication among the education community and industry and commerce. Improved, ongoing dialogue among the education, industry and commerce sectors is desirable and formal structures should facilitate such dialogue. These structures should ensure that the legitimate interests of industrial and commercial sectors will be appropriately and not disproportionately exercised in educational decision-making.

It is necessary for industry and commerce to have increased opportunities to gain a better understanding and appreciation of the work performed by educators, together with the full range of educational institutions, both Government and non-Government, ranging from pre-school to higher education.

Educators, too, need to be more aware of recent and possible future developments in industry and commerce and the implications of such developments for education. The speed of technological change will increase the need for retraining and will have ramifications for education.

#### C. Rationalisation of Structures to Take Account of Continuing Developments in Education

It is widely accepted that profound and rapid changes have occurred in Queensland society during the last decade and there is a need to respond effectively and efficiently

to the varying influences on education. For instance, formal adoption of the P-10 concept by the State Department of Education is a factor which requires attention. There is also pressure to respond to significant growth in the post-compulsory sector. This growth is illustrated not only by the greatly increased retention rates from Year 10 to Years 11 and 12 in schools and colleges and the rapid expansion of curriculum offerings in schools but also by the continued growth and demand for TAFE programs and the emergence of a senior college structure.

There needs to be greater co-ordination of curriculum accreditation and assessment procedures at Years 11 and 12, technical and further education and the college of advanced education levels. The proliferation of post-compulsory educational institution arrangements, including industry-based training programs, coupled with increased demand for retraining as a result of technological change, highlight the need for a reform of assessment and accreditation procedures in post-compulsory education. Today's students exiting Year 10 and Year 12 need to have the opportunity to choose among a number of options. There needs to be an examination of the administration of post-compulsory education to ensure greater co-ordination, co-operation and responsiveness.

There is a need to set in place accreditation and certification procedures which facilitate transfer from a course in one type of institution to that of another. There is also a need for the granting of credit for work done in one institution by a second institution. The present structure, where accreditation of courses in universities, colleges of advanced education, TAFE and senior colleges is done in isolation, has the potential for duplication and wasteful repetition as well as the establishment of barriers to transfer from an institute in one sector to that in another. In this regard a greater degree of co-operation and co-ordination would be desirable. Increasingly, there is a need for more flexibility.

Where appropriate and legitimate, students should be allowed to transfer from one institution to another, not only to complete a course but also to advance their qualifications and to have qualifications received from one institution credited by a subsequent institution in the cases of transfer. There is a need for certification which is recognised and respected by employers and by the community in general. Such a certificate would be required by students whether they leave at or after the completion of Year 10.

The portability of academic awards throughout Australia and beyond is an important consideration in facilitating students' access to further study or employment within and beyond their home States. At a national level, this is achieved through a single body—the Australian Council of Tertiary Awards (ACTA). Accreditation and certification procedures in Queensland would need to be developed and supervised by recognised, statutory and representative Statewide bodies. Such bodies should be characterised by a degree of independent authority appropriate to the exercise of their functions. Efficient and effective methods of maintaining a register of teachers completing accredited programs or accredited courses in teacher education need to be continued.

#### D. A Co-operative Approach to Curriculum Development across the Education Spectrum

Prerequisites for tertiary entrance and the rules governing the awarding of TE scores restrict the range of subjects that students can take and produce a bias in the direction of more traditional academic subjects. With approximately 30 per cent of the Year 12 cohort proceeding to higher education, with record retention rates which are increasing annually, and with insufficient tertiary places, more flexibility with respect to curriculum offerings and less stringent prerequisite requirements for entry to tertiary institutions are needed. The new school curriculum must respond adequately to community needs for new courses and for the review of existing courses. The maintenance of balance, trust and co-operation among the various groups in the community with a stake in education is best achieved where no one group has disproportionate power. Representative bodies, characterised by a degree of independent authority appropriate to the exercise of their function, provide a mechanism for the maintenance of balance and, at the same time, are a means by which various issues can be analysed as the basis for implementing policies and programs. Membership of these bodies should reflect a well-considered

balance of views, taking into account the appropriate roles of each group in the education process.

#### E. Development of a Non-Government Schools Council

There is a need to recognise the non-Government school sector which currently educates 26 per cent of students in this State. This recognition should entail an ongoing consultation process with representatives of this sector.

The recognition of the non-Government sector also entails a responsibility on the part of the Minister for Education to ensure that non-Government schools meet desirable, minimum community standards in the educational programs they provide. While recognising the need for diversity and innovation, formal structures should ensure that the legitimate interests of parents involved with Government and non-Government education will be appropriately and not disproportionately exercised in educational decision-making. On the other hand, the individual rights of parents should be recognised.

In all, the Working Party met on 12 occasions, involving in excess of 45 hours of face-to-face formal consultation. I express, without reservation, my sincere gratitude, and that of the State Government, to the members of the Working Party who gave so generously of their time. Their willingness to attend numerous meetings, to spend long hours liaising with their sponsoring groups and their willingness to put self-interest aside in the interests of the students of Queensland is very much appreciated.

Specifically, the Bill is necessary to amend the Education Act to enable the dissolution of the Boards of Adult Education, Advanced Education, Secondary School Studies and Teacher Education, to repeal all the legislative provisions pertaining thereto and then to provide the legislative bases for three new statutory bodies: the Queensland Post-Compulsory Course Accreditation Council, the Queensland Teacher Registration Council and the Advisory Council of Education for Economic Development.

At this point I would like to place on record the Government's appreciation of the work of the many people who have served on the boards over a number of years. They have received no payment for their services, yet their contribution to education in Queensland has been most significant.

The Queensland Post-Compulsory Course Accreditation Council will supersede the Boards of Advanced Education and Secondary School Studies and oversee standing committees on accreditation of courses for awarding of pre-tertiary exit certificates, higher education selection procedures, accreditation of subdiploma level tertiary education courses and the accreditation of degree, diploma and graduate diploma courses.

The Queensland Teacher Registration Council will supersede the Board of Teacher Education and will administer the teacher registration provisions of the Act. This body will focus almost exclusively on matters of teacher registration rather than teacher education to eliminate the potential for overlap with the functions and powers of the Accreditation Council. Substantial overlap in such areas has existed previously between the Board of Teacher Education and the Board of Advanced Education.

The role and functions of the Board of Adult Education have in the practical sense long since been subsumed by the Division of Technical and Further Education and the removal of the Board of Adult Education provisions from the Act serves to recognise formally that arrangement.

The Advisory Council on Education for Economic Development is to be established to report and make recommendations to the Minister for Education in respect of education and training related to the promotion of the State's economic development.

The Bill also introduces a small number of other new and amended provisions. These have the effect of—

- (a) enabling the Minister to undertake membership of other bodies related to or complementary to education;
- (b) enabling the Minister to produce and sell educational materials and services;

- (c) providing a clear legislative basis for the security and administration of school records, particularly those relating to students;
- (d) updating and expanding the headings for rules applicable to colleges of technical and further education;
- (e) updating the teacher registration provisions of the Act to eliminate minor deficiencies;
- (f) expanding the headings for the functions by-laws applicable to councils of colleges of advanced education;
- (g) transferring to the Education Act, after minor amendment, the provision from the University of Queensland Act pertaining to restrictions on conferring and using certain awards; and
- (h) enshrining in legislation for the first time, the rights of independent schools.

The detail of the new provisions and amendments to the existing legislation, many of which are machinery provisions required to give effect to the dissolution of the present boards and to the establishment of new councils, is provided in the following section.

#### Provisions of the Bill

Clauses 1 and 2 cite the short title of the Bill and provide for the commencement of the various provisions by proclamation. This provision has been included to permit the Government some flexibility in the timing of the dissolution of existing boards and the establishment of the new councils proposed in the Bill. This flexibility is particularly important in the case of the Queensland Post-Compulsory Course Accreditation Council which will need a variety of subordinate legislation to be immediately operable from the date of its establishment. The smooth transition of staff is also a consideration.

Clause 3 divides the amendment Act into its component Parts.

Clause 4 amends the citation of the Education Act.

Clause 5 makes provision of section 2 of the Education Act (Parts and Divisions) for the Parts and Divisions headings necessary for the Queensland Post-Compulsory Course Accreditation Council, the Queensland Teacher Registration Council and the Advisory Council on Education for Economic Development, for the transfer of certain powers pertaining to the restrictions on conferring and using certain academic awards from the University of Queensland Act to the Education Act, and for the minor adjustment of other headings appropriate to the revised structure of the Act.

Clause 6 introduces into section 4 (Interpretation) the various new and amended definitions of terms now to be used in the Education Act.

Clause 7 provides two new sections in the Education Act. The first provides for the Minister or an officer authorised by him, upon invitation of agreement to undertake membership of other bodies which have among their objects education, training or research etc., and further, to enter into agreements with such bodies. Examples of such bodies would include the National Research and Development Centre for Technical and Further Education and the Australian Music Examinations Board.

The second section authorises the Minister to produce, promote and sell educational materials, and services and to enter into agreements for such purposes. Examples of such arrangements would be the marketing of departmentally produced materials in south-east Asian countries (the ASEAN marketing exercises); and the marketing of produce and technology developed by colleges of technical and further education.

Clause 8 provides for the security and confidentiality of school records, particularly those pertaining to students. It legislates what has long been policy, and in doing so preserves the integrity of school records while at the same time enabling officers to divulge information to a court or other authorised recipient with appropriate protection from liability.

Clause 9 provides for new and updated headings for rules in respect of colleges of technical and further education. These include—the capacity to levy fees for extra

curricular services; the establishment of facilities designed to support the conduct of technical and further education; the expanded use of college facilities etc., for purposes other than education; the establishment of student organisation and college consultative committees; safety standards; and the establishment of research and consultancy centres.

Clauses 10, 11, 12 and 13 provide for the repealing of the sections of the Education Act pertaining to the Board of Secondary School Studies.

Clause 14 provides for the insertion of the Part and Sections necessary for the constitution of the Queensland Post-Compulsory Course Accreditation Council, the Advisory Council on Education for Economic Development and the Queensland Teacher Registration Council, and the relocation of the teacher registration provisions which have been taken from the current Act and subjected to minor amendments to improve clarity of understanding and to rectify deficiencies present in the existing provisions.

Those deficiencies were—

- (a) That the subsection dealing with provisional registration was worded in such a manner as to be self-cancelling. The new provision expresses the conditions for provisional registration in a positive way.
- (b) That the references to a day appointed by the Governor in Council for the commencement of the requirement for teachers to hold teacher registration were no longer necessary as that day has long since passed. That provision has been deleted.
- (c) That the teacher registration provisions were not binding on the Crown. The proposed provisions are binding on the Crown.
- (d) That the penalty provisions did not reflect the importance of the provisions. In the proposed provisions, those penalties have been increased to appropriate levels.
- (e) That there was not an onus placed on an unregistered teacher not to be employed as a teacher. The new provision expresses this requirement.
- (f) That teachers, employed by the Crown, who failed to renew their registration could not adequately be dealt with. The new provisions enable such situations to be handled administratively by the Director-General of Education under the authority of the Public Service Act 1922-1978.
- (g) That there was no requirement for registered teachers, convicted of an indictable offence, to notify the Board of Teacher Education of such a conviction. The new provisions require that all registered teachers so convicted shall notify the Queensland Teacher Registration Council of each such conviction.
- (h) That a person wishing to appeal against a decision of the Board of Teacher Education could do so only by means of a rehearing of old evidence and witnesses previously produced. The new provisions contain the facility for an appeal to be by hearing de novo (that is, where new evidence and new witnesses can be produced).

Clause 15 provides for the repealing of the sections of the Education Act pertaining to the Board of Adult Education.

Clause 16 provides for the repealing of the sections of the Education Act pertaining to the Board of Advanced Education and the Board of Teacher Education.

Clause 17 provides for the dissolution, on dates to be proclaimed, of the Board of Adult Education, the Board of Teacher Education, the Board of Advanced Education and the Board of Secondary School Studies and for the termination of all by-laws and rules made by either the Board of Teacher Education or the Board of Secondary School Studies.

Clause 18 transfers to the Corporation of the Minister for Education responsibility for all assets and liabilities of the Board of Advanced Education, the Board of Teacher

Education and the Board of Secondary School Studies. This clause also provides for the continuation by the Queensland Post-compulsory Course Accreditation Council of the existing curriculum development activities of the Board of Secondary School Studies.

Clause 19 provides for the employment by the Department of Education of all full-time permanent staff of the Boards of Advanced Education and Teacher Education who wish to join the Queensland public service. It provides for their employment on terms and conditions, subject to any applicable award, as the Governor in Council may determine, with the added proviso that those terms and conditions shall not be more favourable than those applicable to officers of equivalent level already with the public service.

Clause 20 provides for the maintenance of entitlements, in respect of leave and superannuation, of those employees of the Board of Advanced Education or the Board of Teacher Education who commence employment with the Department of Education, pursuant to the provisions of Clause 19.

Clause 21 provides for the audit and finalisation of accounts of the Boards of Advanced Education, Secondary School Studies and Teacher Education.

Clause 22 provides for the establishment of a new part heading within the Education Act—a machinery provision only.

Clause 23 provides for the amendment of section 51F—functions and powers of Council of College of Advanced Education—to remove from that section references to the Board of Advanced Education and to substitute in lieu thereof “the Minister”. It also establishes a relationship between the Council of each College of Advanced Education and the Queensland Post-Compulsory Course Accreditation Council and provides the head of power necessary for colleges of advanced education to undertake applied research.

Clauses 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32 and 33 provide for machinery amendments to the heading of Part VIIIA and to sections 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60 and 61 of the Act respectively, which contain general administration provisions, to cause application of those provisions to the Queensland Post-Compulsory Course Accreditation Council, the Queensland Teacher Registration Council and the Advisory Council on Education for Economic Development.

Clause 34 provides for the repealing of section 62—attendance by proxy at meetings—which is no longer required and the placement in its stead of a section enabling the Minister to provide staffing and financial resources for the three new councils.

Clauses 35 and 36 provide for machinery amendments to the heading of Part VIIIA and to section 62A to remove references to the expression “Board”.

Clause 37 provides for machinery amendments to section 62B (Restriction of alienation, etc., of land) to remove references to the expression “Board” and for the conferment of Crown status on the councils of colleges of advanced education in building matters. The need for this amendment stems from a High Court decision of 1 September 1982 in the case of the Townsville Hospitals Board. Cabinet approved the proposed amendment on 13 September 1982 for insertion in the Education Act when it was next amended.

Clause 38 provides for machinery amendments to section 62C (Council may make by-laws) to substitute the penalty unit provision for a money expression and for the removal of the reference to the Board of Advanced Education. The clause also provides further headings for by-laws in respect of the establishment of research and consultancy centres and the fees payable in respect of college services.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Mr Row): Order! As there are 63 clauses in the Bill, the Minister might seek leave to have the balance of his speech incorporated in *Hansard*.

**Mr POWELL**: I would be delighted to do so. I seek leave to have the remainder of my speech incorporated in *Hansard*.

Leave granted.

Clauses 39, 40, 41, & 42 provide for machinery amendments to the heading immediately before section 62D and sections 62D, 62E and 62F to remove references to the expression "Board".

Clauses 43 & 44 provide for the repealing of those sections pertaining specifically to the Board of Teacher Education and to the registration of teachers. These matters have been transferred to a new Part of the Act (Part VII) and sections created by means of Clause 14.

Clause 45 provides for a machinery amendment to the heading of Division V of Part VIIIA to remove all references to the expression "Board".

Clause 46 provides for machinery amendments to sections 62M (Funds of Board or Council) to remove all references to the expression "Board" and to update references to money amounts and the keeping of bank accounts to reflect current policy requirements.

Clause 47 provides for the replacement of section 62N (Accounts and Audit) with a new section which has been provided by the Auditor-General and which accommodates the requirements of the Financial Administration and Audit Act 1977, particularly as they pertain to Statutory Authorities.

Clauses 48 & 49 provide for machinery amendments to section 62P (Budget of Council of college of advanced education) and section 62Q (Observance of budget) to remove references to the Boards of Advanced Education and Teacher Education and to provide for the Minister to fulfil the role formerly played by the Board of Advanced Education with respect to the budgets of Councils of colleges of advanced education.

Clauses 50, 51, 52, 53 & 54 provide for machinery amendments to sections 62R, 62S, 62T, 62U and the heading immediately before section 62V to remove references to the expression "Board".

Clause 55 provides for machinery amendments to section 62V (Power of a Council of a college of advanced education to borrow) to remove references to the expression "Board" and for the removal of the reference to The Local Bodies Loans Guarantee Acts 1923 to 1957, those Acts having now been repealed and replaced by the Statutory Authorities Financial Arrangements Act 1982 to 1984 which by virtue of its defined scope of application obviates the need for separate referencing in the Education Act.

Clauses 56, 57, 58, 59 & 60 provide machinery amendments to sections 62W, 62X, 62Y, 62Z and 62AA to remove all references to the expression "Board".

Clause 61 provides for the insertion of a new Part XII and section 66 (Restriction on conferring and using certain awards). This section is transferred from the University of Queensland Act. It applies to all tertiary awards and is considered more appropriately placed in a general education provision such as the Education Act. In transferring the section the opportunity has been taken to amend its provisions to update the penalty provisions in amount and form (to 10 penalty units) and to provide greater clarity in regard to the application of the section. As the old provision stood it referred to an award being authorised by "an Act". Legal interpretation of the simple term "an Act" means an Act of Queensland, so awards under other States' or Commonwealth legislation were not so authorised. This was not the intention of the measure. It is clarified in the amended provision and has been extended to make it more flexible.

Clauses 62 & 63 cover the citation and amendment of the University of Queensland Act necessary pursuant to Clause 61.

**Mr POWELL:** I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate, on motion of Mr Prest, adjourned.

## INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

**Hon. P. R. McKECHNIE** (Carnarvon—Minister for Industry and Technology)  
(10.12 p.m.), by leave, without notice: I move—

"That leave be granted to bring in a Bill to amend the Industrial Development Act 1963-1981 in certain particulars."

Motion agreed to.

### First Reading

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

**Second Reading**

**Hon. P. R. McKECHNIE** (Carnarvon—Minister for Industry and Technology)  
(10.13 p.m.): I move—

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

The Government supports my view that as much effort as possible in this period of financial restraint should be given to industry assistance and industry promotion. Consequently, I want to place a greater emphasis on industry development and a lesser emphasis on property development by my department.

Interest and redemption payments and management costs associated with industrial estates eat up a considerable percentage of my revenue budget. Industrial land, as far as is possible, should be developed by the private sector.

Bearing in mind these factors, I have decided to review the industrial estates program in Queensland. Consequently, I have decided that, in consultation with the local authorities concerned, my department will sell what it considers to be surplus land. The amendments will facilitate these sales. However, the Department of Industry Development will continue to maintain strategic reserves of land for future industrial development, because the private sector cannot always afford to hold land for future development. A reduced interest and redemption commitment will help my department make money available for greater assistance for, and the promotion of, industry in this State.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate, on motion of Mr Prest, adjourned.

The House adjourned at 10.15 p.m.