

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

TUESDAY, 30 AUGUST 1988

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

TUESDAY, 30 AUGUST 1988

Mr SPEAKER (Hon. L. W. Powell, Isis) read prayers and took the chair at 10 a.m.

ASSENT TO BILL

Assent to the Commissions of Inquiry Act and Other Acts Amendment Bill reported by Mr Speaker.

PETITIONS

The Deputy Clerk announced the receipt of the following petitions—

Construction of High School at Undurba

From **Mr Wells** (221 signatories) praying that the Parliament of Queensland will take action to construct a high school at Undurba in the Pine Rivers area.

Primary Schoolchildren, Eligibility for School Bus Transport

From **Mr Littleproud** (104 signatories) praying that the Parliament of Queensland will take action to ensure that the Queensland Department of Education Board will consider an amendment to policy re eligibility of primary schoolchildren so as not to disadvantage children over the age of 10, and their parents.

Shire of Proserpine, Change of Name

From **Mr Stephan** (916 signatories) praying that the Parliament of Queensland will ensure that the name of the Shire of Proserpine is not changed to the Shire of Whitsunday.

Reinstatement of Policeman at Paluma on Permanent Basis

From **Mr Row** (1 663 signatories) praying that the Parliament of Queensland will reinstate the policeman in Paluma on a permanent basis.

South Queensland Power Boat Club

From **Mr Beanland** (592 signatories) praying that the Parliament of Queensland will revoke the licence of the South Queensland Power Boat Club to hold race meetings on the St Lucia reach of the Brisbane River.

Licensed Sporting Clubs

From **Mr Austin** (322 signatories) praying that the Parliament of Queensland will review restrictions on trading hours, fund-raising and other activities in licensed sporting clubs.

Review of Fire Services Levy

From **Mr Clauson** (69 signatories) praying that the Parliament of Queensland will review the present fire levy so as not to disadvantage senior citizens.

Bridge Linking Russell Island to Mainland

From **Mr Clauson** (200 signatories) praying that the Parliament of Queensland will provide a road bridge linking Russell Island and the mainland to ensure increased productivity and employment.

Florence Bay, Inclusion in Magnetic Island National Park

From **Mr Burreket** (1 146 signatories) praying that the Parliament of Queensland will include Florence Bay in the Magnetic Island national park.

Third-party Insurance for Concessionally Registered Vehicles

From **Mr Innes** (96 signatories) praying that the Parliament of Queensland will review the increase in third-party insurance for concessionally registered vehicles.

A similar petition was received from **Mr Burreket** (61 signatories).

Petitions received.

PAPERS

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

Reports—

Registrar of Commercial Acts on the administration of the Building Societies Act 1985-1987 for the year ended 30 June 1987

Registrar of Commercial Acts on the administration of the Credit Societies Act 1986 for the year ended 30 June 1987

Registrar of Co-operative and Other Societies for the year ended 30 June 1987

One Hundred and First Report of the Registrar of Friendly Societies

Director of Prosecutions for the year ended 31 December 1987

Report incorporating the Balance Sheet and Profit and Loss Account of the Union-Fidelity Trustee Company of Australia Limited for the year ended 29 February 1988

Public Defender for the year ended 30 June 1987

Registrar of Co-operative Housing Societies for the year ended 30 June 1987.

The following papers were laid on the table—

Report concerning the Operations of The Registrar of Superannuation Trust Deeds for the period ended 30 June 1987

Proclamations under—

Public Service Act 1922-1978

Public Service Management and Employment Act 1988

State Service Superannuation Act 1972-1988

Auctioneers and Agents Act Amendment Act 1988

Orders in Council under—

Superannuation (Public Employees Portability and Acts Amendment) Act 1985

Superannuation (Government and Other Employees) Act 1988

Public Service Management and Employment Act 1988

Harbours Act 1955-1987

Harbours Act 1955-1987 and Statutory Bodies Financial Arrangements Act 1982-1984

Harbours Act 1955-1987, Cairns Airport Act 1981-1987 and Statutory Bodies Financial Arrangements Act 1982-1984

Canals Act 1958-1987

Roman Catholic Church Lands Act 1985-1986

The Supreme Court Act of 1921

Liquor Act 1912-1987

Auctioneers and Agents Act 1971-1988

Credit Societies Act 1986

District Courts Act 1967-1985

District Courts Act 1967-1988

Justices Act 1886-1987
Liens on Crops of Sugar Cane Act 1931-1981
Building Societies Act 1985-1987
Art Unions and Amusements Act 1976-1984
Magistrates Courts Act 1921-1982
Magistrates Courts Act 1921-1988
Religious Educational and Charitable Institutions Act Amendment Act 1895-1977
Jury Act 1929-1988

Regulations under—

Stamp Act 1894-1988
Golden Casket Art Union Act 1978-1984
Motor Vehicles Insurance Act 1936-1979
Public Service Act 1922-1978 and Public Service (Board's Powers and Functions) Act 1987
Public Service Management and Employment Act 1988
Harbours Act 1955-1987
Queensland Marine Act 1958-1985
Pollution of Waters by Oil Act 1973
Canals Act 1958-1987
Building Units and Group Titles Act 1980-1986
Films Review Act 1974-1984
Warehousemen's Liens Act 1973
Small Claims Tribunals Act 1973-1987
Legal Assistance Act 1965-1981
Business Names Act 1962-1979
Mortgages (Secondary Market) Act 1984-1985
Registration of Births, Deaths and Marriages Act 1962-1987
The Recording of Evidence Acts, 1962 to 1968
Court Funds Act 1973
Art Unions and Amusements Act 1976-1984
Associations Incorporation Act 1981
Auctioneers and Agents Act 1971-1988
Bills of Sale and Other Instruments Act 1955-1986
Building Societies Act 1985-1987
The Cash Orders Regulation Acts, 1946 to 1959
Collections Act 1966-1981
Co-operative and Other Societies Act 1967-1986
Co-operative Housing Societies Act 1958-1974
Credit Societies Act 1986
Elections Act 1983-1985
Friendly Societies Act 1913-1986
Funeral Benefit Business Act 1982
Invasion of Privacy Act 1971-1981
Justices of the Peace Act 1975

Land Sales Act 1984-1985

Liquor Act 1912-1987

Motor Vehicles Securities Act 1986

Property Law Act 1974-1986

Real Property Act 1861-1986

By-laws under—

Harbours Act 1955-1987

Harbours Act 1955-1987 and Cairns Airport Act 1981-1987

Harbours Act 1955-1987 and Port of Brisbane Authority Act 1976-1987

Rules under—

Coroners Act 1958-1982.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

Accident at Commonwealth Bank Construction Site, Queen Street

Hon. V. P. LESTER (Peak Downs—Minister for Employment, Training and Industrial Affairs) (10.12 a.m.), by leave: As foreshadowed last week, I am now in a position to report to honourable members on the fatal Queen Street construction site accident which occurred early this month. Three people were killed and several others injured when a flat web sling broke, sending two slabs of concrete through a wooden gantry and onto the footpath below.

The board of reference initiated by State Cabinet has found that the cause of the sling breakage was the internal abrasion of fibres by mineral particles. The board has found that this damage could not have been detected by visual inspection and was evident only during microscopic forensic examination. Therefore, the board has concluded that no individual is culpable and no person or persons can be held individually accountable.

The board of reference has stated its opinion that the accident was one of a number of examples of a deficiency of the control or work systems within the construction industry, and has made a number of recommendations for strategies which it believes will ensure the safety of the general public. Among the recommendations are requirements that an approved back-up method should be used when flat web slings are in operation—a move which I have already instructed the Division of Occupational Safety to implement—and that the Australian Standard AS 1353 should be revised by the Standards Association of Australia.

The board also believes that zones of risk should be defined and be made public prior to the construction approval process and that all activities to do with construction work, including lifting, be done within the boundaries of the site and the building perimeter.

The point needs to be made that the board believes that it is not appropriate to rely on a massive Government inspectorate to ensure safety. The building industry must regulate itself with Government supervision.

I wish to thank the past president of the Queensland Division of the Safety Institute of Australia, Mr Ross Wyatt, for his single-minded approach to chairing the board, and to Garry Rossow and Wal Trohear for their many hours of work. I table their report, and I will make it public.

Whereupon the honourable member laid the document on the table.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

Australian Scholastic Aptitude Test

Hon. B. G. LITTLEPROUD (Condamine—Minister for Education, Youth and Sport) (10.15 a.m.), by leave: The Australian Scholastic Aptitude Test (ASAT), the test used for the scaling of Year 12 student results, is conducted each year by the Board of Secondary School Studies. The board commissions the Australian Council for Educational Research (ACER) in Melbourne to design and develop the actual test.

ASAT is a three-hour test consisting of 100 multiple-choice questions presented in two booklets of 50 questions each, administered on two days for 1½ hours per day. This year the test was taken on Tuesday, 23 August and Wednesday, 24 August.

The second paper contained two errors. One question gave a set of tables which were not expressed to a sufficient number of decimal places for the precisely correct answer to be obtained. Another contained incorrect data.

At a number of schools, the problems were drawn to the attention of the chief supervisor, who is the principal of the school. Although all schools and students are advised that the test should be worked through without disruption, there is no specific instruction in the handbook *Directions for Administration* for dealing with an incorrect question.

Some principals telephoned the board and pointed out the problem. Where disturbance of the test resulted from this action, advice was given that a small amount of time matching that break created by the disturbance was allowable. By the time the matter was drawn to the attention of the executive officer, the test was almost over. He stated clearly that extensions of time should not have been allowed.

In the event, test conditions were not the same in all schools. Although these variations were small, when considered together with the immeasurable effect on student performance of the errors in the question booklet, I concluded that a back-up second paper should be undertaken by all students. Students will sit for this paper on Wednesday, 5 October 1988.

Dr Barry McGaw, the Director of ACER, Melbourne, states that the errors in the paper are entirely the responsibility of ACER. The test is delivered to Queensland in its final form and, for security reasons, printing and appropriate proof-reading are the only times the test is seen by anyone until the papers are handed out to students.

The Board of Secondary School Studies is the responsible authority in Queensland and will be asked to change this arrangement by having the test in its final form worked through by some of its own experienced officers. It will also be asked to ensure that its directions to candidates and supervisors cover explicitly and specifically more examination contingencies.

Obviously, the test errors and the variations in conditions should not have happened. I have received an initial report from the board and, after perusal of that, I am seeking further details.

The board has apologised to schools and, as the Minister ultimately responsible for the board's actions, I publicly apologise to all those who suffered. I am fully aware of the personal anguish that these Year 12 students endured.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr GOSS (Logan—Leader of the Opposition) (10.18 a.m.), by leave: Mr Speaker, I have been misrepresented in a media report of statements I made in this House last week, and I wish to set the public record straight. During debate on the referendum questions I said that the Premier "accepted the graft of political success and all the damage that has been done to this State". I said also that he had basked "in the benefits

of that electoral corruption", which stemmed from the National Party Government's being protected and insulated in office by a corrupt electoral system.

On a point of order, the Premier said that he took exception to the implication that he personally had accepted graft and asked for the statement to be withdrawn. In response I clarified my comments by saying—

" . . . I withdraw any personal reference to graft. I intended no reference to graft in the financial sense or in the personal sense; I was speaking in the electoral sense."

I then went on to say—

"It is appropriate that a distinction be made between electoral graft and monetary graft, because I certainly do not suggest the latter."

In last Thursday's *Courier-Mail* it was reported that "Mr Goss accused Mr Ahern of electoral corruption before withdrawing his comments." That newspaper report is an incomplete and inaccurate account of my statements on this matter, as I have just detailed. Clearly, I did not withdraw my comments of electoral corruption in relation to the Premier, and I confirm them again today. Later, in the Matters of Public Interest debate, I will be taking this matter further, because this Premier has basked in those benefits; he has accepted the success of electoral corruption.

LEAVE TO MOVE MOTION WITHOUT NOTICE

Mr CASEY (Mackay) (10.20 a.m.): In accordance with Standing Order 332, I seek leave to move that so much of Standing Orders as is necessary be suspended to allow me to move General Business—Notice of Motion No. 2 standing in my name.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The member for Mackay seeks leave to move a motion without notice.

Mr CASEY: No, I am sorry, Mr Speaker; that is not the motion. The motion is in accordance with Standing Order 332, not Standing Order 49.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! You are seeking leave to vary Standing Orders?

Mr CASEY: Yes, so that I can move Notice of Motion No. 2 about the Warwick Co-operative Dairy Association.

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

AYES, 33

Ardill	Smith
Beanland	Smyth
Beard	Underwood
Burns	Vaughan
Campbell	Warburton
Casey	Warner
Comben	Wells
D'Arcy	Yewdale
Eaton	
Gibbs, R. J.	
Goss	
Hamill	
Hayward	
Innes	
Knox	
Lickiss	
McElligott	
Mackenroth	
McLean	
Milliner	
Palaszczuk	<i>Tellers:</i>
Schuntner	Davis
Sherlock	Prest

NOES, 44

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

Resolved in the negative.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

Investigation by Fitzgerald Inquiry of Allegations by Mr R. J. Hinze of Electoral Boundary-rigging

Mr GOSS: In asking a question of the Premier and Treasurer, I refer to comments by his former ministerial colleague, Mr Hinze, who said recently about the State system—

“I have carried the National Party. Unlike some of the seats in Queensland that are rigged to the extent that the boundaries—that all you have to do is to get the National Party tag and you can win it for ever and a day.”

I ask: now that the terms of reference of the Fitzgerald inquiry have been widened to include other areas of corruption and improper conduct, why is the Premier not prepared to have this allegation by Mr Hinze, which is an admission of electoral corruption, investigated by the Fitzgerald inquiry or the permanent anti-corruption body that will follow?

Mr AHERN: The honourable member's question is most ironic. For day after day after day, along with many other members of Parliament, I sat in this place and heard the honourable member who asked the question consistently challenge the honesty and integrity of the former member for South Coast. Day after day he did it; now he quotes him as a source of authenticity on an allegation in respect of the rigging of electoral boundaries. It is a clear nonsense.

The former member for South Coast made that statement, and I have rejected it totally. Mr Hinze was not associated with the former redistribution of electoral boundaries; that was done by an independent commission.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The Premier was asked a question. He is answering it. I will not tolerate persistent interjections from the Opposition.

Mr AHERN: Given his record of performance in the House, the question from the Leader of the Opposition is completely hypocritical. I reject totally and completely the allegation that has been made by the Leader of the Opposition and the former member for South Coast; it is completely and totally without foundation.

The honourable member knows the reason why the terms of reference of the Fitzgerald inquiry were expanded: to prevent legal argument before the inquiry by persons who might mount a defence that a particular crime was not covered by the terms of reference but another one was. At this stage in the sensitive proceedings, that would clearly be a nonsense and, given his time-frame, is not an argument that need preoccupy the commissioner. That was the reason the new power was sought; that was the way it was very clearly explained. It is certainly the reason for the new powers being given. There is now a clear time-frame. It is not seriously suggested that the investigations by the Fitzgerald commission be widened now to take in all manner of issues. It has a very well-defined brief. It is looking at police corruption in this State.

Mr Goss: Don't misrepresent those discussions. If you want to open it up, I will open it up.

Mr AHERN: I am indicating clearly to the House the reasons that were presented to the Government as to why those terms of reference were changed. It was not intended to encourage Mr Fitzgerald, nor was it expressed to me, that he should be able to take on any extra issues that may be presented to him. It was clearly not intended, nor was it sought. It is clear nonsense for the Leader of the Opposition to even suggest that that would be an appropriate course, given the long-ranging Fitzgerald inquiry, which has the Government's strong support, into police corruption in this State. It has nothing to do with electoral matters at all. I am sure that the commissioner would not be remotely interested in that.

Alleged Breach by Premier of Section 121 of the Referendum (Machinery Provisions) Act

Mr GOSS: In directing my second question to the Premier, I refer to a letter from him which I understand has been circulated widely throughout the State using public money. I ask: is he aware that that letter, which purports to bear his signature, is illegal in that it breaches section 121 of the Referendum (Machinery Provisions) Act by not including the "printed by" and "authorised by" identification? What action does he propose to take to correct that breach of the law that he has committed?

Mr AHERN: My legal advice is contrary to the advice of the honourable Leader of the Opposition.

Referendum to Alter Constitution; Threat to Queensland by Senator Walsh

Mr FITZGERALD: I ask the Minister for Finance and Minister Assisting the Premier and Treasurer: is it of concern that a senior Federal Minister, Senator Walsh, should be threatening to punish Queensland over its fight for States' rights with respect to the Federal referendum?

Mr AUSTIN: I was somewhat amazed yesterday afternoon when I heard the statement made by Senator Walsh, which subsequently appeared in today's *Courier-Mail*, that he might punish or penalise Queensland in relation to the referendum campaign that the Queensland Government is running for and on behalf of the State of Queensland. Senator Walsh's statement gives a fair insight into the way that man behaves not only inside but also outside Parliament. It is preposterous that a senior Minister in the Federal Government would attempt to blackmail—I repeat "blackmail"—a State Government by threatening to withdraw funds from that State under the tax-sharing arrangements.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr AUSTIN: It is interesting that members of the Opposition are quite happy to support Senator Walsh in his attempt to blackmail the people of Queensland, which is exactly what he is on about.

On the question of whether local government should or should not be recognised in the Constitution—I advise all people who represent local government in Queensland to take note of Senator Walsh's statement and beware. If local governments are recognised under the Federal Constitution, they will be subject to blackmail by Senator Walsh. They should take that into account. The Queensland Government has run the referendum campaign on the basis of giving no more power to Canberra. If local authorities are recognised under the Constitution, it can be easily seen that Senator Walsh will use the power of the purse-strings to stand over and blackmail local authorities to do what he wishes, not what the people who elect the local authorities wish.

I am intrigued that Senator Walsh is talking about deducting funds from the State Government because of its referendum campaign. The public of this country are now well and truly aware that they are footing the bill for more than \$40m to run the referendum campaign, which is meaningless. One of the referendum questions is to placate the Left Wing of the ALP in Queensland. It is a totally meaningless motherhood campaign. I notice that all honourable members opposite are silent.

I want to ask a simple question of my colleagues opposite. All honourable members will note that the Local Government Association appropriated \$60,000, I think, to support the "Yes" campaign for local authorities. Is Senator Walsh saying to the local authorities, "We are going to take \$60,000 off you." No, he has not said that.

Lionel Bowen, the Federal Attorney-General, who is running the campaign throughout this country, has said that this referendum is a non-political issue. Mr Bowen is running all around the country turning the referendum into the greatest political issue Australia has ever seen. I have a suggestion for Senator Walsh. I suggest that he look into the cost of Federal Government Ministers running around the country in VIP jets, and to

see how much the contribution of the Australian tax-payer is to the "Yes" case. I venture to say it is many, many hundreds of thousands——

Mr Burns: I move that your answer be printed and bound.

Mr AUSTIN: Oh, the honourable member is a joke.

The very week that the Leader of the Opposition was trying to make a big noise about Queensland's borrowings, the member for Lytton was in north Queensland saying that the Government ought to be spending more money on the Tully/Millstream project to get it off the ground. So the Leader of the Opposition is saying, "They have borrowed far too much money", while his deputy is saying, "Borrow more." The Leader of the Opposition's left hand does not know what his right hand is doing.

Referendum to Alter Constitution

Mr FITZGERALD: I ask the Premier: can he tell the House whether, if the referendum question relating to fair and democratic elections is passed, that will lead to a fair result? Or is it a numerical hoax?

Mr AHERN: This fair and democratic elections question will lead to nothing but a permanent Labor gerrymander. That is the issue. When one examines the position in the other States of Australia and the Commonwealth, one finds that there is no doubt that that is the certain outcome of a "Yes" vote on the No. 2 referendum question this Saturday.

Mr Goss: You are trying to uphold corruption——

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Goss: It's the system. It is corrupt.

Mr AHERN: The Leader of the Opposition does not want to hear these figures——

Mr Goss: Minuzzo, Lewis—the whole lot. Your whole system is absolutely offensive.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable Leader of the Opposition under Standing Order 123A.

Mr AHERN: Mr Speaker, I ask you to go easy on the Leader of the Opposition. He is nervous about a by-election in Ipswich.

If this referendum question is passed, it will certainly not correct the problem at all in terms of fair and democratic elections. I invite honourable members to listen to some figures: 52.3 per cent is the vote that is required for the Federal coalition to win office under the latest national redistribution in this country. I repeat: 52.3 per cent! That is because of the Labor gerrymander in Canberra——

Mr Goss: You're profiting under a corrupt system. Just look at Lewis—that sums you up.

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Mr AHERN: Take the South Australian Labor Government—52.2 per cent is required for the conservatives to win in that State——

Mr Goss: This is misuse of the Parliament.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The persistent interjections by the honourable Leader of the Opposition will not be tolerated. I will warn the honourable Leader of the Opposition once again under Standing Order 123A.

Mr AHERN: The relevant figure in Western Australia, under the Western Australian Labor Government, is that 53.5 per cent of the vote is required by the conservative

parties to win Government from the Labor Party in that State. Because of the Labor gerrymander in Western Australia——

Mr Goss: In Western Australia it is the conservatives. Mr Speaker, that is dishonest.

Mr AHERN: That is not true.

In Victoria—where there is to be an election on 1 October—on the two-party preferred basis, a conservative vote of 51.3 per cent is required for the conservative parties to win in that Labor State. In New South Wales, it took 52 per cent of the vote for the Greiner Government to win office. Therefore, the issue is quite clear. This referendum will not end the practice of gerrymander in Australia. The Labor Governments in Australia have been the best exponents of gerrymander in the country; there is no doubt about that. When one looks at the position in this State on the percentage that is required to bring about a Labor victory—which will never happen, of course—one sees that the percentage that is required is 51.4 per cent, the lowest of the percentages that I have quoted. There is no doubt at all that Labor's hypocrisy on this issue is very, very great.

Mr Goss: Hypocrisy? It comes down to Lewis, and you and your system protect him.

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Goss: That's dishonest. Let him tell us about Lewis.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The Leader of the Opposition will keep quiet while I am on my feet. He will have an opportunity later to debate the issue, if he so desires.

Mr Goss: I will.

Mr SPEAKER: This is not a debating time.

Mr Goss: How much time does he get?

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Mr AHERN: How the honourable Leader of the Opposition could possibly connect Lewis with the issue of redistribution is quite beyond me. The two issues are not related.

This Government is acting on police corruption in this State in a way that no other Government in Australia is acting. The members of the Government deserve due credit from the people of Queensland for the very substantial action that we have taken.

Statements by Member for Merthyr about Referendum to Alter Constitution

Mr BURNS: I direct a question to the Premier. Now that he has told the House that Mr Hinze lied in relation to the ballot-rigging allegations——

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Mr BURNS: Well, he said that he did not tell the truth.

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Austin: He didn't say that.

Mr BURNS: You wouldn't know, hairy!

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The member for Lytton will ask his question.

Mr BURNS: I refer the Premier to statements made by the sacked Transport Minister, now the member for Merthyr, about the gerrymandered electoral system in this State, and in particular to his claim that a successful "Yes" vote to referendum question 2 this Saturday would be political disaster for the National Party.

The member for Merthyr also claimed that under a fair and honest electoral system the National Party could lose 10 safe seats. I ask: does the Premier share these views expressed by his former ministerial colleague?

Mr AHERN: I do not accept the preamble to the honourable member's question relating to my remarks about the statements of Mr Russ Hinze. All that I said was that the Leader of the Opposition was hypocritical inasmuch as he is now quoting him after he spent years and years in this place calling him a liar.

As to the statements by Mr Lane——

Mr GOSS: I rise to a point of order.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! What is the honourable member's point of order? Under which Standing Order is he rising?

Mr GOSS: That the Premier has misrepresented me. I find——

Mr SPEAKER: Order! That is not a point of order.

Mr AHERN: As to the statements made by Mr Lane—they represent his view. I believe that this referendum question will not be carried by the Australian people, because they can see the real informal agenda behind it. I do not agree with Mr Lane's assessment.

Mr Burns: And you say that Mr Hinze is not correct?

Mr AHERN: He is not correct; neither is Mr Lane.

Mr Burns: So he's telling lies?

Mr AHERN: No. I am saying that neither member is correct in his assertion.

It is my intention today to charge the ALP with trying, by its every action, to slant the whole system in Australia in respect of a "Yes" vote in this coming referendum campaign. Members of the ALP have sought to throw dirt at members of the Government for what we are doing in relation to this issue, but the issue, without any doubt at all, is that Labor on every occasion is trying by underhanded means through the system to assist the "Yes" vote.

The debate in the Federal House last night was a nonsense. It has been revealed—to the very great disgust of the Australian people, I am sure—that the ballot paper will be gerrymandered by Labor to assist the "Yes" case. Ticks and crosses will be accepted as "Yeses" and "Noes" respectively, but four crosses will be ruled invalid. What a nonsense! How unfair! The Federal Government accuses this Government of unfairness. I accuse the Labor Party of the ultimate in hypocrisy.

Police Verballing of Accused Persons

Mr BURNS: In directing a question to the Premier and Treasurer, I refer to allegations of police verballing arising from evidence before the Fitzgerald inquiry. Yesterday, evidence was given to the inquiry by a policeman to the effect that, in the past, verballing has been carried out by senior police and other police officers in this State. I ask: without pre-empting any of Mr Fitzgerald's recommendations, will the Premier order an immediate review of the cases involving officers who are alleged to have verballled suspects? Will he do that in order to ensure that no-one has been convicted purely on the evidence of a corrupt police officer of a crime that he did not commit? Will the Premier guarantee that adequate compensation is paid to innocent people whose lives have been ruined in this way?

Mr AHERN: The Fitzgerald commission of inquiry was preceded by a great deal of care and professionalism on the part of this Government, its advisers and the commission itself. Corruption has obviously been a long-standing problem. What has

been revealed has been variously described as disappointing and sad, and has shocked many within the community.

Mr Burns interjected.

Mr AHERN: Because people are interested in it, it is reasonable that I try to answer the honourable member's detailed question.

This Government has very strongly supported the inquiry. No doubt the other States will have to follow suit to change the system that has probably been in operation around the country for decades. The Government is doing its job without reservations. We are very proud of the way in which we have conducted ourselves. It has been in an entirely professional manner.

The honourable member has raised matters that are obviously of serious concern. However, the issues must be settled professionally with due legal advice being taken. In the first instance, it is a matter for Commissioner Fitzgerald to consider with the Attorney-General on a case-by-case basis. Obviously issues will have to be considered by the courts and applications will be made from time to time.

In the overall exercise it is important that due respect is given to the rules of law in our State and the fact that institutions exist for the resolution of disputes and conflicts of that type by independent arbitration of argument. The issues must be proceeded with in that way and cannot be instantaneously remedied by executive action on the part of this Government.

Regardless of the difficulties that are presented and the problems which may arise from time to time in individual cases where actions are taken by corrupt policemen, I simply restate this Government's complete commitment to the resolution of the problem. This Government's resolve in the matter will not be weakened; it is absolute.

Speech Therapists

Mr STEPHAN: In directing a question to the Minister for Education, Youth and Sport, I refer to the fact that, in recent years, there has been a shortage of speech therapists in country areas. I ask: can the Minister advise this House whether the problem can be rectified?

Mr LITTLEPROUD: I recall that earlier this year the honourable member for Mount Isa raised a question with me about the inability to appoint a speech therapist in Mount Isa. I am pleased to report that, following graduation from the speech therapy course at the University of Queensland, speech therapists have been placed at Bowen, Bundaberg, Cairns, Dalby, Charleville, Emerald, Gladstone, Mount Isa, Townsville and Warwick, bringing to more than 80 the number of speech therapists who are now employed by the Education Department of Queensland.

It is interesting to note the reason why Queensland should have had such a shortage. Of course, it is all due to the Commonwealth's underfunding of tertiary education in Queensland. The faculty of medicine is in charge of speech therapy. To make more places available, it has battled as best it could and has gradually increased the number of undergraduates. If in fact that faculty had been able to obtain more money, the situation would have been addressed much more readily.

It seems remarkable that the Federal Government has a \$5.5 billion surplus, yet it is willing to sit back and talk about even-handedness, consensus and equity while tertiary education in Queensland is underfunded by \$38m. Mr Dawkins has commented that the Federal Budget makes provision for 40 000 extra tertiary places. I am still waiting to see how many of those extra places come to Queensland. I only hope that Mr Dawkins addresses the problem. Documentary evidence from the Sherrin committee indicates that Queensland is about 4 000 places short. I am desperately waiting for those places to come through so that this sort of problem does not arise again.

I am sure that the member for Mount Isa is now very pleased that speech therapists have been appointed to Mount Isa as well as to those other places throughout Queensland.

Payment of Ministerial Expenses from Health Department Funds

Mr INNES: In directing a question to the Premier, I refer to the guide-lines for ministerial expenditure in the Health Department and I ask, firstly, will he table the old guide-lines that operated before April this year and, secondly, will he table the guide-lines that have operated from April this year? I also ask if he or his officers or officers of the Treasury Department were involved in the change of guide-lines. Was the change made with knowledge of cheques which have been drawn by the Minister for Health? What was the purpose and intent of and the difference achieved by the changes in the guide-lines?

Mr AHERN: I was not involved as the honourable member implies. There are some issues relating to Treasury Instruction 330, I think it is, which was withdrawn. The opposition parties have sought to make much of this. What has happened in recent times is that the matters are now brought under the direct supervision of the Auditor-General and the Financial Administration and Audit Act. It is the same procedure as that which is applied in all of the other States and nationally in respect of these particular matters.

The Auditor-General now looks at each expense on a one-to-one basis and determines whether it is appropriate to the circumstances. He has the capacity to report to Parliament. That is the way in which it is done in all of the other States and nationally. There is no further difficulty in respect of the matter.

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

MATTERS OF PUBLIC INTEREST

Administration of Queensland Police Force

Mr INNES (Sherwood—Leader of the Liberal Party) (11 a.m.): I wish to deal briefly with something that arose in question-time this morning. The Premier said that there was nothing in common with Sir Terence Lewis and redistribution. I wish to highlight that statement, because one of the revelations of the Fitzgerald inquiry is that the Police Commissioner believed it was appropriate—and this was revealed, and reported as being revealed, in his diaries—for the Commissioner of Police to talk about matters of redistribution.

The entries in his diaries demonstrate not only that he talked about matters of redistribution with Government Ministers, National Party trustees and trustees but also about many other matters that no Commissioner of Police should ever have been allowed to talk about, or encouraged to talk about, which refer to public life in this State. I refer to matters such as the appointment of judges and the appointment of Governors.

Such a person was embraced deliberately by the power structure of this State. He was never kept at arm's length with regard to matters outside the Police portfolio. On the contrary, his diaries show that he was encouraged and expected to—certainly never deterred or discouraged from doing so—offer comment, not without fear or favour on the administration of criminal law in this State, but on matters that clearly involved the domestic politics of the National Party in Queensland.

Mr Ahern: Even when the Liberals were in power.

Mr INNES: The diaries show that the conversations were with National Party Ministers and National Party officials, not with other people. In November last year an arm went round, which the Premier cannot disengage. An arm of embrace went round a person who was sworn as the head of a body to act without fear and favour. He was encouraged—never deterred, never kept at arm's length—and repeatedly intruded and

offered his views, which were accepted, on matters that had absolutely nothing to do with the administration of the police force in this State. To use the word in its broader context, if one likes, that was part of the corruption of life in this State. It involved people who did not know and did not have any apparent training, reflexes, instincts, inbuilt morality or understanding of the special oath taken by the Commissioner of Police as the head of a special body of men to carry out responsibilities that are absolutely different to the political processes of this State.

When one begins to clearly see the overlap, it is not possible to try to wash one's hands and isolate the matter as being something that happened only in the police force in this State. Why were members of the police force running amok? Why did they feel free of the questioning, critical eye of administration that was supposed to be focused on them by the Police Minister? There was an unbroken line of National Party Police Ministers who failed to ensure that the Government's own reports were investigated.

Let me go back to the responsibility of those involved. Let me refer to the Sturgess report, which was a specific report into sexual crimes involving a vulnerable group, namely children. This was a matter of very particular concern to the Government because the person whose actions started the inquiry that was ordered by the Government was a member of the personal staff of the Commissioner of Police. Former constable David Moore is specified by Mr Sturgess as the person whose actions gave rise to the inquiry that was widened to look into sexual offences involving teenage boys and girls in this State. That should have been a matter, one would have thought, of very special concern to the commissioner and to the Minister for Police, and to the National-Party-solo Cabinet that ruled at that time.

Yet it is so often the case that it is not a sense of grievance, not a sense of injustice or an instinct or sense of morality about public life that causes the Government to act, but publicity. If there is one element of consistency, one golden thread through National Party actions in this State, it is that the Government reacts only to publicity, and only to adverse publicity. It is when the publicity is on—when nothing else is possible—that they come clean, start being hard and claim to be fearlessly pursuing matters of corruption. The Sturgess report languished for 18 months—almost two years. It was partly a public report.

Mr Harper: Not right.

Mr INNES: There was certainly no action taken, because if one recalls the evidence given only a couple of days ago——

Mr Harper: There was no publicity.

Mr INNES: The evidence was that the meeting with the Minister, the Premier and senior public servants happened after the *Four Corners* inquiry. That is when a crack-down on prostitution was ordered. It was not after the Sturgess report.

Mr Harper: Why don't you acknowledge the facts?

Mr INNES: Mr Harper was the person, together with the Police Minister, who received a secret report. The members of this House did not receive one. Mr Harper received a secret report specifying the names of the brothel-operators and the names of the owners of the premises. Those names were not given to me; they were given to Mr Harper. In addition, dates and places were also given and Mr Sturgess was the man who said, "A 24-hour investigation by my clerk and myself revealed the names of the people manipulating the system in this State." As he pointed out, it was not that the girls were being turned over on a rotational basis, but the grubs and parasites—the people who should have been affected and who later were proved to have been paying the police—were the people about whom the members of the National Party Cabinet alone had secret knowledge because that secret report was given to them and not to us. It was suppressed from us and given to them. They did nothing about it until the revelations

on the *Four Corners* program caused the adverse publicity which in turn caused the reaction, "We must do something about it." Then instructions were given to the police.

Mr Harper: Acknowledge the facts; face reality.

Mr INNES: Mr Harper is the one who is interjecting so fiercely and, as I recall it, he was the person presiding over investigations which involved the police force. He was also directly responsible for and involved in the rather notorious case of the production of an unbelievable report about a person who was wrongly convicted of murder.

In reality the web shows that the senior public servant in charge of the police force was allowed constantly to offer views which were embraced as part of that power structure. Apparently he lost sight of what police commissioners were supposed to do and what politicians and other people, who were absorbed in a friendly way and embraced by the power structure, were entitled to do. That is where things went wrong. No-one is saying that there was no corruption in the police force, because there is corruption of some level in all police forces. It is the disinhibition that occurs when no questions are answered; when the police force can tell its Minister that there are no illegal casinos; when the Minister can tell this House that the illegal casinos were ethnic coffee shops; and when the Minister can say—in the face of the almost weekly opening of new premises and the disinhibition that made massage parlours into open places for prostitution—that no such prostitution existed. It was not only one National Party Minister who maintained that, but also successive National Party Ministers. These Ministers are still in the Queensland Government Cabinet. They take part in the sanctimonious hand-wringing carried out by the Premier and say, "We are doing something about it." This Government had no political option other than to do something about it. It is only when there is no other political option that action occurs. There is so much culpability.

Mr Harper: You know that is not fact.

Mr INNES: That is absolute fact. This Government has a power structure that defends it against criticism. It is not passionately committed to the delivery of good government in this State. The record speaks for itself.

I wish to turn now to another level of hypocrisy. Firstly, the Liberal Party makes no claim to be entitled to any other party's political preferences. That is a decision for that particular party.

Time expired.

Application to Rezone Bald Hills Land for Shopping Centre

Mrs NELSON (Aspley) (11.10 a.m.): The matter that I wish to raise today relates to the serious consequences for the business community in the electorate of Aspley as a result of collusion, conspiracy and possible corruption on the part of the Brisbane City Council. I am very pleased that the Leader of the Liberal Party is in the House, as he has just made a passionate defence of morality and the sorts of activities that parties should engage in. I hope that he takes careful note of what his own party has been engaged in in the city of Brisbane.

In 1981, approval by the Brisbane City Council of an application by Girvan Brothers to rezone land for a shopping complex at Bald Hills was rejected by the Local Government Court on appeal on the basis of there being no planning need for additional retail facilities in the district. In May 1986, Hooker Projects lodged an application to rezone this land for a shopping centre. A number of people objected to that, including the Pine Rivers Shire Council, major retailers in the area and all of the local residents who lived adjacent to the proposed shopping centre.

In September 1986, Hooker withdrew its first application and lodged a second application for rezoning, to which a large number of people also objected. For the purposes of this debate, I will regard the September 1986 application by Hooker as the first serious application. This application was objected to by many people, including the Queensland Retail Traders and Shopkeepers Association, small traders, a number of

local residents, the Westfield Corporation and the Pine Rivers Shire Council. However, there was obviously some very close relationship between either council officers or council aldermen. Whether in fact the Lord Mayor was involved, I do not know; probably she was not, but she will know after today, because the local people are fed up with the secrecy, the collusion and the conspiracy that has taken place in their area.

On 22 December—I want the House to take note of that date, because on that date a very large number of signs went up all over Brisbane, including quite a number in the electorate of Aspley. It took me three months of solid, hard work with the Minister for Local Government to get that little rort stopped by the council, as well. I will speak about that in this place on another day.

On 22 December 1987, a second application—in reality, it was probably about the fifth, but I will call it the second for the purposes of this debate—with substantially the same boundaries and the same proposal was advertised by notices on the site. It was advertised in the *Telegraph*, a newspaper in its death throes and with virtually no readership. That occurred at a time when everybody in the area had already gone on leave. As a result, only three people objected to the proposal. The curious thing is that 11 of the residents who had been notified of the first application were not notified of this one.

In March, after the council election, the Planning Policy and Advisory Committee of the Brisbane City Council recommended approval of the application, despite vigorous objections from the local people and from the Queensland Retail Traders and Shopkeepers Association and the Pine Rivers Shire Council.

I understand that that first application subsequently went into limbo. Two applications are currently before the council. I have been led to believe by reliable sources that the Brisbane City Council does not intend to proceed to a decision on the first application, because if it approves that application the objections to the Local Government Court will be many and substantial.

I am also reliably advised that the application that is being dealt with by the council is the one advertised on 22 December last year, to which there were only three objectors. In fact, if the council approves the application and the objectors wish to go to the Local Government Court, only three formal objectors can do so and the Local Government Court could quite easily believe that the council and the people had no serious objections to this proposal.

How and why did this circumstance take place? I see that the honourable member for Sherwood has left the Chamber. It seems to me that he always leaves this Chamber when he is in hot water, when it looks as though his party may be held accountable for some sort of morality and philosophy, which his party seems to have lost many years ago.

I draw the attention of the House to an article titled "Point of view—a long death to the Liberals". It will be a rapid death in Queensland if all that the Liberal Party in this city can do is attack individuals, when it should be looking at the positive philosophies and principles that it can offer the people of Queensland.

Mr Palaszczuk: You've got only one eye.

Mrs NELSON: I apologise to the member for Sherwood, because he is still in the House.

I will look further into the matter. It is curious that the proposed rezoning is from Future Urban Zone to Particular Development Zone, allowing as of right, subject only to the imposition of development conditions, a shopping centre of up to 46 000 square metres gross floor area overall, including shops up to 32 500 square metres gross floor area and business premises up to 2 500 square metres.

The application plans are understood to show a Super K mart discount department store, two mini-major stores, specialty shops, a hardware store, a trading facility, 10 cinemas, a restaurant, professional suites, child-care centres, a health and fitness centre

and a medical centre, together with parking for 2 425 cars. Less than a kilometre away in each direction are major retail outlets which provide all of those services, and more.

The relevant facts are: since the 1981 proposal was rejected by the Local Government Court, the population in the northern suburbs of Brisbane has increased by about 6 per cent.

Mr Davis: Did you object to the hypermarket?

Mrs NELSON: I will take the interjection of the honourable member for Brisbane Central, because exactly the same arguments applied to the hypermarket. I used them in this place on a previous date.

During the past 12 years, the population in the region has increased by only 6 per cent, but retail shopping space has more than doubled. New shopping centres have been built at Aspley, a classic example being the hypermarket, which was another shopping centre that the community did not need. It introduced another level of retailing that did not give jobs to young people. I am proud that I took that stand. As a member of Parliament, the honourable member for Brisbane Central would be wise to think about the young unemployed in this State.

I am delighted to see the Government, through the Minister for Finance, the Premier and the Minister for Employment, is introducing Project Pay Packet in this State. The reason that the Government is elected and receives the support of the people is that it is interested in taking positive initiatives for the people. It is not in the business of merely attempting to attack and destroy individuals, as the Leader of the Opposition is. His career in this Parliament has been based on being negative and destructive, yet he wonders why he goes down in the polls every time. The people of Queensland want strong, positive and tough leadership, and they are receiving it from the National Party. I am proud to serve under Mike Ahern. At the next election, Opposition members will have a battle holding one seat in this Parliament.

A further shopping centre has been proposed for and approved at Rothwell. In total, these projects will add 1.5 million square feet of retail space in that region. What is going on? Did Hooker Projects give a donation to the Liberal Party during the last council elections? Why was there a sudden application for that site on 22 December 1987 when every single person in the region is opposed to the centre being constructed?

I would like the Local Government Minister to assure me of two things: firstly, that he will investigate this piece of collusion, conspiracy and corruption and, secondly, that he will instruct the Brisbane City Council never to allow applications to be made between 22 December and 5 January. A regulation should be passed tomorrow which prevents any local authority, and especially the Brisbane City Council, from exercising a rort on people when they are away on holidays. The most morally corrupt aspect of this matter is the fact that local people could not have their say because somebody snuck in while they were away, and put a sign on the land. They had no choice or opportunity to have their say in the Local Government Court. I ask the Minister for Local Government to deal with that regulation by amendment immediately.

Corruption in Queensland

Mr GOSS (Logan—Leader of the Opposition) (11.20 a.m.): Today I want to talk about what has been described in the Fitzgerald inquiry and throughout Queensland as “the system”. What honourable members witnessed today was the Premier, on behalf of the National Party—as he has done with his publicly funded advertising campaign—defend and stand up for the system.

I want this Parliament and the people of Queensland to understand quite clearly what “the system” means. It is quite clear what this new Premier—this new and different Premier—stands for. The system is more than Tilley, Burgess, Parker and the other people who have admitted corruption. The system is more than some police officers taking money, taking graft from a few parlours, casinos or drug-pedlars and passing it on to other police and, perhaps, politicians. The system is more than that.

This State has an overall system of corruption, cronyism and back-scratching that harks back to the corrupt electoral system. It is in that corrupt electoral system that we see the death of electoral justice and the seeds of corruption. It has been that cloak, those walls of the corrupt electoral system, behind which the crooks and the cronies have flourished, and that corrupt electoral system is being maintained, as it has been maintained for many years in this State, to protect those people; to protect not the people of Queensland but the select few who have benefited from it. The people who have benefited from it are being revealed every day at the Fitzgerald inquiry.

The inquiry has revealed a range of corrupt senior police officers. The Lewis diaries have revealed a range of other people, the cronies of the National Party, the cronies of members of the Government who have also been protected and benefited by the network of corruption, and the person who has been a central part of that network is the suspended Police Commissioner, Sir Terence Lewis.

The electoral system that this Premier justifies is not just an electoral system. It is an overall system of corruption that he seeks to prop up and defend because the benefits that flow from it are not just for a few police; the benefits are for each and every member of the Government.

Last week I spoke about this Premier for 20 years, sitting mute on the back bench, in Cabinet and as Premier, accepting the graft of political success, accepting and basking in the benefits of the electoral corruption that has kept the National Party in power and not once speaking out. Suddenly, when Mr Ahern is sworn into office as Premier, he is supposed to have a vision of excellence.

If honourable members want to see the badge of corruption pinned on anyone, they need only examine the case of Sir Terence Lewis. It is quite obvious—and it has been quite obvious to some of us for many years but certainly since the start of the Fitzgerald inquiry—that it has been Sir Terence Lewis who has presided over this network of corruption and the growth of corruption in this State.

I do not pre-judge specific allegations of personal corruption against the commissioner. I am talking about the massive network of corruption involving senior officers and other people, which all went on while he was in the top job. There can only be one administrative penalty for that shocking and shoddy record of administration of our police force, and that is for the Police Commissioner to be dismissed. But, no, this system that the Premier, Mr Ahern, would seek to prop up protects Lewis, in the same way that it has protected and benefited and delivered financial and other rewards to a range of people in this State.

Honourable members have only to examine the history of this State and consider the people who have been the beneficiaries: the former Minister for Main Roads, Mr Hinze; Sir Edward Lyons and Minuzzo. Honourable members have only to consider other scandals in this State's sorry history: the Lucas inquiry, the Sturgess inquiry, Mr Hinze and the TAB and this Premier's own administration and the way in which Sir Frank Moore's consortium was corruptly and wrongly awarded the tender for the redevelopment of the Expo site.

In the first major test of the honesty of this administration and the honesty of its tendering system, the evaluation committee was overridden so that the tender could be given to a crony of the National Party at the behest of Sir Robert Sparkes and some others. That was the first test for this Premier. Honourable members saw then and there, when the Premier faced the first test of awarding that major contract, that the system of corruption was continued—the system of corruption that benefits all those people—and this Premier seeks to continue it.

The reason the police were able to get away with it was that they knew that they were untouchable. They knew that, in the final analysis, there was no accountability at the top of the police force, that nobody would be brought to account. And they were quite right—they never were. That is why corruption has flourished in our police force—because the police knew that they would never be brought to account by the administration

of the police force. Furthermore, they knew that, when it comes to the ultimate accountability, the ultimate accountability lies with the Government and it lies with the Premier and the Minister. They knew that under the system of corruption that we have in this State—electoral corruption and corruption of the criminal justice system—they would not be touched by the commissioner or the Premier and the relevant Ministers, the Minister for Justice and the Minister for Police.

That system existed not just under the former Premier, Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen; it has continued to exist under the present Premier, and the Commissioner of Police, Sir Terence Lewis, is still untouchable. There is one rule for the rank-and-file police, one rule for Mr Hinze and Mr Lane, but another rule for Sir Terence Lewis. It is in that situation that one sees the corrupt system that these people would seek to prop up.

Mr Austin: Don't you think we take legal advice on those matters?

Mr GOSS: On what matter?

Mr Austin: On Sir Terence Lewis.

Mr GOSS: You take legal advice, but you get a range of opinions and then you pick the one that suits Sir Terence Lewis. If you had the honesty, if the Premier had the guts and the honesty, to table the legal opinion of Mr Ian Callanan of Queen's Counsel, we would find that you are not telling the truth. We would find that Mr Callanan has said that you have the power to sack Sir Terence Lewis and/or to dismiss him without pay. But you won't do it. The Premier continues to slip Sir Terence Lewis \$88,000 a year of public money, because you and your corrupt system, your corrupt electoral system, protects Sir Terence Lewis—

Mr AUSTIN: I rise to a point of order. I find that statement offensive and untrue in that the honourable member said "you", meaning me, "protect people like Sir Terence Lewis". I find it objectionable and untrue, and I ask him to withdraw.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Row): Order! I advise the honourable Leader of the Opposition that in *Erskine May's Parliamentary Practice* there is provision for consideration of direct reference to members of Parliament being corrupt.

Mr GOSS: If he thinks I am referring to him, I will withdraw that.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! There is provision for consideration of direct reference to members of Parliament being corrupt as being unparliamentary. I think that the Leader of the Opposition is definitely verging on unparliamentary language, on which the Chair is—

Mr GOSS: Stop taking up my time; I have conceded that.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The Chair is reluctant to allow the Leader of the Opposition to continue so close to the margin of parliamentary practice, so I will have to ask the Leader of the Opposition to withdraw the comment that the Minister requires withdrawn.

Mr GOSS: Mr Deputy Speaker, I was not referring to the Minister for Finance. I was using "you" in the general sense of "you" in terms of a Government—

Mr SIMPSON: I rise to a point of order.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I will deal with one point of order at a time.

I ask the Leader of the Opposition to consider the point of order taken by the Minister. Will the Leader of the Opposition consider that point of order and give me an answer to my suggestion that he consider it?

Mr GOSS: Yes.

The general system that I am talking about is a corrupt electoral system and one which leads directly to the system of police corruption, the corruption of a criminal

justice system, and bribery. What I am saying is that bribery down there—what I am saying is that we have a system of government——

Mr AUSTIN: I rise to a point of order. The honourable member has directly said in this statement, “You and the people opposite there.” I demand that he withdraw.

Mr Goss: I did.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! In the circumstances, I uphold the Minister’s point of order and I ask the Leader of the Opposition to withdraw any implication of the people opposite that he has made. Will the Leader of the Opposition withdraw the——

Mr GOSS: The reference was to him, and I withdraw that. I maintain my allegation of electoral corruption and propping up a corrupt system against the Government. I am entitled to do that. I am entitled to refer to the Government.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Will the Minister accept the situation?

Mr AUSTIN: Yes.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Minister accepts that.

Mr GOSS: In conclusion, I point out that we can see the corruption, I say, coming home directly to this Premier. I say that in this sense, and I want to clarify it because I am not talking about the personal or the financial sense. Just look at the Premier’s record in terms of protecting Lewis, in terms of transferring milk entitlement quotas at the behest of Charlie Holm. That is the system of cronies and corruption that these people have propped up. That is where we see the badge of corruption and this system being pinned on this Premier and this Government. In relation to the milk entitlements transfer—one saw the same corruption that protects Lewis being extended to Holm.

Mr AHERN: I rise to a point of order. I take very strong exception to the honourable member’s comments in respect of milk quotas. He is totally wrong and I ask him to withdraw the statement.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The Premier has asked for a withdrawal of the comments that the honourable the Leader of the Opposition made concerning corruption in relation to the dealing with milk quotas. I uphold the Premier’s request. The honourable member will withdraw the comment.

Mr GOSS: There is no difference between Lewis and Holm. I stand by my comments. It is unreasonable that I be asked to withdraw them.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable member will withdraw the comment. That is the decision that I have made, otherwise this argument will go on all day.

Mr GOSS: I stand by my allegations in relation to a corrupt system. It is a fair comment.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I have made the decision that the honourable member will withdraw the comment in relation to milk quotas. I am entitled to make that decision. The honourable member has already been warned several times. Very soon I will have no option but to ask him to leave the Chamber, which would be more uncomfortable for him than withdrawing the statement.

Mr GOSS: I am not prepared to back down on what I say about the Premier and the corrupt electoral system. It is the system that I want to complain about.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member has been given a direction.

Mr GOSS: Surely I can be heard on that.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member has been given a direction from the Chair. If he does not undertake to do what I ask, I will have to ask him to resume his seat at least.

Electoral System; Installation of Radar at Coolangatta Airport

Mr GATELY (Currumbin) (11.32 a.m.): Mr Deputy Speaker——

Mr Hamill interjected.

Mr GATELY: I am not slow at all. I do not need any help from the Fabian wimp from Ipswich.

Honourable members have listened to the nonsense about corruption in this State and the spending of Government moneys, together with the utterances of one who will not abide by the rules of the Speaker in this House and conducts himself in less than an honourable manner.

I am in possession of a copy of a brochure entitled *Under Wayne Goss and Labor*.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I have already dealt with one very difficult situation. I will no longer tolerate exchanges across the Chamber between the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr GATELY: I suggest that the brochure that has been circulated by Wayne Goss and Labor should be titled "Wayne Goss in labour", because he looks almost pregnant. The brochure contains one particular comment that is far from fair dinkum and is misleading to the public. Mr Goss talks about a fair electoral system. The Labor Party is perpetrating one of the greatest insults on the Australian electors by saying that Australia is going to have a fair electoral system. I challenge any member of the Labor Party to show where he or anyone else has said, "We oppose the result of that election because it was unfair." When has any member of the Labor Party done that? Never! An election result in Nunawading was challenged because of something that the Labor Party had rigged. That is the score.

Last week in this House the true story was revealed when none other than a member of the Labor Party stood up and said, "when we become a republic". I questioned him on that aspect and he said, "Yes, when we become a republic." That is the hidden agenda of the Labor Party's referendum, and that is why Mr Hayden has become the Governor-General designate: to get rid of the connection with royalty in this country.

Anyone in the House who is fair dinkum will admit that prior to my election to Parliament I raised issues in regard to the fact that no radar was provided at Coolangatta airport—no radar at all. If honourable members want to see an example of lack of forethought for the rights of the safety of people, all they have to do is cast their minds back to what was seen on television yesterday. As a result of a mid-air collision, 47 people were killed.

I have been talking about a dream, a dream that I have in relation to preventing a major disaster in the area of Coolangatta and the region that I am charged by the people with the responsibility of representing. On a number of occasions I have raised this issue, only to find that the Federal Labor Government has done nothing, will do nothing and will just abdicate its responsibility of spending a few lousy dollars. At the same time, the Federal Government increases air navigation charges to the point at which it could not give a damn whether the people who are employed in that industry are put out of it. Charges of \$1,200 have been raised to something in excess of \$20,000 a year. Yet the Federal Government talks about helping the workers. What a lot of rot!

The air traffic controllers down there do their job under adverse conditions, but does the Labor Party worry about that? No way. The air crews and air traffic controllers are frightened to report incidents, as they are called, or break-downs of separation because

of their fear of being put in a position of risk, either by punishment of losing their job or by severe reprimand.

Mr Austin: That is because they are stood over by union reps.

Mr GATELY: That is true.

In mid-April this year I raised my concern about the lack of proper facilities at Coolangatta airport.

Mr Davis interjected.

Mr GATELY: I will let Opposition members have a bit of a spell for a minute.

I requested the Federal shadow Minister for aviation, Liberal member Julian Beale, to meet me at Coolangatta airport to discuss safety issues, because a shadow Cabinet meeting was to be held in the electorate.

Mr Casey: Is that before or after the immigration matter?

Mr GATELY: I told Opposition members I would give them a break, so if they shut up for a minute they will get the message.

The shadow Minister failed in his responsibility to meet me. The Liberals are supposed to be the champions of helping everybody on the Gold Coast. Mr Beale even failed to come down to a front. He would not come and talk about safety issues at the airport. So, I raised five issues with Mr Sinclair and Senator John Stone. They paid the electorate the courtesy of coming down to look at those issues. After I had raised those issues I suggested that ultimately, in the long term, Coolangatta airport may well become and should be increased to the status of an international airport. But what happened as a result of that? None other than Peter White, who happens to be the member for McPherson, enters into it. Not much is heard of him except when somebody prods him with a bit of a razz up the ear-hole and says to him that he is not doing his job too well. Next there was a newspaper article headed "White against international status. No support for airport." Goodness gracious me! Mr White accused me of swinging in the breeze on my own. The Liberal Party is supposed to be doing everything to help the people on the Gold Coast.

A newspaper article quoted Mr White as saying—

"As for Mr Gately's continued talks about airport safety, he should know Coolangatta has a high safety record, and that I have nevertheless been campaigning for radar and a new control tower for three years . . ."

He said also—

"If Mr Gately is so concerned about the airport, all he has to do is pick up the phone and talk it over with me."

He said that he would be able to help me. Yes, Mr Liberal member. What happened? He looked after the area very well. That refers to 2 February 1987. The time that I am talking about is 2 May 1988, more than a year later. Mr White received a letter from Mr Peter Morris, the member for Shortland and Minister for Transport at the time, in which Mr Morris abdicates his responsibility and says—

"... the current air traffic movements do not yet warrant the provision of a local radar."

Although more than 600 000 people travelled in and out of the airport, according to him no safety improvements were required.

The grotty Liberals came down and were going to do great things for the airport and for the Gold Coast. They criticised me for suggesting that it should be upgraded to become an international airport. What a motley, weak group of people they turned out to be. They criticised me because I was trying to do what was in the best interests of the people in the electorate. To find out what the Liberals did, I need only refer to an article in the *Bulletin* of 10 October 1986 headed, "Liberals launch new deal message".

What do honourable members think the Liberals were going to do as part of the Liberal Party's strategy and policies? They were going to update the Coolangatta airport to international status. Bill Knox and Mr Gygar were down on the Gold Coast, and what a dismal failure they were! However, I will not worry about that. I will get on to other issues raised by Senator Glen Shiel in Federal Parliament in recent times.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr GATELY: Opposition members may well laugh, but Senator Gareth Evans has misled the Parliament. He said that he did not receive an invitation to look at the safety issues at the airport, but that is not true. An air traffic controller issued the invitation because air traffic controllers were concerned—as I was—about safety. In addition, the letters that I sent to Gareth Evans in relation to these matters were totally ignored. Senator Evans told the Parliament that he considered my letters routine and couched in offensive terms. The offensive terms were that I demanded proper safety facilities at Coolangatta airport in the interests not of 600 000, but 930 000 passengers who travel in and out of that airport; yet Senator Evans says that my letters were couched in offensive terms. He is the one who is wrong. He refused to look into these matters. Since the date on which four people lost their lives, there has been no comment from either Mr White or Senator Evans.

Time expired.

Payment of Ministerial Expenses from Departmental Funds

Mr WELLS (Murrumba) (11.42 a.m.): The other day I tabled in this House a number of documents that I said were the tip of the iceberg of ministerial corruption. The Ministry opposite never denied that claim. In fact, it is interesting that, since then, the claim has been confirmed. I wish to read to the House an excerpt from the *Courier-Mail* of Friday, 26 August that is headed, "Harvey won't resign over allegations". Among other things, the article states—

"She said the payment of function attendances by departments was a 'regular occurrence' throughout the ministry."

If the payment of function attendances by National Party Ministers from departmental funds is in fact a regular occurrence throughout the Ministry, then it really is the tip of an iceberg of quite massive proportions. If payment of function attendances and donations to the National Party amount to that much—

Mrs Harvey: How much?

Mr WELLS: How much is it going to amount to when all the other things are taken into account? The tip of the iceberg amounted to well over \$300, and that consisted only of the cheques that I happened to have in my possession. The principle of the issue is that if function attendances are regularly paid for by departments, according to the words of the Minister for Health, the amount of money I am talking about is extremely substantial.

Mr Casey: You can multiply that by 18 straight off.

Mr WELLS: I thank the honourable member for Mackay.

The Government seeks to hide behind guide-lines. The guide-lines behind which it seeks to hide have not been produced and have not been shown to the House. Mr Deputy Speaker, we have a Government which is proposing to hide itself behind invisible barriers and I think that the emperor definitely has no clothes. Why can the Government not produce these guide-lines?

The Parliament has been informed that a review was carried out by the Department of Health in April. As I subsequently proved by demonstration with another cheque, the review still did not prevent this Government from making donations to the National Party out of the people's funds; not the funds voted to Ministers as part of their salary

structures, not their expense of office allowances, not their electoral allowances and not their salaries, but money that belongs to the people of Queensland that was voted for the salaries of doctors and nurses, for equipment in hospitals and so forth.

Today I placed on notice a question to the Attorney-General. The question is along the following lines: does the Attorney-General recall section 408C of the Criminal Code? Because it is extremely interesting, I wish to read that section to the House. It is headed "Misappropriation of property" and states—

"(1) Any person who dishonestly applies to his own use or to the use of any person—

(a) property belonging to another; or

(b) property belonging to him, which is in his possession or control (either solely or conjointly with any other person) subject to a trust, direction or condition or on account of any other person,

is guilty of the crime of misappropriation of property."

That question will be placed on the Notices of Questions and the Attorney-General will answer it tomorrow. It is a polite request that the Attorney-General consult with his departmental officials and make a statement to Parliament at an appropriate time. I would like him to answer several questions. Does the use of departmental funds to pay for personal or political debts of Ministers constitute a breach of the Criminal Code under section 408C or any other section? I draw the attention of the House to the fact that the breach, if any, would be a breach committed not by one but by all those Ministers who make regular donations, as stated in the *Courier-Mail* of Friday, 26 August. Also I would like the Minister to advise this House whether any person who attempted to conceal—

Mrs HARVEY: I rise to a point of order. I take offence at the fact that the honourable member opposite is deliberately misrepresenting the situation. Last week in the House I made my answer quite clear and I ask him to withdraw references to Ministers using departmental funds for personal expenses.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Row): Order! The honourable member for Murrumba was making reference in general terms to matters which he feels that he is entitled to raise. On this occasion I did not detect any particular personal reference to the Minister for Health. There is no point of order.

Mr WELLS: In addition, I would like to know from the Attorney-General whether the practice of using departmental funds to pay Ministers' personal and political expenses is in fact a regular occurrence within the Ministry, as suggested in the *Courier-Mail* article. Finally, I wish to ask whether there are in existence any guide-lines which purport to validate such use of public funds and whether such guide-lines, if any, are legally valid.

A great deal hangs on that last question because if such guide-lines—which may or may not be in existence—purport to validate the sort of behaviour which the Minister for Health has indicated in the *Courier-Mail* article is a regular occurrence in the department, those guide-lines would be the best defence for any Minister charged under section 408C with the misappropriation of funds and would provide a legal colour for the activities in which they are engaged. The trouble with that defence is that if there are such legal guide-lines in existence which would justify Ministers making donations to the National Party out of departmental funds, then what would such guide-lines justify? The guide-lines would, for example, justify such things as a Minister who attended a Townsville conference of the National Party taking all the Sunshine Coast delegates out to dinner and duchessing them at departmental expense. Even behaviour such as that would be justified by such guide-lines. The guide-lines would justify such things as allowing Ministers to live a free-wheeling, rollicking and perpetual junketing life at departmental expense and using their salaries, Minister's expenses, office allowances and electorate allowances as nothing more or less than pocket money.

I am pleased that the Leader of the Liberal Party is in the House. I welcome his assistance in drawing attention to various matters in this campaign. It is interesting that it would not even occur to the Leader of the Liberal Party to do such things himself. However, one of the Liberal members, a former Minister in the National/Liberal Government, always had his dry-cleaning done under his departmental expense account. All of these things would be justified by whatever guide-lines are brought forward.

The guide-lines have not been brought forward. I suggest that they either do not exist or are just a meaningless scramble. Nobody has confirmed or denied any details relating to those guide-lines. Without such guide-lines being in place, I put it to the House that there exists a *prima facie* case that section 408C of the Criminal Code has been breached by all those Ministers who engage regularly in this occurrence, as it has been called, of using departmental funds to subsidise their own personal expenses.

It is interesting to try to plumb the mentality of people who engage in that sort of activity and to try to work out how it came about that a whole Ministry should engage in such behaviour. I think that I know the answer: they have been entrenched in power for so long that they have come to look at Queensland as nothing more than their own feudal fief, to look at the rest of us as serfs and to look at the wealth and the resources of the State and the Parliament of Queensland as nothing more than mere property to be plundered by an unscrupulous, avaricious and voracious group of Ministers who are adopting unfettered and undignified attitudes towards the public treasury of Queensland.

This State is run according to the precepts of people who are operating on their own conception of the feudal system; it is operating under a system run by people who see themselves as nothing more nor less than robber barons. It is not good enough. It cannot go on and this shonky, shabby, shady Government cannot last very long.

Repeal of Legislation Governing Iwasaki Franchise Agreement

Mr HINTON (Broadsound) (11.52 a.m.): I wish to bring to the attention of the House some of the problems and some of the programs relating to the Livingstone Shire Council, which is in my electorate. I wish to refer particularly to the considerable extra responsibilities that the shire will now face as a result of State Cabinet's decision to repeal legislation governing the Iwasaki franchise agreement.

Mr R. J. Gibbs: You can always forge it for them.

Mr HINTON: You could not even get your name on the entry form for pre-selection for the Oxley by-election. You backed out. The moment the pressure came on to you, you went to water.

Mr R. J. Gibbs interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I direct the member for Broadsound to direct his remarks to the Chair. Persistent and incoherent interjections from the member for Wolston will not be tolerated.

Mr HINTON: Mr Deputy Speaker, I was simply pointing out that, the moment the pressure came on the member for Wolston for pre-selection at Oxley, he went to water. He did not just go to water; last night on the *7.30 Report* he gave his colleague a thorough bucketing to make sure that he could not win pre-selection, either. If that was not good enough, I was pleased to see Andrew Vickers, the president of the miners' union, wade in and have the common sense to say that the ALP is on the nose. I can assure the House that one-third of the electors in my electorate are coal-miners and I will certainly bring that comment to their attention. I can also assure the House that they certainly know that the ALP is on the nose.

I suggest to the member for Wolston and the public that the by-election for the seat of Oxley provides no better an opportunity for the public to show its disgust at the appointment of Mr Hayden as Governor-General. That could very well be a major issue in that by-election and could turn that supposedly safe Labor seat right upside down.

I did not come along to speak about that, but I was very pleased to be given the opportunity to remind the member for Wolston of his responsibilities and also the member for Ipswich, who the member for Wolston last night said had no guts.

Mr R. J. Gibbs: I didn't say that.

Mr HINTON: The honourable member did.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Some of the profanity that is emerging in this debate is trying the patience of the Chair. I ask the honourable member for Broadsound and all other members in the Chamber to moderate their language.

Mr HINTON: Yesterday, Cabinet took a decision that the franchise agreement with Iwasaki should be repealed by legislation. That was a good decision. Because that company has provided the Yeppoon district with a great deal of economic stimulus over the years, it was a difficult decision. Unfortunately, the franchise agreement was made by an Act of Parliament, the terms of which have not been fulfilled by the company in the manner that was expected when it was drawn up. At this stage, 10 years on, roughly five years of the program have been put into effect. Many areas of public interest, such as the beach access points and the recreation areas, have not been provided. The Government had no alternative other than to take the action that it has. That action is strongly supported in my electorate.

The Government was concerned about the previous franchise agreement and particularly about the proposals mooted by the company, one of which was to build an international airport in the area. Those indefinite proposals made it difficult for entrepreneurs and others to gauge the potential of the area. It was important that the matter be brought to a head. I commend the Premier for his actions.

It is almost three months since the Premier asked the company to provide a program of achievable goals under the franchise agreement. It is history that on 6 August, accompanied by officers of the department and me, the Premier visited the resort and was advised by Mr Iwasaki, Senior, that the company proposed to build, by 1 May 1991, an international hotel, an international airport, an international village, a golf course and some additional accommodation. The Premier asked that those proposals be substantiated and that the program of action for construction be firmed up within two weeks. However, I regret to inform the House that nothing of substance was forthcoming, which left the Government with no alternative but to proceed to bring in legislation to repeal the previous Act.

That is now history. If the company comes forward with a program of substance—a program of achievable goals; a program whose performance can be guaranteed—the Government will consider a fresh application under the Integrated Resort Development Act. The company can do that in the future if it so desires. In the meantime, the company must operate under the usual conditions that apply to any other developer under the Land Act, the Water Resources Administration Act, the Beach Protection Act and the Local Government Act.

I am concerned at the added onerous responsibility that is thrust upon the Livingstone Shire Council. I assure the residents and the rate-payers of that area that those responsibilities will not cost them one cent. I have spoken with officers of the Premier's Department. The extra planning and responsibilities will be taken up by the Government or by the company, according to where the responsibilities lie.

An impact study should be implemented immediately to consider all aspects of the local government requirements for that resort. I am concerned about the water supply at the resort. At present, the company has its own supply. However, when the resort comes under the control of the council, the water supply will have to be integrated. If the proposed developments of the company occur, it could mean the construction, at great cost, of a pipeline from the Fitzroy River barrage. I understand that the cost is estimated at approximately \$30m. Of course, if those proposed developments proceed, the company would be liable for considerable headworks costs.

The issue of zoning will need to be considered. The area would need an appropriate zoning both for rating purposes and for future development proposed by the company.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Row): Order! The time allotted for the Matters of Public Interest debate has now expired.

At 12 noon,

In accordance with the Sessional Order, the House proceeded with the debate on the Address in Reply.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Second and Third Allotted Days

Debate resumed from 25 August (see p. 156).

Mr McELLIGOTT (Thuringowa) (12 noon): During my contribution to the Address in Reply debate, I wish to focus very strongly on local government and I wish to comment specifically on its status in Queensland today. That is particularly appropriate at this time given that on 3 September the people of Australia will have the opportunity at last to recognise that Australia has a three-tier system of government.

Few members in this House would seek to denigrate the importance of local government, and fewer still would suggest that local government should ever be abandoned or abolished. Indeed, a large number of members have served for varying periods on their local councils and some, in fact, still do.

Of course, it is not good enough to direct platitudes at local government. It has to be a genuine partner in government. The Advisory Council for Inter-government Relations has identified four basic roles for local government—

- to be an informed and responsible decision-maker in the interests of developing the community and its resources;
- to be a responsible and effective provider and co-ordinator of public services at the local level;
- to be a catalyst for, and a resourceful initiator and co-ordinator of, local effort; and
- to represent the local community to other Governments and the wider society.

Given appropriate recognition and resources, local government in Queensland is very well equipped to fulfil those roles. Quite honestly, the people of Queensland have a right to expect that that would be so. The combined budgets of the State's local authorities represents quite a massive financial commitment. Clearly the previous Local Government Minister, Mr Hinze, had considerable respect for the system of local government in this State, which he often described as the best in Australia.

It is a great shame that Mr Hinze could not resist the temptation to allow party politics to intrude into his administration of the portfolio. Of course, Mr Hinze's views of politics have changed in recent times. He has developed a sense of honesty about, for example, the rigged State electoral boundaries, which was not in evidence when he imposed a ward system and preferential voting on a number of Labor-held provincial councils or when he sacked the Townsville/Thuringowa Water Board. His lead has been followed by his former ministerial colleagues in their restructuring of electricity boards and port authorities. They have selectively removed elected representatives from those boards purely on the basis of political considerations.

It is worth mentioning that the member for Townsville has attempted to justify this political chicanery by arguing that this Government was really trying to remove party politics from those authorities. Of course, what he meant was that no member of the Labor Party will be permitted to sit on those boards. There is no similar ban on members of the coalition parties. People who are members of the National and Liberal Parties do sit on those boards and organisations.

We now have the extraordinary situation in which the Townsville City Council is not represented on the electricity board, the port authority or the hospitals board. The Cairns City Council is represented on the Cairns Port Authority not by a representative of the group which holds the reins of power but by the one member of the council who is not a member of the majority group. Of course, he is a member of the National Party. So much for taking the party politics out of those organisations!

Quite simply, this State Government has ratted on local government. It has substantially increased stamp duty costs to councils and substantially reduced subsidies. It has interfered with the autonomy of councils. It has paid lip-service to the importance of local government.

I did not believe that I would ever have to stand up in this place and argue the status of local government and to plead for recognition of local government as the legitimate third tier of government in this nation. I did not think that I would ever have to do that because of the number of members of this Parliament who have at some time served on a local council. Indeed, some members continue to serve on a council, and the member for Toowoomba South is Mayor of a large provincial city.

All honourable members understand the importance of local government in the delivery of services in this State. All honourable members claim to support the local councils in their own electorates. Yet the National Party and the Liberal Party are telling the people of Queensland to oppose a change in the Constitution of the Commonwealth that would give local government the status, the permanence and the legitimacy which it has craved for years.

At its 89th annual conference held at Gladstone from 9 to 12 September 1985, the Local Government Association of Queensland unanimously carried the following resolution—

“There should be an acknowledgement of Local Government in the Constitution Act of the Commonwealth of Australia as a means of recognising the existence and importance of Local Government as a sphere of responsible government in Australia.”

At the 91st annual conference held at Broadbeach from 7 to 10 September 1987, the association unanimously carried this resolution—

“The LGAQ reaffirm its support to the ALGA in its quest for recognition of Local Government in the Commonwealth Constitution.”

It is very likely that some National Party members who are now in this place actually attended either or both of those conferences. In any case, the councils of which they were members were represented and supported those policy positions. It is certain that many National Party counsellors who are now supporting the “No” case raised no objection when their association determined that local government should be recognised in the Commonwealth Constitution.

Those National Party councillors who are now supporting the “No” case are doing so because they have been instructed to do so. They have been instructed to do so because the National Party has so little faith in the intelligence of Queenslanders that it fears that, if the people are convinced to vote “Yes” on any one of the questions, they may find it easy to vote “Yes” on some of the others, including, of course, the one that is vital to the National Party’s future—the question on fair electoral boundaries.

I am sure that Opposition members are all amazed at some of the gross untruths that are being spread about the one vote, one value question—and, indeed, about all of the other questions that the people will consider on Saturday. I have to refer to the bleating comments by the member for Burdekin in the *Townsville Bulletin* some weeks ago, when he suggested that somehow or other he needs to be treated specially because of the remoteness of his electorate from access to television channels and lines of communication. The fact is that, although the member for Burdekin lives closer to the centre of media communication in Townsville than he does to his own electorate office, the number of voters in his electorate is about half the number of electors in my electorate. In the circumstances, I fail to see that he is deserving of any special

consideration. He obviously has the same access to communications and to the media as I and other members who represent provincial areas have.

The National Party talks about the need to keep together a community of interest. For example, it is ridiculous that the member for Flinders, the Minister for Northern Development, Mr Katter, lives in Charters Towers, yet his electorate extends as far as Cloncurry, which is 600 kilometres away. If community of interest were to be considered, clearly the residents of Cloncurry have a community of interest with the residents of Mount Isa. Similarly, if Charters Towers has a community of interest with any other major centre, it must be with Townsville.

On many occasions reference has been made to the seat of Roma, which is only three hours' drive from Brisbane, yet it has less than half the number of electors in my electorate of Thuringowa, which is more than 1 000 kilometres from Brisbane. If the Government were serious about considering the more isolated seats, then, as has been pointed out in this place, the seat of Cook should have the least number of voters in the entire State. Again, that is not the position.

Thuringowa has about 12 000 voters, compared with only about 8 000 voters in Roma. The seat of Maryborough is about on line with a State quota. By road, Maryborough is about the same distance from Brisbane as Roma, yet Maryborough has 19 000 voters, compared with only 8 000 voters in Roma. Clearly, the sorts of excuses—

Mr Stephan: What has distance from Brisbane to do with the ability of a member to service his electorate?

Mr McELLIGOTT: Reference is made to access to all of the facilities and services that exist in the capital cities, and to access to this Parliament. Government members claim that the member for Roma has special difficulties. I am just pointing out that, geographically, he is in exactly the same circumstances as the member for Maryborough.

I point out to the member for Gympie that we are talking about representation of the people. The point I am trying to make is that all members are elected to this Assembly to represent the people who live in their communities. It is the people who vote for us. Those votes should be of equal value.

Mr Casey: Mr Stephan's electorate is so convenient that his constituents even shop in Brisbane.

Mr McELLIGOTT: Exactly.

I have been disgusted by the lies being spread by members of the National Party to frighten people into voting against constitutional recognition for local government. Those lies were repeated in this House last week and again this morning.

Next week the Local Government Association of Queensland will hold its annual conference in Brisbane. My challenge to both the National and Liberal Parties is: if the local government referendum question is defeated on 3 September, let those who have sponsored that defeat stand up at that conference and move that the demand for constitutional recognition be extracted from the policy of the association and thereby commit local government to be for ever the plaything of State and Federal Governments. To continue to argue a policy of recognition within the forums of that association and yet oppose it on the one occasion that it will ever be offered is hypocrisy in the extreme.

I believe that honourable members have been present at conferences of that association, which, on two separate occasions, has unanimously adopted a policy position calling for constitutional recognition of local government but has gone out on instructions by the National Party organisation and opposed that recognition publicly.

I turn now to the facts that are in dispute. The proposed change to the Constitution provides for a new clause 119A to be inserted as follows—

“Each State”—

and I emphasise “State”—

“shall provide for the establishment and continuance of a system of local government with local government elected in accordance with the laws of the State and

empowered to administer, and to make by-laws for, their respective areas in accordance with the laws of the State."

The Premier, the National Party and his coalition partners, the Liberals, somehow interpret that to mean the transfer of power to Canberra. Last week in this House the Premier said—

"Once again the local government proposal is a political proposal to enable Canberra to grab more power. It is a mechanism to enable the Commonwealth to by-pass the States."

Those statements are clearly not true.

The explanatory notes that have been issued by the Commonwealth Attorney-General state—

"This clause inserts in the Constitution a new section obliging each State to provide for the establishment and continuance of a system of local government with local government bodies—elected in accordance with the laws of the State; and—empowered to administer, and to make by-laws for, their respective areas in accordance with the laws of the State."

The statement continues—

"It will be a matter for State Parliaments to determine the manner of elections, the area to be covered by each local government body, the manner of administration and the manner of exercise and the extent of the power to make by-laws."

Is any member opposite prepared to interject and say that the Attorney-General of our Commonwealth Government is lying or deliberately misleading the nation?

In a letter published in the *Australian* on 18 July, Mr W. A. Hemmingham, the secretary of the Local Government and Shires Associations of New South Wales, said—

"The truth is that constitutional recognition will not alter existing financial arrangements, increase council powers nor necessarily lead to an increased bureaucracy. Neither will it alter the legal relationships between local government and the High Court. It will not increase the Commonwealth's power and it will not reduce the States' power except to ensure that local elections are called following a Council's dismissal—a long overdue reform."

Is any member opposite prepared to interject and say that Mr Hemmingham is lying or deliberately misleading the nation? I assume that honourable members opposite all accept that those two statements are true and accurate.

In the editorial in its magazine for April/May, the Local Government Association of Queensland stated—

"The statement of there being three tiers, levels or partners in the Government of the nation is merely words without substance unless Local Government is recognised in the Federal Constitution. The recognition proposed in the form of the Referendum question will provide for genuine partnerships but with the all-important condition that Local Government is subject to the laws of the State. It could not, and should not, be any other way. The words proposed are unambiguous and cannot, if one is honest and realistic, be interpreted in any other way. The proposal is not a threat to States' rights. The Federal Government does not achieve any Legislative power over Local Government from this proposal. This power remains with the State."

Again I issue a challenge: does any member opposite want to say that Greg Hoffman, the secretary, or Councillor Kerry Park, the president of the Local Government Association of Queensland, are telling lies?

Mr Simpson: Most definitely!

Mr McELLIGOTT: The honourable member for Cooroora says that those gentlemen are telling lies.

Mr Simpson: Most definitely misleading the public.

Mr McELLIGOTT: No, the lies in this campaign are being spread by members of the National Party and, regrettably, by some members of the Liberal Party. Let me say that they are in good company. On the week-end I received in my letterbox a document authorised by the Queensland Council for Democratic Rights, which is an offshoot of the National Civic Council, of which Mr Burreket is the Townsville patron.

Mr Burreket: And very proud of it.

Mr McELLIGOTT: The honourable member is proud to be patron of the National Civic Council in Townsville?

Mr Burreket: I certainly am.

Mr McELLIGOTT: The honourable member needs to address himself to the comments of the State President of the National Party, Sir Robert Sparkes, who declared that the National Civic Council is a blot on our society and that members of the National Party should not associate themselves with the policies of that organisation. If the honourable member for Townsville is the patron of that organisation, he had better have a rethink.

The document that I received referred to the referendum question dealing with control of local authorities and stated—

“Seeks to have local Government ‘recognised’ in Federal Law, whereas it has been a function of the various State Governments since earliest times. Canberra’s recognition could force amalgamations of some authorities and create ‘super regions’ to the distinct detriment of the States. Canberra control of local authorities would starve and weaken the States and hi-jack more of their rights.”

That is completely untrue. That document contains a parcel of lies similar to those that have been told by the group of people opposite with, as I said, regrettably, the support of the Liberal Party.

The two lies most resorted to are that constitutional recognition will lead to forced amalgamations and that one vote, one value elections will be extended to local authority elections. In response to the first point, the Queensland Local Government Association said—

“More than two-thirds of Australia’s 836 Local Governments are voluntary members of regional associations and work with that form of Local Government region effectively and happily. Local Government has consistently opposed ‘top down regions’. The wording of the Referendum proposal puts any prospect of a Commonwealth-imposed approach to regionalism out of the question.”

On the second point, of course, even the most biased of commentators will acknowledge that the referendum question on fair and parliamentary elections will have no impact on local government elections at all. Yet the member for Callide claimed publicly that it would, for which she was soundly rebuked by Councillor Park, as well she should have been. The northern director of the National Party made similar claims in the *Townsville Bulletin*.

Others whom I have caught spreading untruths on this question have been National Party Senators Bjelke-Petersen, Boswell and Sheil, and the member for Lockyer. Clearly the National Party campaign is not “No”, “No”, “No”, “No”, but “Lies”, “Lies”, “Lies”, “Lies”.

I would now like to turn very briefly to the comments made on this question in the House last week by the member for Sherwood. He relied on the regionalisation scare, but I must admit that he sounded unconvinced and unconvincing. We can only wonder why Mr Innes would differ from Lord Mayor Atkinson on the local government question. He does not appear to be in any hurry to enlighten us.

Honourable members who are fair would acknowledge that Lord Mayor Atkinson does speak for local government in this State. She is obviously a very successful leader in local government. She has been prepared and has the strength of character to put aside her party political allegiance to support what really ought to be a motherhood issue for the voters of this State.

As an organisation, local government has been seeking Federal constitutional recognition for more than 40 years. As I indicated, on two separate occasions the Local Government Association has indicated its unanimous support for the recognition of local government in the Constitution of this country.

Mr Burreket: What does your own Thuringowa council say about the referendum questions?

Mr McELLIGOTT: The member for Townsville sought the opinion of the Thuringowa City Council. That council has passed a resolution supporting constitutional recognition of local government. At the instigation of its Mayor, it withdrew financial support for a campaign to support the "Yes" vote. Obviously, I do not support that. The levy that has been proposed by the Local Government Association is a voluntary one. According to my most recent information, 84 per cent of local authorities in Queensland have voluntarily agreed to financially support the "Yes" campaign being conducted by the Local Government Association of Queensland. The Thuringowa City Council has given its support but has not agreed to financially support the campaign.

The honourable member for Sherwood commented on the Labor Party's how-to-vote ticket for the South Coast, and I cannot let this occasion go by without making a comment. He accused the Labor Party of extending preferences to the "forces of darkness". I point out, however, that if the Liberal Party had the necessary intestinal fortitude over the years, there would have been no need for a referendum to achieve fair and democratic elections and the "forces of darkness" would not have survived. As recently as the South Coast by-election, the Queensland Liberals could have said enough was enough and accepted Mr Goss's offer to exchange preferences. However, yet again the Liberals held out the olive branch to the Nationals, as they will after the next election if the situation arises. In my opinion, it would be the ultimate hypocrisy if the Liberals crawled back into bed with the National Party, especially a National Party that includes Mr Austin and Mr Lane. I personally support the decision of the Labor Party to produce a two-sided card for the South Coast by-election. The parties nominated to receive preferences were both as bad as each other, as far as I am concerned. History will deal harshly with the Queensland Liberals, who have had many opportunities over the past decade or so to bring decency and democracy to this State. They have repeatedly failed this test.

In the time that remains available to me I wish to raise two matters relating to local government. The first issue I wish to raise is the gap in the Standard Building By-laws which allows a commercial developer to build a fire-rated wall on the boundary between commercially zoned land and neighbouring residential land. As a result, an elderly lady in my electorate now has a 4.5 metre high blank wall along her entire rear boundary. What was once quite a pleasant view of Mount Stuart and the neighbouring hills has been replaced by a stark concrete block wall, not even broken by windows. Of course, she could have objected to the development, but given that the land was already zoned commercial she was unlikely to succeed. In any case, she did not object to the development as such, and she assumed that she would have a car park at the rear boundary. The developer cannot really be blamed as he was entitled to make the best and maximum use of the site. What is needed is a change to the Standard Building By-laws to restrict the height of boundary walls where commercial zoning abuts areas zoned residential.

The second matter I wish to raise is one on which I contacted the Minister for Finance by letter on 5 April. Apart from an acknowledgement from the Minister, I have heard nothing further. As honourable members would be aware, local authority rates remain a charge on the land, even in the event of a change of ownership by private individuals and commercial enterprises. The authority granted under the Local Government

Act ensures that defaulting rate-payers do not become a burden on those who have already met their community commitment by paying their rates.

As the Local Government Act does not allow Crown land to be rated, and as a Crown mortgagee in possession such as the Queensland Housing Commission does not absorb any outstanding rates, councils have limited possibilities of recovering outstanding rates on property where the commission has an interest and, in particular, where it becomes the mortgagee in possession. Other powers exist to recover rates from property-owners through the courts. However, this is only if the rate has been levied and recovery is only possible if the defaulting rate-payer can pay. Generally, this would not be so. Excess water charges are not levied until the following year and, in the meantime, a property may be taken back by the commission and resold. The former owner may have disappeared. The commission will only accept responsibility for rates accrued since the date it became the mortgagee in possession.

Action is needed to ensure that all Crown instrumentalities, such as the commission, liaise with the respective local authority to ensure that rates are settled before any property changes hands. In particular, a Crown mortgagor, such as the Queensland Housing Commission, should only receive any surplus equity in the property after rates have been cleared.

At present, while most properties repossessed by the commission are sold in the normal manner, if a surplus does eventuate as between the amount owed by the defaulting former owner and the relevant net sale price, there is no legislative provision requiring the Crown to settle any outstanding rates from such a surplus. Legislative changes are needed to ensure that when the Crown becomes the mortgagee in possession and sells a property, outstanding rates and charges remain a charge against the land, in the same manner as they do for any private similar dealing. They are two matters of an administrative nature that are causing problems for local authorities in the State. I ask that the appropriate Ministers look into those two examples and make the necessary changes in the legislation.

I wish now to refer to what has been a very public and unseemly brawl between the member for Aspley and the Lord Mayor of Brisbane over control of the banks of the Brisbane River in which the member for Aspley said, amongst other things—

“It appears the Lord Mayor’s voracious appetite for pay rises is exceeded only by her voracious appetite for power.”

I think that all honourable members would agree that that is the sort of comment that one would not expect from a former party political colleague of the Lord Mayor. I make the point which has been made on many other occasions, that surely the ultimate responsibility for co-ordination and planning within the city of Brisbane is the Brisbane City Council.

Other comments made by the honourable member for Aspley were—

“The Brisbane City Council does not have those skills and abilities. It has a very poor record in the areas in which it does have authority.”

Again, I am amazed that the honourable member for Aspley would make those sorts of comments about the Brisbane City Council.

I am not referring to this particular council, but over a long period of time the Brisbane City Council has had a very successful record in dealing with those responsibilities that are normally handled by the local authority. The only problems that have arisen have been those in which the State Government has chosen to intervene. I suggest very strongly that the honourable member for Aspley is merely seeking to use her position as chairman of the Brisbane River Committee to bring attention to herself. She has already followed the example of her predecessor by using tax-payers’ money on worthless overseas trips. I understand that she has been issued with a car, presumably to carry

out regular inspections of the Brisbane River. Generally speaking, it is another situation where this Government has created a position——

Mr Casey: You would think she would be better off in a row-boat rather than a car.

Mr McELLIGOTT: Clearly, she would be, but my information is that the honourable member for Aspley is a very poor sailor and it is her choice to stay on dry land and conduct her inspections from the safety of firm land.

Mr Beard: She speaks very nice French.

Mr McELLIGOTT: The honourable member certainly goes where the wind blows, including Paris and other grand places overseas. I suggest that if there is any real need for this Government to maintain an interest in the Brisbane River, then there are vantage points within this complex itself where that can be achieved without unnecessary expense and costs being put in the direction of the honourable member for Aspley.

The whole point of my comment is that this State Government has shelved local authority as far as planning responsibilities are concerned, particularly in the city of Brisbane. The State Government appears to believe that it possesses some expertise that is not available to local government. In my opinion it is very obvious that, because of the number of Government departments that have an interest and expertise in matters affecting the river, there is a need for some co-ordinating authority. I strongly believe that that co-ordinating authority must be the Brisbane City Council, otherwise there will be a situation similar to what has occurred in Townsville, for example, where the Townsville City Council has been excluded from a Cabinet committee established to plan and co-ordinate activities on the banks of Ross Creek, which is right in the heartland of Townsville. The Townsville City Council is not represented on that committee. The Cabinet committee consists of the patron——

Mr Burreket: It has nothing to do with the council. It is a Government department.

Mr McELLIGOTT: Ross Creek is right in the middle of Townsville and I suggest that the appropriate planning authority is the Townsville City Council. As I was about to say, the committee consists of the patron of the National Civic Council, Townsville branch and other members of the National Party in Townsville who are unable to get elected to positions in the city and who instead have sought to obtain power and be in a position to direct the future organisation of the city through this State Government initiated authority.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member for Barambah. Before the honourable member commences his speech, I would remind the House that this is the honourable member's first speech and I would be grateful if honourable members would advance to him the courtesies of this place.

Mr PERRETT (Barambah) (12.29 p.m.): Mr Speaker and members of both sides of the House, this is my first speech in this House, and it would be remiss of me if I did not first thank you, Mr Speaker and other members, for your courtesy and assistance in introducing me to the workings of this institution, which has been established to represent the will of the people of Queensland for the Queen and Governor, who represent the Government of Queensland in perpetuity.

A few months ago, I had no inclination to sit in this House. That all changed during a period of five weeks, and it is to the credit of the electors of my great electorate that I am here today, delivering my maiden speech. I thank them for their confidence in me. It is my intention to represent their will to the best of my ability and to place that will above all external pressures and considerations where possible.

As one newly come to this House, I commit myself as much to learning and understanding as to advancing opinions. I am as dedicated to the essential values of integrity, truth, honour, justice and dignity as I am to any fresh contributions of my own.

It is my joyous duty to pay tribute to my predecessor, Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen who, for almost 20 years, was Premier of this great State of Queensland, who for 40 years was a member of this House, and who at his retirement was the State's longest-serving Premier and longest-serving sitting member.

Sir Joh and his good wife, Lady Flo, are institutions in my area. They have worked for the electorate for so long that during their life-times most voters knew no other representative. Their achievements are rich with lore and so numerous that it would be hard to list all of them in one speech in this House. I thank Sir Joh for his years of service and his great achievements, and I know that, at least in my electorate, they are honoured and remembered.

The electorate of Barambah is situated in the fertile and very versatile South Burnett and includes the shires of Kingaroy, Wondai, Murgon and Kilkivan and also the Aboriginal community of Cherbourg. It is essentially a rural area, producing peanuts, navy and soya beans, grain crops, sunflowers, lucerne and cotton. It also has a very extensive livestock industry, with grazing, piggeries and dairying being the principal enterprises. Forestry is another major industry of the district.

The population is approximately 21 000, with 93 per cent being Australian born. A total of 43.5 per cent have an income of less than \$6,000, 36.1 per cent have an income between \$6,000 and \$18,000, while only 14.3 per cent have an income over \$18,000. My electors are no different from many other rural Queenslanders, who are now feeling the wrath of rural poverty, many years of low commodity prices, high productivity costs, record interest rates and spiralling inflation—all coupled together with successive years of drought.

My family have lived in Barambah for several generations, and I have been fortunate enough to acquire property which my grandfather selected almost 100 years ago. He was able to develop Mount Hope with only bare hands. With a will to succeed, he forged ahead, just like many more of our pioneers, because in those days people were rewarded for hard work and effort. What has happened today? Our young people, eager to start on the land, have no chance unless they are lucky enough to inherit a property. It is most disheartening to those desirous of making their future in a rural enterprise and being prevented from doing so by the current economic situation to see so much of our prized freehold land falling into the hands of foreigners.

Our land is our greatest asset. Australians must be given the chance of working on the land and to till the soil as they see fit. Our own countrymen know better than anyone else how that should be done. Rural business is likewise affected. With the recent announcement of the closure of the Murgon dairy factory, the last of many that used to be in the area, another 37 workers were affected. Country towns can no longer stand these economic set-backs. Employment opportunities for young people are almost non-existent.

What has happened to the Government's policy of decentralisation? One does not have to travel far from a centre of population to discover hundreds of family farms which are unlikely to be saved from financial disaster by one good season, even a record one. Throughout our primary production areas, farming families are in dire straits—honest, hardworking people in most cases too proud to ask for any kind of handout. They not only face ruin, but are in the midst of it. Families have been forced to sell to meet interest payments, and know the impending forced sale of their properties is unlikely to leave enough to provide a roof over their heads.

Our city cousins may find it difficult to imagine the utter desolation for a family dispossessed of land—losing a property which may have been in the family for several generations and which represents decades of effort and dedication. For rural men, placed in such a situation, the experience can be shattering, and for rural women the threat of dispossession can be even more horrific. City-dwelling women without a source of income have relatively easy access to social services of all kinds. Friends, neighbours and relatives are usually close by. Women on farms have always been disadvantaged. This disadvantage

becomes massive when there is no money for petrol to go to town and when limited funds cannot even stretch to the luxury of a telephone.

The reasons for current rural economic hardship are numerous. One factor, commonly recognised, and very often a cruel and immediate cause of disaster, is debt. Debt is manageable when interest rates are low and when prices for rural products are high in Australian dollar terms; but debt becomes unmanageable when interest rates are excessive and when prices are inadequate.

Today, all political parties are bankrupt in generating policies of stability. We all know what the parties have done to the country in general. We also know what they have not done. They have not stopped ever-rising taxes, the interest rate rip-off, robbery and extortion, graft and corruption! They have not even saved the family, but seem intent on pushing it over the edge. They have not stopped inflation, but now seem to accept the present disastrous levels as normal. And they have not stopped ever-rising debt!

Can it all be just accidental that, year after year party politicians follow similar policies that accidentally devastate the economy and country, and thus drive individuals into ever-increasing dependence upon big government, big unions and big business? The historic characteristics of big fascism! Can it all be accidental? One would have to be either horribly perverse to accidentally create so much persistent disaster, or horribly incompetent to accept it, year after year, without ever getting it right once in the long term.

There is, throughout the community, a deepening distrust of political parties and party politicians. Would you buy a used car from a politician these days? More and more politicians are making promises to be broken. Indeed, policies of parties are leading nowhere except maybe to destruction of the family unit as the basis of society. Taxes, rates, charges and associated policies have made family life a living hell for hard-working people in the mortgage belt, for family farmers and for small businesses. All this has meant that the big lie is now accepted politics, or tactics, by an increasing number of party politicians and their advisers. The ultimate result is that party policies made by the politicians have lost their credibility in the big legislative sausage-machine and, for many, are now meaningless as campaign inducements.

In the mouth of a party politician and his masters, policies can be twisted to mean anything at any time, if the sponsor is so motivated.

The eyeball-to-eyeball, face-to-face campaign which the Citizens Council waged in Barambah was a whirlwind success. The "sleeping giant" has been roused, and in the future he will place in this House many more Independents who will be sworn to be free of corrosive and poisonous party politics.

I am the first of many such Independents. The members of this House are now on notice that they are being judged by a Citizens Movement throughout the State. They are being judged based on their performance as members and their loyalty to the electors as distinct from their loyalty to the party machine, which can unilaterally take away their right to be in this place.

People in the Citizens Movement have a "strange" idea that this duty rests alone with the electors, and that party intervention is the bane of modern politics and the ruination of much of society today.

The Citizens Movement has a specific definition for the terms "politician" and "parliamentarian": a politician is one who puts the party first; a parliamentarian is one who puts his electors first.

To those in the Citizens Movement, the policies of the parties are really all much the same. They bring ruination and they are distant from the people. The Citizens Movement believes that people must be let into Government to give people the policies that they want, not just the policies that political parties want.

Party factionalism has created such a backlash that I believe the age of the Independent is dawning. New South Wales set the ball rolling with many Independents elected. The Barambah by-election saw a massive 40 per cent of the primary vote go to Independents, while South Coast recently saw a major drift away from the established parties.

There is a thirst throughout this State for independent politics—politics free of party factions. The problem of the National Party can be put in one word—Sparkes. He is like a drug to the National Party. They know that he is destroying them but they just cannot kick the habit, and anybody who tries gets expelled. Very democratic!

My electors believe that amendments are needed to the defamation laws of this State. Public interest and truth should be adequate protection for persons wishing to expose corruption of public figures. The revelations of the Fitzgerald inquiry would more than adequately provide justification for such amendments.

The media and many upright citizens have had their hands tied by our defamation laws in their attempt to bring to public notice deeply entrenched corruption. If one has a corrupt political body reinforced by a corrupt legal system and a corrupt police force, then there is no chance for the community to rid itself of the problem. Caesar cannot impartially investigate Caesar. This we have now seen. The only avenue left to the community to achieve justice is the public forum.

The present laws offer no protection to the little people, who do not possess the financial resources to defend their names. They can be defamed with impunity, whereas the wealthy and the powerful can hide behind the present laws and continue to do as they please. All this is common knowledge and history.

I believe a few have remarked that I would be like someone isolated and helpless, confined, as it were, to a dark corner. Would it not be truer to warn that there could be a danger of the Parliament of Queensland itself becoming such a dark corner, quite out of touch with the people of this great State and with what they justly seek? This small torch I now therefore produce as a symbolic gesture that I see it as my humble duty to do all I can towards dispelling the darkness, towards helping to see Queensland emerge into a greater light, into a greater happiness, unity and prosperity, and with sufficient reason to feel increasing pride and confidence in what members of Parliament stand for and do in this place.

How do we achieve this? I have no doubts whatever about our proper direction. We all have an implicit, and indeed an inherent, moral obligation in this place to introduce the constitutional and genuinely democratic system of direct legislation, the operating principle and instrument of which is citizen-initiated referendums.

I, of course, have also a more direct and, in essence, legal responsibility in this area, for I was duly elected to this House strictly on the instructions from and on my promise to the electors of Barambah, and I cannot in all conscience treat lightly such a solemn undertaking.

Why do we need this? Because we are supposed to be a constitutional parliamentary democracy where the people rule, yet no machinery or means exist whereby the people in any district or electorate can communicate their majority views to their elected member in Parliament. It will be argued by some that every elector has the right to approach his or her parliamentary representative and to petition the Parliament, and this is constantly happening. Quite so, but I am clearly alluding to the majority will to the expression of a genuine mandate, in other words.

Can honourable members imagine the result if even only one-quarter of their electors suddenly decided to exercise this right of theirs? Can honourable members picture the absurdity of what would then mean thousands of such people every week descending upon the electorate office of each member individually, writing letters or telephoning, as a frequent activity? Obviously members and their staff would be continually exhausted from merely opening the deluge of mail, meeting visitors and answering the phone every day without pause. Hardly any time would remain for proper research, investigation or

reply to electors. Their offices could scarcely handle their own normal routine affairs and responsibilities and would often be in a state of chaos, with an overflow of some frustrated electors inevitably directing themselves to members' homes as well.

As a fortunate circumstance, members have so far been spared that fate or that dilemma. They have taken the soft option, if one may so term it, of virtually always accepting the party's arguments or leadership decisions, toeing the party line, or of watching debates confined within the Parliament itself, whilst ignoring or not even noticing the electors outside.

If this is to be claimed as being an accepted form of representative parliamentary democracy, let us have a second look at the meaning of "representative" to see if that is justified. A representative is surely one who is concerned to represent—or, to put it more clearly, to re-present. So a member can hardly re-present anything if some other entitled person or group does not first present the same to him.

But this, our assumed representatives have either not understood or have chosen to ignore with the consequences developing of incessant party political warfare, pressure group agitation or even violence and public divisions, friction and hostility—with the likelihood of much worse to follow. Yet the real solution is relatively simple, and so beneficial to all—a solution which would bring greatness to this State and to this nation. We have to adopt the principle of direct legislation—citizen-initiated referendum.

What is the actual background to this? Our hard-won struggles over the centuries brought the inspiration of Magna Carta, the common law, and the idea of Parliament itself. We then have the Swiss people adding to this their own splendid achievement—the referendum or the popular initiative.

A constitution, in democratic countries at least, is simply the rules under which people are prepared to be governed. However, Governments, democratic or not, were in the habit of simply taking on extra powers, if their Constitution did not actually forbid it. But in Switzerland, the people finally said, "No!" In future, the Government must first refer each such question to them for approval or otherwise by national vote, hence the term "referendum". Our own founding fathers wisely adopted the same principle, of course, as did other countries.

Now we reach the more dramatic development. The Swiss said this did not go far enough, and they took a giant step forward. They said that not just the Government, but every citizen, must have the right to initiate a referendum at any time and on any matter desired. The procedure was simple enough—on his own initiative any citizen could draw up, or be assisted in drawing up, a petition on the chosen issue and could then seek helpers to collect from electors a minimum total of signatures.

Upon those signatures being checked and found valid to the total lawfully required, the successful initiative, or petition in other words, was then termed a popular initiative, because it had been proved to enjoy a sufficient degree of popularity. An independent authority empowered by the Swiss people for that purpose would then direct the Government to hold a referendum within a stipulated period, accurately framed in accordance with the wording and spirit of a popular initiative. Is this not an admirable objective? Is this not fair and beneficial to all?

This is what sufficient of my own electors in Barambah have understood and now want for Queensland in particular. I am therefore happy to foreshadow—if that is an acceptable term at this time—my proposed moving of a notice of intention to introduce a private member's Bill for the purpose of implementing this truly fine and democratic principle of direct legislation of citizen-initiated referendum.

Nobody need have any qualms that this would constitute an invasion of Government; that it would in any material way hinder or be divisive in the workings of Parliament or the Government. Any such thoughts usually derive from a confusion between the meanings of policy and administration. Policy is, in short, what the people want. If we are to lay claim at all to being a genuine parliamentary democracy and a properly constitutional one, we can scarcely deny this right of the people to decide policy; but

the people are involved no further. It is then the task of the Government to give effect to such policies, carry out the necessary administration and produce the results required.

The Parliament, of course, is the important constitutional link in all these things. It has to translate the authentic policies of the people into sound legislation, pass on the consequent instructions and advice to the respective departments of Governments and see to a reasonable monitoring of their operations. There should be no fear of a flood of referendum petitions. Where the Parliament and the Government are proceeding efficiently and plainly in the public interest, the people are just not going to involve themselves in additional activities that appear unnecessary.

By setting a sensibly high but fair minimum total of electors' signatures to qualify for a citizens' referendum, all petitions of a trivial nature will fail long before they claim any serious attention in responsible quarters. It is only when the Government has not perceived the true mood of the people, and when the Parliament has acted or is failing to act on important matters in the way that the people particularly want, that the people will be stirred to make use of this direct legislative process. Surely in the interests of harmony, true consensus and common sense, we would all welcome that.

This is probably not the appropriate occasion on which to enter into any more great detail, but I can give absolute assurance here that all the merits of this principle and system of citizen-initiated referendums are indeed most impressive and outweigh any alleged disadvantages, most of which are quite clearly discredited, especially by the evidence and success of the Swiss experience and elsewhere where the procedure has been properly adopted.

There is one other observation that I might make now. Because of the heightened level of debate and wider activity and discussion in the general community concerning numerous issues, it is plainly easier for the Government to assess the popular feeling about those issues. Accordingly, the Government is able to adjust its own policies in conformity with the public's desires, thus eliminating the need to proceed to referendums in many cases and avoiding all the cost, time and effort involved.

The Government must give the people what they want. The history of referendums in this country has provided some interesting statistics and proved that Australian people will not be conned into centralising power in Canberra. Of 38 issues voted upon, 30 have been rejected. All would have given more power to the Government. Eight have been passed, all giving more power to the people.

It would be remiss of me indeed if I did not pause and pay tribute, a deeply deserved tribute, to all those good people of Barambah who put such hard but willing effort into securing my election. In particular, I thank all the booth workers, leaflet-distributors, campaign committees and campaign-director, and especially, of course, my family and friends.

I thank the people of Barambah most sincerely for their generous help and encouragement and for having been prepared to place such trust and confidence in me. In return I shall exert every effort to be worthy of that trust and confidence, and I reaffirm my complete loyalty to all the electors of Barambah without distinction or exception.

My success at the polls is largely due to the many hours and hard work put into the campaign by the executive and members of my Citizens Council, which against all odds conducted a whirlwind campaign in all parts of the electorate and brought the message of the council to the voters and created an understanding of citizens-initiated referendums. It was a campaign based on fundamental ideas, and one which did not depend on large sums of campaign money. My opponents had that money, but we citizens did not, and so we cut our cloth to suit the circumstances, and it succeeded beyond our fondest expectations.

One fundamental point that I wish to address to all honourable members is that any political party, or division of it, which honestly embraces citizen-initiated referendums will capture an overwhelming support and respect from the general public. If more than

one such party were to do this, there would quickly be a loosening between them of wasteful, bitter and costly debate, and the encouragement instead of a more friendly spirit in rivalry in seeking to present the best policies for the public's approval rather than compelling the parliamentary group to vote as one, regardless of the public's feelings, or even knowledge or denial of a democratic voice. Wherever the people have been given more responsibility, they have revealed a maturity, a logic and a thoughtfulness which is more pleasing and satisfying.

May I conclude with the earnest hope that honourable members present will not turn away from this God-given opportunity, from this belief in the soundness of the people of Queensland.

Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker and honourable members, for your tolerance and understanding in this my statement of principle.

Sitting suspended from 12.58 to 2.30 p.m.

Mr R. J. GIBBS (Wolston) (2.30 p.m.): Prior to your entry into the Chamber, Mr Speaker, I was advising the honourable member for Mount Gravatt to ensure that he issues an invitation to Pastor Klimionok to be here next week. I might as well warn him in advance that it is my intention to reveal to the people of Queensland how he has been shafting and ripping off the good parishioners at the Christian Outreach Centre at Mount Gravatt.

However, today I have other things that must be attended to which require me to mention the previous speaker, the new honourable member for Barambah. I congratulate the honourable member on having made his maiden speech today. His contribution in this House makes it apparent that the traditions of the rarified atmosphere of the Barambah electorate and the strange people it seems to produce have certainly been carried on. In the case of the honourable member for Barambah, I definitely would not buy a used car from him. However, in all fairness to the gentleman, I wish him well over the next 18 months that he is a member of this House. I do not share his optimism when he says that the day of the Independent has arrived in Queensland. I do not think I could describe his contribution as coming from an Independent, either. I thought it was rather a jumble sale of politics and a mishmash of National Party philosophy from the far Right Wing and a contribution from the Douglas Credit-ers as well. One shares some sense of horror with all sensible and thinking people in the community that the day would ever dawn when members of Parliament or the community are held to ransom by quaint little groups in the community who want people to sign petitions every day of the week for citizen-initiated referendums.

I shudder to think what will become of the tax-payers' money, which is already in short supply for the provision of essential services to the community that are so badly needed, such as education, transport, health and community services. Perhaps at a later time, the honourable member for Barambah might explain to this Parliament how the Citizens for Democracy Council proposes to solve that problem. I look forward to more of his quaint contributions in this Parliament in the coming months.

People do not realise the great contribution that the racing industry makes in this State. It saddens any person who takes an interest in racing to read the types of allegations and reports of the types of dealings that have taken place in Queensland over the last couple of years. Firstly, I refer to the very haphazard and sloppy caffeine affair, which took place approximately two years ago and which turned out to be an incorrect accusation. It was not so much a direct slur on the industry itself but more a slur on the administrators involved in the industry. In more recent times, the fiasco of the Fine Cotton affair was revealed. Even more recently was the occurrence in Western Australia when a very positive test was returned on one of Australia's champion racehorses by the name of Placid Ark. None of those occurrences has added to the image or honesty of the racing industry in Queensland.

In Queensland, the stage is fast approaching when the public loses confidence in the administration of racing, which is a matter of concern both to me and to many

other people in the racing industry. One only has to circulate on the fringes of the racing fraternity or go to the track on the week-end and speak to people who are prominent in the industry to realise that rumours have been rife in this State for ages about professional drug rings, people with the ability to fix races, crooked jockeys, bad trainers and so on.

The latest scandal which has emerged in the racing industry has been the alleged interference by one of Queensland's leading trainers. I am referring to Bruce McLachlan, who supposedly administered cocaine a couple of weeks ago to a racehorse by the name of Blue on Red. As a consequence, the horse ran second in its race. It was raced at quite handsome odds; between 10 and 16 to one. Its previous form had not been what one would describe as good, but on this occasion it turned out and ran a reasonable race. A swab taken from the horse returned a positive result of cocaine doping.

I wish to make the point before I go any further—I do not want any allegation made against me, as I am sure it will be—that I know Bruce McLachlan personally and I would not make this statement today in this Parliament unless I believed it to be absolutely correct. This is a shocking thing to occur in the racing industry to a person who has contributed much to the racing game in Queensland and has an excellent record. Not only has he won nine of out of the last 10 Brisbane training premierships and is an extremely successful man in the racing business, but also he has an impeccable record in the racing game, apart from one occurrence some 18 months ago when he was called before the stewards.

I am sorry that the Minister for Racing is not in the House today. I believe that the rule that disqualified McLachlan is a rule about which every person who is connected with the racing industry should feel concern. It is rule 178 of the QTC rules. This rule applies right across Australian racing and states—

“When any horse which has been brought to a racecourse for the purpose of engaging in a race is found by the Committee of the Club or the Stewards to have had administered to it any prohibited substance as defined in A.R.1.”—

that is another rule—

“the trainer, and any other person who was in charge of such horse at any relevant time, may be punished unless he satisfy the Committee of the Club or the Stewards that he had taken all proper precautions to prevent the administration of the prohibited substance.”

The prohibited substance which showed up as a positive swab in the horse was the illegal drug cocaine.

The amazing thing about this is that any ordinary person in the community who is found in possession of cocaine automatically becomes the target—and correctly so—of an investigation by the law authorities in this State, that is, the police. It is a prohibited and illegal drug and anyone caught in possession of it will serve a stiff gaol sentence.

Mr Mackenroth: More than two grams, mandatory life.

Mr R. J. GIBBS: As the honourable member for Chatsworth has just said, any more than two kilograms, and it is a mandatory——

Mr Mackenroth: Two grams.

Mr R. J. GIBBS: I am sorry; two grams, and it is an automatic mandatory life sentence in Queensland.

Amazingly enough, it was only at the instigation of McLachlan himself, after the horse had returned the positive swab of cocaine, that the police were called in. No action was taken by the QTC for the law authorities of this State either to be in attendance at the stewards' inquiry to hear the evidence that was given before that inquiry or to

initiate an investigation as to where the cocaine itself might have been administered to the horse. Bruce McLachlan stated—

“‘I’m just absolutely shocked,’ McLachlan said last night. ‘I can’t believe it. I’ll be fighting this to the death.’

McLachlan has called in the major crime squad, headed by Detective Sergeant Neil Collins, to investigate the matter, but the QTC inquiry will be totally separate.

‘We are not involved with the police at this stage. Our procedure is to begin with the swab inquiry as soon as possible and that looks like being Wednesday,’ chief steward Ray Murrihy said last night.

A registered strapper from Thornhill Park”—
that is McLachlan’s training venue—

“was sentenced to three months’ jail on a drug related matter, not connected to the cocaine swab matter, after an investigation over the weekend.

‘Somebody’s obviously trying to get at me. I’ve worked hard to get to the top. Why would a leading trainer want to do something like that?

‘I wouldn’t even know how to use the stuff,’ McLachlan said.

McLachlan has 130 thoroughbreds at Thornhill Park, 65 of them in work and has 30 yearlings geared to come into work in the immediate future.”

I know McLachlan and my judgment of the man is that there is no way in the world that he would be involved in doping or, to use the term that is used in the industry, “hitting” one of his own horses. He is just not the sort of person who would be involved in that. Moreover, as I have said, why place at risk such a career, especially after winning nine out of 10 Brisbane premierships and having, as a successful trainer, an annual income of approximately a quarter of a million dollars? A person just does not place those sorts of things at risk by “hitting” one of his own horses. Another press article states—

“‘The police arrested one of my stablehands, who was sentenced to three months for possessing a drug, but they are still looking for another fellow who worked for me until just after the Eagle Farm race,’ McLachlan said.

‘From what I understand, he may be helpful to both the investigations. He worked on my property until the week after that Eagle Farm meeting. We haven’t seen him since.’ ”

When McLachlan was called before the stewards’ inquiry, he requested the assistance of a Sydney chemist named Jeff Kibby, who enjoys a very high reputation within the industry of being an expert in his particular line of work. Kibby was called in because he and McLachlan had requested from the QTC the findings of the urine sample tests and that one of the samples be made available to them. Kibby advised that further testing of the swab sample could virtually determine the approximate time that the drug had been administered. I was amazed that the QTC declined to co-operate. Upon reading the rules of racing as passed by this House in the Racing and Betting Act, I found that, unfortunately, that “out” is available to the QTC.

I say to the Minister that that legislation should be repealed because, for any trainer in those circumstances not to have access to the swab samples taken from the horse so that he can use the services of an expert such as Kibby and get a second opinion or some other help at the stewards’ inquiry as to whether or not the drug in question was administered at the track, en route to the track or perhaps at the stable itself, is a denial of natural justice.

This issue brings up a number of very contentious matters. Statements in the press have been attributed to members of the QTC and to Murrihy. In no way do I cast any aspersions on the reputation of the stewards’ chairman, Ray Murrihy. He is a very honest, capable and competent person who, in his own way, is doing much to try to sort out some of the image problems and some of the questionable things that have taken place in the industry for some years.

One press article reads—

“... Murrihy said: ‘It is not possible for us to say where the drug was administered. But the image of racing is not well served with cocaine administered to horses.’”

In this instance, the chairman of the stewards, a man with high qualifications, is saying, “Look, we don’t know where the drug was administered.” At the same time, McLachlan was found guilty of neglect under rule 178, which I have already quoted to this Parliament.

I have attended race meetings at Eagle Farm, Doomben, various other racecourses throughout Queensland and even interstate. It is high time that security precautions in the racing industry were tightened up. Rule 178 leaves it open to blame trainers when an illegal drug is administered to the horse but it cannot be proved that the trainer or a member of his staff was responsible. It is time that a very strict code of security was administered in relation to the requirements at the stables of trainers. That would not be hard to do. It would require a committee of some experts to be established within the industry.

Mr Veivers: How about at the race-track, though?

Mr R. J. GIBBS: I am coming to that. The honourable member’s point is well made.

A code of security requirements at the properties or training premises of the trainers should be implemented. However, to come to the honourable member for Southport’s point—similar security measures should be taken at the track. A person can visit virtually any race-track in Australia today and witness members of the public walking down to view the horses prior to race-time. In many cases, it would be extremely easy to administer a drug to a horse. Security personnel are not always on duty. Stable personnel are very often not sitting in the stall with the horse. It would be the easiest thing in the world to throw some administered food sample into the horse’s stable. I believe that it is even possible to “hit” a horse with an injection on race day if a person is desperate enough to do that. It is time that security measures were taken at the race-tracks of Queensland so that this slur on the industry and on decent people in the industry can be removed.

Last year, when I was in Hong Kong, I spoke to a number of people in the racing industry. In Hong Kong, the authorities adopt very strict measures. Horses are required to be at the track 48 hours before start-time. Security at the stables is extremely high. The horses are under observation 24 hours a day by security cameras. They are fed and watered by trusted staff. They cannot be interfered with at any time during that 48 hours leading up to actual race-time. It is time that those measures were investigated in Queensland.

Mr Lee: Down at the racecourse now, it is not possible for an owner even to go in and see his horse, go right up to his horse or touch his horse or anything.

Mr R. J. GIBBS: I can understand that the officials would probably want to keep the honourable member away, because he is looked upon as a bit of a shady character around the race-tracks. However, security arrangements are not sufficient at the race-track level. Public entry should not be permitted to stables at race-tracks.

In the case in question, the outcome was that Mr McLachlan was suspended for 12 months. He appealed against the suspension. In what I believe was nothing more than an admission by the QTC, on appeal it not only knocked over the 12 months’ suspension, but it also reduced the suspension to one month with a \$20,000 fine. If the person concerned had not been McLachlan and had been a battling little trainer who could not afford to pay the \$20,000, what would have happened? With the precedent that has been set, what will happen now if a like incident occurs in a couple of weeks’ time? Will a person who is not in a position to pay the \$20,000 have the same treatment meted out to him? I believe that at the appeal hearing the people who were considering the matter had a grave doubt and that the original decision could have been wrong. In

fact, I think they are virtually saying that they were wrong, that he was not guilty of "hitting" the horse himself, but because of the stupidity—the imbecility, if you like—of this racing rule 178, their arms are bound and they had to find him guilty of an offence. He now has to carry that guilt—and, as I said, I do not believe he deserves to carry it—and he has incurred a \$20,000 fine and a one-month suspension. He must carry that on his back for the rest of his days in the racing game. I believe that is wrong and that the Minister needs to examine this aspect of the Queensland racing rules as a matter of urgency.

I now want to mention a highly contentious issue that has been raised recently in the public arena. In recent weeks, all honourable members would have been inundated, as I have been, with circulars and pamphlets from the anti-smoking lobby advising them to support an added tax on tobacco products and calling for the right to be taken away from tobacco companies to sponsor sport, the arts and so on.

I want to place on record today very clearly my personal position. I do not support a tax on tobacco, because I do not believe that taxing tobacco will have one iota of effect on people's desire to smoke. I will certainly not support any moves in this country or in Queensland to ban cigarette companies from having the right to sponsor major sporting events throughout this country.

I do not want to be seen to be belting my Federal colleagues, but I believe that the recent decision taken at the ALP Federal conference was not a decision taken in the best interests of sport in this country. One has only to consider some of the reaction since that decision was made. Some of the very best qualified people in the sporting field, such as the late Senator Ron McAuliffe, are ardent champions of tobacco companies having the right to sponsor sporting events. Others who come to mind are Brian Kerle, the manager and coach of the Brisbane Bullets, people associated with soccer, Terry Doyle from Queensland Rugby Union and Andrew Ireland from the Queensland Australian Football League. I could go on and refer to any number of headlines and articles stating that that is not the correct attitude to adopt. Let us get away from this ludicrous, stupid point of view that imposing some form of additional tax on cigarette-consumers would suddenly and miraculously fill that gap which would be created if sponsorship was taken away from the tobacco companies.

I want to make honourable members aware of the contribution made by tobacco companies, and I will take the financial year of 1987. In that year, the total amount of money provided by way of sponsorship in New South Wales from tobacco companies Australiawide was \$3,427,595; in Victoria, it was \$2,979,625; in South Australia, \$2,465,395; in Western Australia, \$2,140,550; in Queensland, \$1,969,838; in Tasmania, \$840,000 and in the Northern Territory, \$102,000. In addition, sponsorship totalling \$1,244,720 was provided for other national events. That is a total of \$15,170,688. That is a damned big slice of revenue that would have to be raised by additional tax on tax-payers in this country and in Queensland if people go along with the concept that tobacco companies should not have the right to sponsor these events——

Mr Mackenroth: Three times the amount that this Government spends now.

Mr R. J. GIBBS: The honourable member is dead right.

I suppose in recent years in Queensland there has been a trend towards taking for granted what tobacco companies do in this State. Let me refresh the memories of some of those people who say that sport should not be involved with tobacco companies. For example, the following are the sorts of organisations and events in Queensland that tobacco companies have sponsored and in which they have been deeply involved. They include the Brisbane Light Opera Company, the McKay Entertainment Centre, ABA Regional Galleries, the Queensland Art Gallery and Doyles Hall. Tobacco companies are involved with touring exhibitions throughout Queensland; horse-racing, such as the Rothmans 100 000 every April; and the Cairns Jockey Club annual charity race, which

takes place in August and which all honourable members know is one of the most successful charity days in Australia.

Tobacco companies are involved in the sport of Rugby League with the annual State of Origin series and the great Rothmans gold medal presentation night for the player of the year. Likewise, tobacco companies are involved in Rugby Union, with the presentation of the Rothmans gold medal. Tobacco companies are financially involved in soccer, with events such as the Rothmans gold medal presentation night. I do not know whether one would actually call it a sport, but tobacco companies are involved in the pastime of bridge in an annual congress; and the Rothmans/Cathay Pacific Jumbo Tennis, which takes place in Brisbane every year. As to the speedway—tobacco companies are involved in the Garry Rush sponsorship and minor meeting activities, as well as Australian Rules football. Coaching activities at senior and junior levels provided by national coaches and staff include the coverage of sports such as golf, tennis, Rugby League, soccer, athletics and cricket. Coaches receive the assistance of regional directors, money for which is usually forthcoming from the Rothmans sports foundation. Grants that have been applied for and approved at Board of Advice meetings include, from time to time, most handsome grants for sports such as gymnastics, volley ball, women's hockey, tennis, softball, golf and men's hockey. Most of the assistance to which I have referred is provided on an annual basis, that is, tobacco companies provide funding every year for those activities.

Sporting bodies are independent associations that have, over the years, very successfully demonstrated their ability to manage their own affairs without outside interference. This independence encompasses the right to seek funding assistance from whatever source they wish.

For sporting and cultural organisations, tobacco company sponsorship involves, for the most part, financial support. As I have pointed out, last financial year this support to sport and other activities in Australia totalled \$15,170,000.

The support given by tobacco companies provides many sporting organisations with the ability to stage and promote events on an international, national or local stage. Also, it gives these organisations the ability to attract top-line competitors both locally and from overseas and provides them with the opportunity of staging their events before the widest possible audience.

Sponsorships are given freely by tobacco companies. Many smaller organisations, though, also gain benefits through working in partnership with large Australian companies. This is especially so in ensuring promotion for their event, gaining expertise in managing the funds and in general working to their best potential for the benefit of all parties.

There is widespread support for tobacco company sponsorship of sport. Everybody in this Parliament should take note of these figures. A 1987 national Roy Morgan survey showed that 96 per cent of those surveyed did not consider sponsorship by tobacco companies would encourage them to take up smoking, while 89 per cent thought sponsorship would not encourage any member of their family to take up smoking. When asked whether the Government should ban tobacco company sponsorship, 74 per cent said it should remain as it is now.

The fact that the tobacco companies, each year, have to turn away many more requests for sponsorship than they are able to accommodate negates statements that other companies and organisations or Governments would quickly fill any gap created by the banning of tobacco sponsorship.

It is my party's policy in Queensland that it will support and continue to support the right of tobacco companies to sponsor sport.

Mr HOBBS (Warrego) (3 p.m.): I am pleased to rise to speak to the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply to the Speech of His Excellency the Governor when opening the second session of Queensland's Forty-fifth Parliament.

The role of the Governor is a very important and traditional one and one that I and my constituents hold in the highest regard. It is disappointing that the Federal Labor Government does not hold the position of Governor-General in that same very high regard.

I was pleased to hear that the Governor and his wife have been able to travel throughout the State visiting various towns and cities. Nothing can surpass the personal approach.

His Excellency's outlining of Expo as an outstanding success is a moderate explanation. Expo will be remembered by all Australians as one of our greatest achievements. As a Queenslander, I derive great satisfaction from the fact that we have done it again and shown the world.

Mr R. J. Gibbs: They reckon you fell over at the dodgem cars over there the other night.

Mr HOBBS: Was I there?

Mr R. J. Gibbs: You had fairy floss all over you.

Mr HOBBS: It must have been someone else.

Queensland is showing the rest of Australia what can be done even under adverse conditions, including a hostile Federal Government. On seasonally adjusted values, Queensland's increase in private and new capital expenditure for the March quarter was 8 per cent, which is still the second highest of any State. National expenditure increased by only 0.3 per cent. For the 1987-88 financial year the figure for Queensland is expected to increase by 35 per cent on the previous financial year, which is more than double the estimated Australian increase of 14 per cent.

Queensland is a popular State for a number of interstate migrants who continue to arrive. Queensland recorded the highest migrant intake of any State during that period.

Mr De Lacy: I thought you were against migration.

Mr HOBBS: We expect that those people are coming to Queensland because it is a good place and we have a sound Government.

Mr De Lacy: What about the Asians?

Mr HOBBS: All sorts of people are coming to Queensland. I was referring to interstate migration.

For the 12 months to March 1988, the figure for migrant intake to Queensland is expected to be approximately 24 000. We welcome those people to Queensland. We know that they have made the right decision.

There is no doubt that an expanding population puts pressure on community services such as hospitals, schools, police and the community in general. However, it should be pointed out that industrial disputes have declined in Queensland, where 129 working days per 1 000 employees are lost through industrial disputes, compared with the Australian average of 217. Although Queensland's record is still not good, we recorded the second-lowest number of industrial disputes for the 12 months ended April 1988.

I turn now to exports, which are to this nation what the pay-pocket is to the working man and woman. Unless a person earns more in his pay-pocket than he spends, he cannot survive. Queensland is more than pulling its weight, producing a massive 21 per cent of total Australian exports for the 12 months to June 1988.

Queensland's population represents 16 per cent of the Australian total but, on a per capita basis, it receives far less than the other States in funding from the Federal Government for health, education, Grants Commission, roads and many other services. Despite that, Queensland is still the lowest-taxed mainland State in Australia, with a per capita average of \$244 less than the other States. During the past five to 10 years Queensland's economic growth has outpaced that of Australia as a whole.

The Federal Government does not see fit to fund Queensland on a population basis. However, it seems keen to accept our taxes on a pay-packet basis. It accepts our greater exports but does not acknowledge them on a population basis. However, the Federal Government now seems to have a holier-than-thou attitude and has decided that we need to vote on a population basis.

How come Queensland is so popular with interstate migrants? How come Queensland has developed into a great export State? How come Queensland is the most decentralised State in Australia? How come Queensland is the lowest-taxed State? How come Queensland is the only Australian State that was willing to stage Expo? How come Queensland is one of the world's most popular tourist destinations, producing some \$11 billion for the Queensland economy? How can all these events happen without someone saying, "Why?"?

Mr Veivers: It is the best State.

Mr HOBBS: The member for Southport is correct; it certainly is the best State. For us in Queensland the answer is simple. Queensland has a free-enterprise Government that encourages business; it encourages enterprise.

Mr Davis: Where?

Mr HOBBS: Everywhere. That is why people are here. That is why they want to come here. They are coming over the border in droves. The Government encourages people to stand on their own two feet and make a go of it themselves. Because it thinks that some people are getting it easier than others, the Labor Party displays its outdated, communist, work-to-rule, chip-on-the-shoulder, whinge-and-whine attitude. The Liberals adopt a wishy-washy, don't-know, fence-sitting attitude. Even if they do make a decision, it seems to be the wrong one. Those attitudes together have made the Labor and Liberal Parties totally unacceptable and unappealing to the majority of voters in Queensland.

Mr R. J. Gibbs: You have lost our preferences; no more for you.

Mr HOBBS: Really? The honourable member should not be like that.

Because those parties cannot win in a field, they now seek to cheat and break down the very system that has made Queensland great. I ask again: could Queensland have been developed as it has and performed in the economic stakes as it has if there were no members of Parliament from all areas of this vast State to pool their knowledge and resources?

Mr R. J. Gibbs: We certainly wouldn't have had the police force like the one we have got now.

Mr HOBBS: People are still coming into this State. How come Queensland is developing so much? If the honourable member had been in the Chamber a while ago, he would have heard my remarks about how good the State of Queensland is and how it is going ahead. It is the most progressive State.

On 3 September 1939 this nation was called to war to fight an enemy in a far-away land, an enemy that could be identified; an enemy that could be found. Next Saturday, 3 September 1988, this nation again faces an enemy, but this time the enemy is from within. Why fire a shell when the Constitution can be altered? Within Australia is an enemy that is stalking the Australian people with stealth, an enemy that is stalking the Australian people with deceit, an enemy that the Australian people thought they fought and defeated many long years ago.

Mr Gilmore interjected.

Mr HOBBS: Is that him there? "Heil Hitler", he says. Look at his hand out there.

The enemy is alive and well and flourishing in the present Federal Government, and it appears from the raised hands opposite that perhaps the enemy is over there, too.

On this coming Saturday the people of Australia will be asked to vote in a referendum, a referendum proposing to make more changes to the Constitution than have been made since Federation.

Mr Palaszczuk: Are you sure of all that?

Mr HOBBS: I am quite sure of all that. The honourable member has not read his information lately.

The question on fair and democratic elections is one that is likely to affect my electorate and in fact all citizens who live in western Queensland. As I mentioned before, because the Labor and Liberal Parties are electorally unpopular, the only way in which they see they can gain some advantage is to wipe their feet on the people of western Queensland and reduce the number of parliamentary representatives in those areas.

Mr Hayward: Now we know why they want to do it—it is obviously because of the likes of you.

Mr HOBBS: Opposition members are obviously being hurt.

It is quite obvious that both opposition parties do not understand distance and what is involved in a large electorate. Recently in this place the Leader of the Liberal Party, Mr Innes, said that the argument was that the people in the country are worth more because they do more and they are more productive. That is not the substance of the argument at all. The argument is that people have to have equal representation. That is what it is all about. We in the country do not believe that we are worth more or that we are more productive, even though some of us certainly might be much more productive than those members whom I see on the other side of the House at different times.

Mr Elliott: There may be one or two from the Labor Party there.

Mr HOBBS: I see. Mr Innes said that he rejects that and, of course, he should, too. However, he is entirely off the track and out of line with the thinking of level-headed people throughout most of Queensland and across Australia. No doubt after this week-end, when all the referendums are defeated, he will find that out for himself.

Citizens in my electorate who want to see me have to travel up to 800 kilometres. Although I do the trip around the electorate as much as I possibly can, if something crops up in a locality and I am not there, those people have to travel 800 kilometres to see me in my office.

Mr Palaszczuk: Why don't you go to see them? What about the telephone?

Mr HOBBS: The member for Archerfield asks, "Why don't you go and see them?" What happens when a problem that affects people in a particular area crops up the day after the member has left? Nobody knows when people are likely to need the assistance of a member of Parliament. Does the honourable member for Archerfield have people coming into his office?

Mr Palaszczuk: My word I do.

Mr HOBBS: I have people coming into my office, too, and they want to see their member. They do not want to see a secretary or someone who has no relationship to politics; they particularly want to see their member.

Mr Palaszczuk: Have you been seen in Charleville?

Mr HOBBS: Of course I have been seen in Charleville. I am there all the time. It is in my electorate, and my office is there.

I point out to members on the opposite side of the House—those who do not understand the significance of distance—that that journey of 800 kilometres is exactly the same in distance as a journey from Mackay to Brisbane. If a member was based in

Brisbane and a constituent, who wanted to see him, lived in Charleville, that is the distance that the constituent would have to travel.

Mr Palaszczuk: I was in Warwick last night.

Mr HOBBS: That is very commendable, but it is only a few hours' drive down the road.

If the people who live in the farthest areas of my electorate want to see me they have to travel a distance similar to the distance between Mackay and Brisbane or Charleville and Brisbane. That is the position under the present system, but under the one vote, one value system the distance would be twice as great. Under this proposal for so-called fair elections, the figures I have indicate that the distance will increase to 1 300 kilometres.

Mr Davis interjected.

Mr HOBBS: The member for Brisbane Central is shaking his head. He does not want to know about 1 300 kilometres, but he will be told. People will have to travel 1 300 kilometres, which is the distance between Townsville and Brisbane. Is that fair? Is it fair for constituents to have to drive from Townsville to Brisbane, or an equivalent distance, to see their member?

Mr Davis interjected.

Mr HOBBS: The honourable member for Brisbane Central has not even worn out the bike in his electorate yet.

Mr Davis: All the people in your electorate say that they don't see you.

Mr Palaszczuk: That's what they say in Charleville.

Mr HOBBS: They do? I would be surprised about that. It will be interesting to see what happens in my electorate at the next election.

As I said before, the increased distance to be travelled by people who want to see their member will be exactly the same as the distance between Townsville and Brisbane or Brisbane and Winton.

Mr Innes also said that Roma was three hours' drive from Brisbane.

Mr Elliott: I would like to see him do it in three hours, wouldn't you?

Mr HOBBS: Mr Innes said in this House that Roma is three hours' drive from Brisbane. A person would have to travel at an average speed of approximately 160 kilometres per hour to achieve that. Perhaps Mr Innes does not know that people are not allowed to drive as fast as that on Queensland's roads?

Mr Davis: Mr Innes was a policeman, so he would know.

Mr HOBBS: Oh, I see. Perhaps he was wrong in his calculations. Instead of three hours, perhaps the estimate should have been 5½ hours?

Mr Davis: He has been charged in the radar traps.

Mr HOBBS: I see. Now I understand.

Mr Innes said that Balonne, Don Neal's seat, was three hours' drive from Brisbane. It is certainly further than that. How can the Liberal Party be a major political party when its members have no idea of what distances are involved?

Mr Davis: You have your own aeroplane, don't you?

Mr HOBBS: I have my own aeroplane and I fly around my own area all the time.

Mr Davis: What are you on about?

Mr HOBBS: This is what I am trying to get across to the honourable members opposite. My aeroplane is flown nearly every day and I am still unable to get around my electorate properly. The honourable members of the Opposition have no conception of distance.

Mr Davis: You don't fly fast enough.

Mr HOBBS: I fly it as fast as I possibly can.

Mr Prest interjected.

Mr HOBBS: That is right, I do both; I drive a motor car as well.

A while ago the Leader of the Liberal Party, Mr Innes, mentioned Mount Isa. The honourable member for Mount Isa, Mr Beard, is prepared to throw away continued representation by the Liberal Party in western Queensland. It is beyond me. He either does not understand the full effects of this con job or he has completely taken leave of his senses. Mr Beard will go down in the *Guinness Book of Records* for being John Citizen one day, a member of the Liberal Party the next, a member of the parliamentary party not long after, deputy leader of that party soon after that and within three years back to John Citizen.

Mr Elliott: It won't take him long.

Mr HOBBS: It will not take him long.

Mr Davis: The main reason why you are against this referendum is that you know you will lose pre-selection.

Mr HOBBS: That has nothing to do with it at all. I am talking about representation of the people. The Opposition has no concept of distance at all or what it is like for the people who live out in those areas.

I ask Mr Beard: how can he explain to the people of Cloncurry, Julia Creek, Winton or Longreach—if the referendum goes through—why he was part of getting rid of their local members? I call on Mr Beard to back the people of western Queensland and not run away from them.

Mr Elliott: He started off looking as though he was going to support us. I can't believe he has gone the other way.

Mr HOBBS: Yes, I am dumbfounded by it.

He should not run away or desert the people he represents, but stand up and be counted. He should not take the airy-fairy fence-sitting stance of the hierarchy of the Liberal Party.

Mr Goss stated that he believed in honesty, a fair go and equality. That is very noble, but how would the people in his electorate like to drive to Winton or Townsville in order to see him?

Mr Davis: Is it true that you have got a home unit in Brisbane?

Mr HOBBS: No, it is not true. I do not have a home unit here in Brisbane. Perhaps the honourable member would like to look out for one for me.

I ask Mr Goss: is that a fair go, is that equal, should people have to drive that far, from Winton to Brisbane, in order to see their member? Mr Goss also used Mount Isa as an example of the gerrymandering by this Government. Mount Isa was previously held by the National Party, not the Labor Party or the Liberal Party. I see no relationship with gerrymandering. He is grasping at straws. He went on to say that the people of Winton or Longreach have one and-a-half times the vote of the people in Mount Isa. The electorate of Mount Isa covers an area of 41 000 square kilometres. Compared with the size of other electorates, that is only a horse paddock; it is small.

Gregory is another large electorate. I see the Minister who represents it in the House. With 443 000 square kilometres, it is 10 times larger than the electorate of Mount Isa. Therefore, what the Leader of the Opposition is saying is complete rubbish. My electorate of Warrego is the same size as the State of Victoria. If I put all the council and main roads in a line, they would string all the way along Highway 1 of Australia and I would have enough left over to go for a fair sort of drive.

Mr Davis: You are kidding us.

Mr HOBBS: I am not kidding the honourable member. That is correct. The honourable member would not know. All he needs to travel around his area is a push-bike.

Mr Elliott: He used to go out west once and have a look around and see the problems; but he finds it a lot more comfortable to stay in the city.

Mr HOBBS: I fully understand.

Under the one vote, one value principle that operates in the Federal system——

Mr Davis: Hear, hear!

Mr HOBBS: The member for Brisbane Central says, "Hear, hear!" He is happy to accept the fact that the northern half of Australia has only seven Federal members, that the remainder of Australia is represented by 141 Federal members and that Sydney, Canberra and Melbourne have 82 Federal members. Is he happy that most of the Federal representatives of the people are based in the southern-most portion of Australia? I say to you, Mr Deputy Speaker, that that is most unreasonable, if one expects fair development and the present growth pattern of Australia to continue.

Mr Davis: You are talking geographically. We are not talking about sheep, we are talking about people.

Mr HOBBS: I am talking about people and their right to representation in State and Federal Parliaments.

The Federal system of one vote, one value is entirely immoral. The member for Kennedy, Mr Bob Katter, and the member for Maranoa, Ian Cameron, have to cover absolutely massive areas. How the devil can they cover those vast areas efficiently and take back the views of those people to the Federal House of this nation? Those circumstances are intolerable.

I wish to mention an interview conducted last night on the *7.30 Report*, which was an absolute disgrace. Quentin Dempster had two stooges sitting on one side and two gentlemen debating the role of local government. If ever I have seen one, it was an absolute set-up. It was the most disgusting and biased interview that I have ever seen. When we the tax-payers are funding the Australian Broadcasting Corporation, it is absolutely intolerable that this nation is subjected to that type of disgraceful interview. I call on Quentin Dempster to be more down-the-middle and to put the respective referendum arguments in such a way that the people of Queensland and Australia can judge them fairly. They should not have to put up with the rubbish and hog-wash that was screened last night.

I wish to discuss the recognition of local government. I have been in local government for many years. A great deal was achieved. We were able to keep our program going and run a small shire at a profit. In similar circumstances, all Labor Party people want to do is to try in the long term to amalgamate small shires into super regional authorities. Why do they want to do that? I believe it is because that is the only way they can control the States, which have always been a thorn in the side of the Federal Government. The reason for that is that the States have been too big and too powerful. What happened to Mr Gough Whitlam? It was Queensland that brought him down. He was sailing along merrily and then was brought down by one of the States. Mr Hawke was sailing along

and he hit Tasmania with the Franklin Dam issue. He attempted to do the same thing in Queensland. While he was attempting to beat Queensland into submission, New South Wales slipped out of his grasp. Again, another State has got away from him. Total dominance is not possible unless the States can be controlled.

The people of Australia cannot tolerate much more of the rot that is going on in Canberra at present. Queensland is discriminated against time and time again by the Grants Commission in the areas of health and education.

Recently, honourable members have heard of the problems with tertiary places. The Queensland Government calls on the Federal Government, through the Federal Minister, to provide those extra tertiary places that it has been denying Queenslanders. Members of the Opposition should be batting for Queensland, not for themselves, on this issue.

In conclusion, I support the Governor in his Speech when opening Parliament. I look forward to the implementation of the initiatives that he outlined.

Mr BEANLAND (Toowong) (3.27 p.m.): I have great pleasure in reaffirming my loyalty and that of the constituents of my electorate of Toowong to her Most Gracious Majesty Queen Elizabeth II. I also wish to congratulate her representative His Excellency the Governor, the Honourable Sir Walter Campbell, on the excellent job that he does and the goodwill that he brings to that role. The manner in which Sir Walter performs in the role is something of which all Queenslanders can be proud.

I turn my attention to voluntary student unionism, which is a matter of great concern to the student community of this nation. Universities, after all, are supposed to be among the pillars of free thought in our society. Yet Australian universities violate the most basic aim of human rights—the right to freedom of association. They do that through the machine of compulsory student unionism, which sees every student enrolling for a course at a tertiary institution being forced to join the student union of that campus. Universities are the most comprehensive and rigorously enforced closed shop in this nation: no union membership, no higher education.

Student unions are not the debating societies and the social organisations which characterised the atmosphere of student unions before the 1960s. Today's student unions are highly politicised bodies that are more concerned with advancing the careers of those who control them and pushing ideological causes than with advancing the interests of their membership. The importance of student unions is not to be underestimated. Student unions are rich resource centres for those who control them, and the scope for funding political causes and engaging in non-student activity is considerable.

Student unions perform three functions: firstly, political functions in the form of the student representative council or the union, which also funds campus newspapers and various clubs and societies on campus; secondly, a services function providing retail outlets and sometimes catering facilities; and, thirdly, sports organisations, which provide sporting facilities. In Queensland, enrolment is conditional upon the payment of a fee, currently in the vicinity of \$100 to \$170, which is divided amongst those three functions. For example, at the University of Queensland, currently the students' union fee is \$162, while at the Queensland Institute of Technology the fee is \$100.

Student unions command budgets in proportion to institutions' enrolments, and they vary from hundreds of thousands of dollars to several million dollars. More than \$20m in compulsory student fees goes to student unions in Australia each year, which effectively represents an assault of some \$20m on ordinary students. I would have thought that even the Labor Party would take note of that.

At its inaugural conference in December 1987, one of the first actions of the National Union of Students, which was the successor to the Australian Union of Students, was to devote \$50,000 of student funds to fight the Liberal/National coalition on the New South Wales campuses during that State's 1988 election. The Labor Party thinks that that is pretty good. Of course, sometimes members of the Labor Party get bitten themselves.

The National Union of Students, which was formed in 1987, is not, as it says, a national union of students. It is not a national union at all. It has no members on campuses in Western Australia, the two largest campuses in Queensland—the University of Queensland and the Queensland Institute of Technology—the Australian National University, the Sydney University or the New South Wales University.

The NUS derives its funds from a compulsory affiliation fee on all students at its member campuses—something of which the Labor Party would, of course, be very much aware. This increases each individual member's fees. Cases in point are the Griffith University, the Brisbane College of Advanced Education and the James Cook University, which are all member campuses of the National Union of Students.

The National Union of Students does not represent students' interests. For example, it spends more than 87 per cent of its multimillion-dollar annual budget on its own administration and less than 4 per cent on education issues such as the graduate tax. Members of the executive have made trips to Cuba, Rome, London and so on from National Union of Students funds. They regularly fly all over Australia.

When individual campus unions form State-based and national organisations, such as the Australian Union of Students, they become truly formidable. In its heyday in about 1976, the now defunct AUS—the Australian Union of Students—had 90 per cent of Australian tertiary student unions as members and a budget of some \$1.7m, in 1987 terms, the expenditure of which was divided between its own weighty bureaucracy and political propaganda.

I turn briefly to the Queensland scene. I will cite a few examples of the waste of union funds that occurs in this State. The University of Queensland Union has an annual budget of about \$1.5m, while the Queensland Institute of Technology has a budget of more than \$600,000, not to mention the other tertiary institutions in Queensland. These huge sums are controlled by untrained, inexperienced and often unrepresentative students with little accountability or efficiency.

The University of Queensland Union runs the main university refectory, which is a good example. It makes an annual loss of around \$250,000, despite charging average prices and almost having a monopoly out at the University of Queensland. Secondly, in 1987 the University of Queensland Union provisionally affiliated with the National Union of Students and paid for eight delegates to fly to Melbourne for the formation conference. Not only is that extravagant but also union policy states that all such travel will be by train. It was just a mere detail, obviously; why take a train when one can fly?

Thirdly, the University of Queensland Union has an environment officer who is provided with an office and an annual budget of \$6,000. The officer and other members of a loose, unofficial, ad hoc committee have persistently abused this allocation, using it for photocopying, an account for business of the Resistance Club—which, by the way, is a socialist workers' party—and hiring a bus to take Aborigines to an Invasion 88 conference. What has that got to do with the betterment of students at the university?

Fourthly, in May 1987 the university union president travelled, while not on holidays, to Bangkok to attend the Masters of Community Nutrition course. The 1987 executive authorised money for congratulation cards for the graduates of the course—another wonderful waste!

Fifthly, in other unjustifiable waste, one can look at recent events. The University of Queensland Union employed a full-time librarian to look after the women's right library, which has about 100 books yet still requires a full-time librarian. In 1987 an additional \$4,000 was spent on sexuality in human relationship workshops. Clearly, there are many areas of waste.

At the Queensland Institute of Technology Union, one can see further examples of waste. Firstly, in 1988 the union allocated \$5,000 to public radio 4ZZZ, payable in instalments. When 4ZZZ refused to advertise a ball organised by the Articled Clerks Society, which is affiliated with the QIT Union—4ZZZ refused to advertise that ball

only because it was a bicentennial event—in May, a motion was put to the QIT Union council that the remaining funds that were to be paid to 4ZZZ in 1988 be distributed among QIT Union's affiliated clubs and societies. The motion was lost and the then QIT director of student services, to whose department the funds would have gone, had to write to all the clubs for which she was responsible explaining why she had voted against the motion. She said, "After all, the money for 4ZZZ was to support a community radio station." Never mind about the student union clubs and societies directly affiliated with the QIT Union! What about supporting QIT Union members and students instead of all those external organisations that the union seems to be hell-bent on supporting?

I refer now to another example of waste. In February 1988, a paid union employee, Mr Paul Downey, was sacked by the QIT Union president for alleged gross incompetence. Under an employment contract, if sacked he was entitled to \$1,400. He was actually paid by the union just under \$5,000. The QIT Union president justified this by saying that, if that person had remained, it would have cost more and that therefore money was saved by paying \$3,000-odd over and above the amount that the union was contracted to pay. Mr Downey signed an agreement with the union. I might read a part of it to honourable members because it says a lot about the QIT students union. It states—

"I, Paul Downey, in return for the sum of \$4,000 plus my entitled sick and outstanding holiday pay, due immediately in cash, in lieu of notice AND the waiver by Q.I.T.U. of all rights against me arising out of my period of employment with them, in addition to a full and satisfactory employment reference.

Agree to:

1. Submit my resignation from the position of Executive Assistant of the Q.I.T. Union.
2. Forgo any other contractual right of appeal to Council on any question of termination of employment.
3. Waive any other contractual rights I may have against Q.I.T.U. arising prior to the date of this agreement.
4. Waive my right of appeal to the Conciliation and Arbitration Commission in regard to the termination of my employment."

I notice that there is a great deal of silence from members of the ALP when I raise that matter. The agreement further states—

"5. Waive any method of redress against Q.I.T.U. available through the Federated Clerks' Union or any other Union organisation."

That is extraordinary, especially in the case of an employee who resigns.

The union president then tried to give union executive officer Bruce Dickson a pay rise from \$28,000 to \$40,000 per year. It was done in a very clever way by hiding the figure in the 1988 union budget as an executive officer's salary of \$40,000. In 1987 a similar figure covered two salaries, namely, those of Mr Downey and Mr Dickson, whereas the 1988 figure covered only Mr Dickson's salary. That is an extraordinary situation.

I turn now to the elected students. The president is paid \$14,000 plus \$850 expenses. Five other directors are each paid \$8,570 plus expenses for a 20-hour week, which is not bad going, considering that they are elected students from the QIT. Over the past few years the chairman of the union council, who is not a student, has been paid \$1,000 per year for chairing 10 monthly union meetings. In late 1986 the then QIT Union president was defeated at the annual elections. Some of her colleagues spent \$50,000 of union funds on items such as video machines, television sets and other goods that are not used by ordinary students. I might add that that money was spent after they lost the election and before the newly elected officials took office.

Between September and November 1986, the theft of more than \$2,000 in goods from the QIT campus club was not disclosed until the auditor's report was tendered in

April 1987. Union members were not allowed to take copies of that report from the union meeting room, and the theft was never investigated by the union.

I turn now to the editors of the QIT Union newspaper, who are elected from the union council rather than by all union members. In 1986 and 1987 union councillors were elected to those positions. In fact, they voted for themselves. They voted themselves into the job. Had they abstained from voting, they would not have won.

Mr Davis interjected.

Mr BEANLAND: The honourable member for Brisbane Central knows all about winning. As the Prince Consort, he found out all about that earlier in the year.

It is clear that there are many other areas of concern and waste at the QIT. A referendum of QIT Union members in 1987 failed to affiliate the union with the Queensland Union of Students. In late 1987 the QUS became a State branch of the National Union of Students. A QIT Union meeting in December approved a provisional affiliation with the NUS, which cost \$3,491. That affiliation lapsed on 1 June 1988, and will remain so unless another referendum is held. That has not happened. The whole exercise was carried out without consulting the union membership. Once the referendum was lost, the council went ahead with the affiliation on a temporary basis.

Last December several QIT delegates attended an NUS meeting in Melbourne. Once again the union paid the return air fares from Melbourne because the bus trip to Melbourne was too exhausting. Most of the delegates returned by bus, as they should have, but a number of them returned by air.

In May 1988, after the union's affiliation had lapsed, the QIT Union president paid some \$250 towards an anti-graduate-tax advertisement, even though the union had no policy whatsoever on graduate tax. The saga continues. Part of the saga involves the QIT Union's owning a Toyota Tarago, which was bought in 1985 for some \$10,400. It was bought for very dubious uses. In fact, it was driven all around the city on the pretence of deliveries, when it was quite clear that those deliveries could have been carried out for a mere fraction of its purchase price by using hire services, courier services, rentals and so on. That could have been done instead of the union's acquiring a \$10,400 vehicle.

I understand that the union owns a stack of video equipment. Again, the students have never seen that. It is all unnecessary expenditure. In 1987 the union shop itself showed a loss of some \$13,644.

Another great example of union waste and extravagance is that in 1988 three editors of the union's newspaper are each paid \$164.80 per week. Similar wages are paid to the editors of *Semper* at the University of Queensland, but *Semper* has double the potential readership.

I will now deal with point 14. In 1988 the union paid some \$1,875 in tree tax. The union's explanation for this is that it was paid to compensate the conservation groups for the trees cut down to make newspapers. The union is concerned about all the trees that have been cut down, so it decided to pay a tree tax.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr BEANLAND: Could I just say to the ever-eager Labor members that, if they wait, all will unfold before them; all will be told to them. They are getting very agitated all round the Chamber.

Mr Palaszczuk: When is your private member's Bill coming in?

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Row): Order! The member for Archerfield!

Mr BEANLAND: Point 15 of the waste by the QIT Union relates to its education department. The union's education department produces an alternative handbook outlining to students opinions on selected subjects. That handbook costs some \$12,000. In

theory that might sound good, but it is released in May. It is great having it come out in May. Students must select the subjects for their first semester by February. What is the use of the documents being produced in May at a cost of \$12,000? It includes subjects and courses in which every subject must be passed, for example, law. Students have no choice but to take a subject whether they like the previous year's review of it or not.

I now turn to the Griffith University. It is similar to the QIT. Last May the Griffith Union paid some \$245 by way of a tree fund because obviously it considered that it used fewer trees and a lot less paper than the QIT Union used. Secondly, in May it spent \$100 to fund a bus going to protest at the Mount Etna caves. That might be acceptable for community groups and various conservation groups, but it is hardly the sort of thing that students' union funds should be spent on.

Next, of course, is the famous case of Mr Hansen, a student who was prosecuted by the police for kicking in the glass door of the vice-chancellor's office during anti-fees demonstrations last year. I am sure all members remember it. He was fined \$200. However, the union paid the fine because it considered the legal action was an attack on the Griffith students' union.

It can be argued that the students' unions provide valuable and necessary services for students, for example, legal services which cost some \$100,000 a year. However, being forced to join an organisation is a violation of one of the most fundamental of human rights—freedom of association. Australia is a signatory to three international agreements which specifically outlaw the practice of compulsory unionism in terms of positive international law. Article 20 of the United Nations Universal Declaration on Human Rights states that no-one may be compelled to belong to an association. That specific statement is one of the basic rights proclaimed by the United Nations.

UN Resolution 217 (iii) of 10 December 1948 states—

“Every individual and every organ of society shall strive . . . to secure their universal and effective recognition and observance.”

I mention that for the benefit of Labor members who are present, because I know how keen they are on United Nations treaties and agreements. One only has to look at the way they use the international treaties and the Federal Constitution in relation to World Heritage listing matters.

Mr Lickiss: They exploit them and abuse those powers.

Mr BEANLAND: They certainly exploit them to the fullest and abuse the people of this State and the nation. Of course, when their actions are thrown back at them, they do not like it.

Australia is also signatory to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the International Labor Organisation convention concerning freedom of association and protection of the right to organise. These conventions also specifically outlaw the practice of compulsory unionism. The end to a system of compulsory student unionism would be popular with students as well as the overall voting population. The students resent having to pay such a large sum of money for such a minimal return. They resent also providing funds for such outrageous activities.

Over the next few weeks, petitions will be taken up on campuses throughout this State objecting to compulsory student unionism and calling on the Government to implement voluntary student unionism. The community as a whole would support the Government if it were to take a strong stand on this issue. No rational person could condone the unjustifiable practices that compulsory student unionism allows. The introduction of voluntary student unionism would be unpopular with a few vocal, self-serving minority groups, and some have already been mentioned. They are the ones with most to gain from the exploitation of students, along with several comrades from various extremist groups who would loudly protest against such a move because it would spell the end of their free meal ticket and power base.

It is said by many people that the Queensland Government has no jurisdiction to legislate with respect to student unionism. The undertaking given to the Whitlam Government by State Governments in 1973 stated in part that student representative council and union sports fees could be collected on the understanding that institutions would make the payment of these fees compulsory for all students. However, that undertaking is in no way binding on the relevant State Government today. Since 1973, that fact has been highlighted by various Federal Governments when they have indicated over and over again that the matter is within the State's jurisdiction. That position was made very plain in 1979 when it was indicated that universities are State institutions and that a State authority has the power to determine whether non-academic amenities and facilities should be supported from compulsory contributions, or in some other way. It is clear that the State Government has jurisdiction. I mentioned that fact because the Minister for Education is present. So often the State Government says, "Whoa, it has nothing to do with us." The State Government has a clear mandate to pass the necessary legislation.

I am not advocating the abolition of student unions, but I am proposing that if a choice is available and if students believe they will benefit by becoming members, they will be prepared to join; otherwise, they can and will refrain. I know that freedom of choice is something that is foreign to members of the Labor Party.

The legislation will not stop student services. It will, however, divert funds from an inefficient and wasteful organisation to the students, who will be able to put the money to their own benefit. Student unions will be forced to improve their act and offer students a service that is necessary and cost effective in order to encourage student participation, which would be of far more benefit to tertiary students in Queensland.

Student unions will try to say that this is an attack on students; but how can the giving of choice or benefit be an attack? If student unions are as beneficial and as necessary for students as they claim they are, then I present this challenge: they have nothing to fear and nothing to worry about. Let us drop compulsory student unionism and allow students freedom of choice.

If students realise what the benefits are, they will have no hesitation in joining the union. However, if they feel that the unions have little worth—and I believe many of them feel this way at the present time—tertiary students, in their wisdom, will not join, because many of them will realise the incredible rorts that student unions have been involved in in recent times. Students will applaud a democratic and far-sighted Government that gives them this choice. I appeal to the Minister and challenge the State Government to do just that. There is nothing inherently wrong with students organising to provide for political representation and services; however, student unions become objectionable when based on compulsory membership and fees.

In conclusion—because of the forthcoming State Budget, this House has heard a great deal about tobacco taxes and talk of increased taxation. There has been no attempt by, or talk or input from, the Government as to where it might cut out waste and improve efficiency within Government services. There has been no mention at all in the media, in the press, on television or anywhere else, about cutting down Government waste and improving efficiency. The Liberal Party is waiting to see what the State Government will do. It is not good enough to simply bring forward a tobacco tax and increase other taxes. I challenge the State Government to look at ways of cutting waste and inefficiency within the Government. The Liberal Party has achieved this in New South Wales and in city hall, and the Liberal Party is cutting waste throughout the nation.

Time expired.

Mr SHERRIN (Mansfield) (3.57 p.m.): It is interesting to see the Liberal Party leading from the front again. I have picked up some of the interjections which have been made about what the Liberal Party has done in New South Wales. In that State the Liberal Party has sponsored the largest non-Vietnam-associated public demonstration

since the 1960s against its education policies. Two weeks ago 50 000 people were witnessed demonstrating outside the New South Wales Parliament in response to the education policies sponsored by the New South Wales Liberal Party Government. The Liberal Party in Queensland is pontificating consistently—as it is wont to do—about the need to consult widely with different groups within the community.

As can be seen in New South Wales, when the Liberal Party gets into Government it does not practise what it preaches here in Queensland. It storms ahead, bulldozing over all of the interest groups in education in New South Wales. To hell with what the teachers, parents or students want! The Liberal Party knows what is right. The Liberal Party in Queensland has had a born-to-rule mentality for a long time. When the Liberal Party is in opposition, it makes all the grandiose statements in the world; but when it is actually elected to govern and is given the opportunity to deliver the goods, it does totally the opposite.

That warning must be given to the people of Queensland. They must not listen to what the Liberals say in opposition, but should look at what happens when the Liberal Party is put in a position to be able to deliver the goods in government. Queenslanders should look at what the Liberal Party is doing in New South Wales and look at the policies that it has put in place in that State. The Liberal Party spokesman on Education in this House has talked about reducing class sizes and things of that nature, but in New South Wales the Liberal Party is putting off over 2 000 teachers. When the Liberal Party is in Government with ability to deliver the goods, it is a case of, "Do as I say; do not do as I do."

Mr Davis: Look at the way they are working at the forthcoming referendum.

Mr SHERRIN: Which policy is the honourable member talking about?

Mr Davis interjected.

Mr SHERRIN: There are a number of policies. I will take up this point now because I was going to touch on it later.

There is the Federal Liberal Party policy based on an agreement made with the Queensland Government; there is the Angus Innes policy; there is the Peter Beard policy; and there is the Sallyanne Liberal policy. There is a choice of four Liberal policies on the referendum.

Mr Clauson: That's the "Salaryanne for Canberra" policy.

Mr SHERRIN: Indeed it is. There is a choice. It is the party for all seasons.

Mr Muntz: It is no good having a policy if you can't count.

Mr SHERRIN: That is it.

It is not the first occasion. We saw the Liberals do the same thing in Redlands. I am sure Mr Clauson would be well aware of that. The Liberals claimed victory well in advance. They are prima donnas who are just out to grab the headlines. The same thing happened with my colleague Mr Veivers in Southport. They were totally consistent; they did the same thing after the South Coast by-election. They got three out of three. They were wrong every time. How on earth could they be entrusted with the government of this State? They cannot deliver the goods.

Mr Schuntner: Are you going to follow our lead and call for more tertiary places to be provided by the State Government?

Mr SHERRIN: I am glad the member raised that, as I was coming to it. I will give the member the right context there.

In response to the Governor's Speech, I once again declare my personal allegiance, and that of my constituents, to Her Majesty the Queen and her representative, His Excellency the Governor of Queensland.

I wish to touch on two points, the first of which was raised by my colleague who just interjected, that is, the issue of tertiary funding, which has continued to be a focus of attention for the Queensland Government since the Commonwealth Government assumed full responsibility for the funding of higher education in 1973. It has not been just a recent interest, as has been displayed by the Liberal Party over the last 12 months. Members of the Liberal Party have seen that some cheap political gain can be made on this subject. During the last State election campaign the Liberal Party quite falsely gave the impression that the Queensland Government had some responsibility to provide the required funding.

All honourable members know that it is the responsibility of the Commonwealth Government, which has assumed full responsibility for tertiary funding. This has been of continual interest and a focus of the Government's attention since 1973, not like the johnny-come-latelies on the education scene, the members of the Liberal Party, who suddenly took an interest towards the end of 1986 and in 1987. The Government's interest has been particularly accentuated by the lack of tertiary education places available in Queensland compared with those in other Australian States.

In February this year State Cabinet approved the establishment by my colleague the Honourable the Minister for Education, Youth and Sport, Brian Littleproud, of a committee to inquire into the funding of additional higher education places in Queensland's universities and colleges. I was privileged to be asked to chair the committee. In brief, the terms of reference were to seek advice to the Government in the areas of quantifying the demand for higher education places, the extent of underfunding by the Commonwealth, the capacity of existing and alternative higher education structures to ensure efficient and effective allocation of additional places—that is a particular point I wish to touch on later—the admission criteria, the distribution of resources, the potential for leverage effects for any State-funded places and potential sources of additional revenue.

Mr Davis: You are on the way up, aren't you?

Mr SHERRIN: I do not know. Just 12 months ago the honourable member for Brisbane Central was on the way up.

The committee has met on eight occasions and it is anticipated that the report will provide the basis for future ongoing discussions between the State and Commonwealth Governments over the months to come.

Before I outline some of the deliberations of the committee, it may be helpful if I put the committee's efforts into the wider context of a number of reviews that are occurring within the Queensland Government. Honourable members are no doubt aware that earlier this year the State Government commissioned the Stanford Research Institute to prepare, in collaboration with the Premier's Department, an economic development strategy for Queensland towards the twenty-first century. This work is now coming towards completion and will form the basis for many decisions to be made within the context of the State's economic planning and Budget preparation over the next two years.

In addition to that review, an interdepartmental committee has been operating under the responsibility of the Minister for Employment, Training and Industrial Affairs, Vince Lester, to provide a detailed examination of the variable factors associated with employment and, consequently, unemployment within this State, with particular emphasis being given to the problem of youth unemployment, an interest that I think would certainly exercise the minds of all honourable members. That committee's review was presented to Cabinet within the last few weeks.

I understand that Cabinet, and in particular the Cabinet Budget Committee, are awaiting receipt of the three reports, which overlap in a number of key areas, to provide the framework for a number of key Cabinet Budget decisions over the next two years.

I shall now return to the substance of our committee's report. The major issue addressed, one with which members are undoubtedly familiar, is the very low proportion of funding of student places that the Commonwealth has provided for Queensland since it assumed full responsibility for tertiary education in 1973.

I am interested to see—and it should be noted in *Hansard*—that the Liberal Party's interest in this very grave problem for our students is to the extent that not one of its members is now present in the Chamber. It is also interesting to note for *Hansard* that Queensland suffered the gravest shortfall when the Liberal Prime Minister, Malcolm Fraser, was in power in Canberra. It is a problem that the Labor Party in the last two or three years has begun to address, to such an extent that last year, out of the 3 750 extra places given Australiawide, the Federal Government provided Queensland with 22 per cent, a point that some of the Labor Party people from time to time bring to our notice. Such is the extent and the interest of the Liberal Party in this very grave problem for our young people.

In each of the two areas of high education—university education and advanced education—since 1973 Queensland has received a disproportionately low share of the Commonwealth's funding. The underallocation of Commonwealth financial resources has seen the participation rate of our 15 to 29-year-old population in university education fall from the highest in 1971 to the lowest in 1983, 1984 and 1985, and the second-lowest in 1986 and 1987.

Although the advanced education participation rate in Queensland has moved a little closer to the Australian average, the overall higher participation rate remains well below the Australian average. If Queensland were to receive its entitlement based on the proportion of the Australian population, our colleges and universities would gain an additional \$30m. In other words, an extra 4 000 Queenslanders would have been able to undertake higher-education studies in 1987.

The committee has highlighted the critical nature of the current underfunding and that Queensland has experienced sustained growth in its population, particularly from migration. That is a point that is missed in the context. Many people will argue that it has been a political persecution in Queensland. My argument is not necessarily along the political line.

Queensland has undergone sustained migration growth from the other States. Over the years, the money has not followed the people as they have moved up from the southern States into Queensland. As parliamentarians are all aware, one of the easiest things is to provide an extra benefit for people; one of the most difficult is to actually withdraw the benefit. As the population in the southern States has fallen relative to Queensland's rapidly increasing population, the funding has not followed as the people moved to Queensland. In the last two months, interstate migration to Queensland has reached the level of seven years ago, so there are now in excess of 2 000 people a month moving from the southern States into Queensland.

Mr Palaszczuk: Mainly pensioners.

Mr SHERRIN: Not all pensioners; not by a long shot. Many of them are family people bringing their children to Queensland.

Those people are coming to Queensland, but the tertiary funding received by New South Wales and Victoria for them has not followed.

Congruently with that, we have witnessed tremendous increases in our retention rates in high schools. I believe that is a tribute to the curriculum reforms that we have seen through Radford and also through ROSBA, which have broadened the curriculum offerings and encouraged our students to stay on in high school. Queensland's high school retention rates are now the highest in the nation. On a per capita basis, more Queensland young people are staying through to see a full 12 years' education in our schools and expecting with a fair degree of certainty that there should be some tertiary

place available for them when they leave Year 12. Those two factors have worsened an already chronic shortage in Queensland, which has now reached critical proportions.

The committee was of the view that Queensland's higher-education participation rate will fall even further behind the national average unless enrolment places are increased immediately to allow a primary target of a further 4 000 students to enrol, and consequently increase the State's enrolment base on which further enrolment increases will be based in the following years. Our discussions focused on two immediate consequences of this continuing crisis in our State's higher-education institutions. One is obviously the wastage of extremely valuable human resources and the social consequences associated with that. To put it bluntly, many Queensland students are discriminated against because of their birthplace. If they were fortunate enough to live in Victoria or Tasmania, to name two States, their secondary results would allow them entry into many tertiary education courses. Because of the underfunding of Queensland's higher-education institutions, however, they are unable to undertake tertiary studies. The tragedy of all this is that many, if not all, of the 4 000 students who are unable to gain entry have the intellectual capacity to successfully complete tertiary education courses. We have identified those students. I am not talking about students who do not have the capacity to go through missing out; I am talking about 4 000 students who have the intellectual capacity and the motivation to complete three years' study in our tertiary colleges.

The second issue is that the State has an immediate need for an expanded and educated work-force to meet the emerging demand of Queensland's graduates in business, commerce, management, tourism, engineering, science, computing and developing technologies. It also needs to redress the imbalance that has existed since 1973 and which I believe, on a personal note, may well have inhibited some of this State's economic growth.

In essence, the main aim of the committee is to explore alternative ways of providing and funding higher-education places. Of course, the committee's discussions are occurring within the ever-changing context of the Commonwealth's Green Papers and White Papers on higher-education reform.

The committee has noted the State's preferred position in relation to the proposals contained in the Commonwealth's Green Paper and has endeavoured to couch its range of options to the Government for delivering the additional higher-education places within the context of the State's preferred position.

The committee views most favourably the current program wherein higher-education courses are offered through existing regional TAFE facilities, study centres or remote campuses such as that operating at the Gladstone campus of the Capricornia Institute of Advanced Education. It is the view of the committee that this scheme makes higher-education places available in close proximity to the home environment of students, thereby considerably reducing the costs incurred by students and their parents whilst also meeting the needs of other disadvantaged groups in the community.

An additional benefit has been identified in the committee's discussions in that the members of the committee are of the opinion that sufficient spare capacity exists in the off-campus program for a relatively rapid increase in student places to be catered for.

The committee's attention was drawn to the fact that TAFE has an extensive network of 29 colleges scattered throughout the State, 17 of which are located in country areas. The TAFE system was seen to be well placed to assist in the immediate and rapid increase in higher-education places. The members of the committee believe that by upgrading and expanding TAFE facilities it is possible to offer a greater range of tertiary programs in a number of centres spread widely throughout the State. This delivery method also concurs with the Commonwealth's own high priority, the committee notes, for the promotion of cross-sector arrangements between TAFE and universities in relation to course-provision and the use of buildings and equipment.

In a similar manner, the extensive system of TAFE colleges throughout the State allows for the presentation of a further strategy for the expansion of higher-education participation. The growth of the associate diploma level programs and the inclusion of these courses with degree programs for accreditation purposes has led to a range of proposals to allow for the articulation of programs of study from the associate diploma level to the second year of study of selected degree award courses. I commend this articulation program to honourable members.

Agreement in principle has been reached between TAFE and the QIT for students completing associate diploma courses in TAFE to be credited with up to one year's study towards selected degree programs at QIT. The committee strongly commends this. In addition, credit arrangements for TAFE associate diplomas have been negotiated with Griffith University.

An expansion of student places in the associate diploma courses and subsequent transfer into the existing degree programs would have significant appeal for a range of social and economic reasons. Firstly, as with cross-sectoral initiatives in regional areas, it would facilitate young people undertaking a significant part of their tertiary education in close proximity to their home environment, thereby reducing the cost to students of study away from home, and also increasing the likelihood that students would return to work in their home regions. I am sure that many honourable members representing country areas are well aware of the drain associated with students undertaking study away from home and the tremendous problem of having those students trying to return to their local community once they have been away from home for three years undertaking study.

Secondly, the recurrent funding provided for TAFE associate diploma courses is lower than that provided for related programs in higher-education institutions. In other words, it would be cheaper for them to undertake their higher-education studies partially in TAFE.

Thirdly, TAFE has demonstrated a capacity to facilitate rapid expansion in this level of course-provision, given adequate physical and financial resources. Fourthly, associate diploma level courses are gaining widespread recognition throughout the general community, and those students who choose not to articulate through into further study would be in receipt of a qualification that would be readily acceptable to a wide range of employers.

Fifthly, only successful students would carry on to further study at higher-education institutions, that is, only those students who have already proved their capacity for tertiary study would move on to the higher cost and sometimes specialised areas of study.

It is interesting to note some of the reviews that are taking place throughout the higher-education institutions in this country. Committees have noted the inability of any selection procedures, particularly those acting on students' finishing secondary education, to predict with any great degree of success the capacity for undertaking further higher-education study. It has come to my notice that the only accurate way of predicting whether a student can successfully undertake further study is his success at previous tertiary study. That is common sense, but it is amazing how few people actually understand that point.

Finally, under this strategy consideration would have to be given to expanding student places at the second and third year levels in our higher-education institutions. The committee also canvassed a number of other delivery methods, such as increased use of technology and video loan schemes, to provide additional places throughout this State.

In the area of funding—in other words, who is going to be responsible for paying the quantum increase to close the gap in places—the committee indentified a number of sources of funding and has identified five of them: obviously, the Commonwealth

Government, which has prime responsibility in this area; the possibility of some State involvement; private enterprise; students; and, finally, the institutions themselves.

I note with some happiness the Commonwealth Government's commitment in its recent Budget to increasing the number of higher-education places throughout Australia by 40 000 over the next three years. I am very pleased to note that the report that our committee prepared has formed the basis of ongoing ministerial and ongoing officer discussions between the Queensland Government and the Commonwealth Government with a view to using some of those 40 000 places to redress the imbalance in the shortfall of places. If for no other reason, the committee's work has been well utilised if this report provides a substantive statistical basis upon which the State Government can successfully argue its case for additional tertiary education places.

However, the committee has noted that significant funds from the Commonwealth will be limited until at least 1992. Consequently, in the unlikely event of the Commonwealth Government's giving great priority in the short term to higher education in its Budget, it is unrealistic to expect that the quantum of funds necessary for Queensland in the short term will be enough to redress the backlog of student places over the next two to three years. The members of the committee believe that the possibility exists for private enterprise to participate in the funding of additional places. The committee's attention has been drawn to a joint proposal initiated by the Victorian Government in conjunction with the business sector. It is known as the Victorian Education Foundation, and it has the following broad objectives: firstly, to increase the number of courses for students; secondly, where appropriate, to increase the quality of such courses; and, thirdly, to contribute to the export of educational services. I emphasise that third objective. We believe that the potential exists in the south-east Asian basin for Australian educational institutions, which have a reputation of world standard, to market a number of highly competitive income-earning courses throughout south-east Asia. That income could be used by the institutions to provide more places for Queensland and Australian students. We believe that this is not an activity that should be undertaken solely by the institutions themselves, because the courses should be promoted on a Statewide basis. One of the functions of a Queensland education foundation would be to assist the institutions to promote their courses throughout south-east Asia.

I also note that a few years ago the World Bank provided well over \$1 billion to underdeveloped nations in south-east Asia to help promote higher-education and technical-education courses. Queensland has the runs on the board to enter the market and to compete successfully for funds of such magnitude.

The involvement of the Victorian Government in the Victorian Education Foundation is on the basis of joint dollar-for-dollar funding for additional courses or places that are additional to the existing Commonwealth programs. The committee has noted that the operation of such a foundation has the possibility of impacting on the long-term problem of the shortfall of funding in higher-education places. Based on the Victorian experiences, the committee does not believe that the foundation addresses the short-term problem.

There is no doubt that Queensland is a magnificent State in which to live and raise a family. I am sure that all honourable members will agree with that sentiment. It gives me great personal pleasure to have spoken to the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply.

Mr SMYTH (Bowen) (4.20 p.m.): In rising to speak to the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply, I concur with the remarks of my parliamentary colleague Mr Sherrin in relation to the attitude of the Liberal Party in this State and nation towards the general public and the voting public. Liberal Party members claim that they are born to rule.

For almost his entire speech Mr Beanland put down the student unions in this State and the good work that they do. He referred to their misuse of funds and the compulsion which applies. The conservatives in Australia continually try to use scare tactics about unions. To them, the word "union" means something that is not welcome

in Australia. During the past 15 years some cattlemen have refused to go along with the United Graziers Association. They formed their own union. Although they are a very conservative group, they do a good job for the cattle industry in this State. They are very progressive, and I am sure that in the future they will become the dominating body that will represent the cattle-graziers.

As to unions in general—the group opposing them is the Confederation of Industry Limited, which represents people such as Mr Beanland. To become a member of that particular confederation one must pay a compulsory fee. The Confederation of Industry Limited continually tries to bring down the wages and living standards of working people in this State. Over the years, under conservative Governments, the confederation has managed to do that. Of all Australian workers, Queensland workers receive the least amount of money in their pay-packets for no reason other than that they live in Queensland.

People have to pay union dues if they wish to belong to a union. They need to be able to contribute to an organisation that protects their interests. There is no difference between a union donating money to a political party and the Confederation of Industry or any industry donating money to a political party.

Mr Wells: Or a Government.

Mr SMYTH: True. I thank the honourable member for that comment.

The Liberal and National Parties continually claim that union members should not give their few dollars to political parties. However, members of the public invest on the stock-market in companies that plough part of their profits back into conservative Governments or political parties.

The union movement is required to go through the arbitration system in order to gain increases in wages and conditions. It has already been mentioned that Sallyanne Atkinson, the Mayor of this city, did not have to go through the arbitration system to obtain her pay increase; it was done at the stroke of a pen.

Mr Davis: That's why she won't be Prime Minister, because she can't afford it.

Mr SMYTH: I thank the honourable member for that comment.

Both in this House and in the media members of the Liberal Party claim that they will win Government at the next election. Anybody who can count—I am sure that most people in this place can—would know that, to govern in its own right, the Liberal Party needs to win 35 seats. Honourable members have heard Liberal Party speakers in this debate. They have been pandering to the National Party in the hope that if the National Party does not win enough seats to govern in its own right after the next election, the Liberal Party will get into bed with it and make sure that it is part of the Government.

Mr Davis: They couldn't even win the South Coast by-election.

Mr SMYTH: I thank the honourable member for Brisbane Central. The Liberal Party could not even win the South Coast by-election.

Sir William Knox: The Labor Party gave its preferences to the National Party.

Mr SMYTH: I will take the interjection. Mr Knox is saying that the Labor Party gives its preferences to the National Party. In that by-election the Labor Party did what its policy stipulates: it gave optional preferences. People could choose one or the other. The people preferred the National Party rather the Liberal Party. They know exactly where the Liberal Party lies; it keeps turning around and voting with the National Party on every single issue.

Mr Clauson: They've only voted with us 30 per cent of the time.

Mr SMYTH: Only 30 per cent of the time?

Mr Clauson: The rest of the time they stick with you fellows. They've been pretty loyal.

Mr SMYTH: I would have to check those figures out.

Mr Howard Hobbs from Charleville spoke about the referendum question in relation to the one vote, one value. He said that it takes eight hours for him to go from one end of his electorate to the other. The seat of Cook is represented by a Labor member, Mr Scott, and he never complains about the distance that he travels throughout his electorate. I suggest to Mr Hobbs that if he cannot handle his electorate, he should hand it over to a Labor member.

Sir William Knox: He spends most of this time in Brisbane; he doesn't travel anywhere.

Mr SMYTH: Mr Hobbs does?

Mr Clauson: At least he's not attending fashion parades like your leader does.

Sir William Knox: I am talking about the member for Cook.

Mr SMYTH: No, you were talking about the member for Warrego.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Row): Order! The honourable member will address the Chair.

Mr SMYTH: The Governor's Speech contains monetary figures. I am not casting any aspersions on the Governor, because he has merely stipulated the particular figures that have been supplied to him by the National Party Government, but most, if not all, of the amounts contained in his Speech are funded by the Federal Government, either by half or by a large percentage. The way in which the Governor's Speech is written implies that the State Government is providing all of those funds. If the Government wants to be honest, trustworthy and open, as stipulated yesterday by Mrs Nelson, it should make sure that if figures are to be quoted the people of Queensland should have an idea exactly where the money is coming from. In this House, when answering questions about Federal Government funding to the State, National Party Ministers reply that the Federal Government is falling back on its responsibilities.

The increasing neglect shown by the Ahern National Party Government in public hospital funding can be seen in my electorate of Bowen. People have suffered from the lack of essential health services and staff cut-backs. The local community has been without the services of a social worker since the position became vacant in July 1987.

Mr Clauson: You haven't got a social disease, have you?

Mr SMYTH: I think that interjection is uncalled for, Mr Deputy Speaker. But it is typical of a Government Minister. I do not think that anybody in a Government with responsibility should be making such statements against the Queensland people.

Mr Prest: He has been to Hong Kong. He should know about it.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I warn every member in the Chamber that risque remarks can lead to action by the Chair.

Mr Palaszczuk: He looks a bit worried.

Mr SMYTH: Yes, he does.

It is a disgrace that the community has been without that service for over 12 months. The Minister for Health, Mrs Harvey, has stated that the position will be filled on a priority basis. I have asked her what priority she places on multiplying social problems through neglecting to provide services.

To explain how the situation arose, I refer to what Mr Hobbs was saying earlier. The social worker was expected to cover towns such as Proserpine, Bowen, Collinsville

and Scottville, which would necessitate a four-hour round trip approximately. The social worker was excellent in carrying out her job. However, because of the problems in the area associated with low incomes, industries in the area not extending to 12 months' operation and the high incidence of people relying on social security benefits, she found the job too demanding. The social worker found that she could not carry out the duties of her position and she retired. The Health Minister is now saying that the position will be filled on priority.

I point out that there are 500 vacant positions in the health system in Queensland. It appears that the only positions that are being filled are those that are funded by the Federal Government, yet members of this State Government continually stand in the Parliament and say that the Federal Government is not acting responsibly.

Mr Newton: Over the years, there has been underfunding, though.

Mr SMYTH: Every State in Australia receives the same funding. However, the Queensland Government claims that the Federal Government does not support Queensland's free hospital system, and it uses that as an excuse for falling down on its responsibilities. In fact, the fault lies with the State Government, because positions that should be filled are not being filled.

People in country areas are concerned about further suffering caused by cut-backs in health services. A relieving doctor is stationed at Bowen Hospital, and I am sure that relieving medical staff service many other areas of the State, not just Labor electorates. Surveys carried out by the Labor Party indicate that the electorate of South Coast—a National Party electorate—received health services far below the standard provided in other areas of Queensland. The doctor stationed in Bowen is expected to relieve medical staff in Collinsville, and I have been recently informed by the Minister for Health that that doctor will also carry out relieving duties in the hospital at Proserpine, which will result in a further scaling-down of the system. The permanent medical officer at the Bowen Hospital is expected to work for three weeks without a break. However, I am sure that the staff of that hospital and the staff at hospitals in Proserpine and Collinsville will not allow anyone to be turned away, because they are devoted to their work. The State Government plays on the devotion of workers who carry out their duties far beyond the expectation that applies in other areas. I think that Mrs Harvey should spend more time concentrating on the Health Department instead of doing her hair.

The Federal Government has increased funding for child health care and neighbourhood centres and has also provided funds to meet ongoing costs. According to reports and studies compiled by the Queensland Nurses Union into the public hospitals system in Queensland, an additional \$214m needs to be injected into the system. If this is a taste of the Ahern National Party's vision of excellence for Queenslanders, Queensland voters will be looking elsewhere at the next State election. I certainly believe that the Ahern National Party Government has lost track of the needs of the people in this State. Last year Queensland spent \$283 per head compared with \$390 per head in Western Australia. If one looks at the funding of the Queensland hospital system by the State Government, its contribution is far below the amount provided by other State Governments. Queensland has fared better than most States through Federal funding for the areas of both health and education.

Queensland's free hospital system, which was established by a previous Labor Government, is unique in Australia. It is a complete and utter shambles. The Ahern National Party Government is being deceitful by cutting staff but not telling the people exactly what it is doing. Unfortunately, unless they work in it or have to use it, people do not realise what is happening within the hospital system. Such people are not a majority in this State. Further cut-backs in essential services in public hospitals cannot be tolerated.

During 1987-88 the National Party Government spent less than any other State Government on social welfare per head of population on the aged, infirm and young. The contribution per head in relation to child welfare was \$23, which was an enormous

33 per cent behind the average of \$35 for the other six States. The Federal Government contributed \$346,000 towards the establishment of the Bowen and District Child Care Centre, which has recently been opened in my electorate. Child care is something that the State Government has not recognised. It does not fund such services and has nothing in its welfare policy in regard to them. By December of this year 110 000 child care places will be available throughout Australia. In the past four years the Federal Government's expenditure on child care has increased by more than 170 per cent. This financial year a total of \$235m is expected to be spent on new and existing services. Queensland has been given more Federal funding than most of the other Australian States. People want value for their money and are asking where their money has gone. The money certainly has not gone into the public hospital system. The Minister for Health should be more responsible when it comes to the serious health problems throughout the State.

The provision of education services within my electorate is also an area of great concern. At the beginning of this year the Federal Government funded a new library for the Bowen State High School. The Minister for Environment, Mr Muntz, when opening the library, asserted that the State Government provided the funding. One must be concerned when one sees this type of thing happening in Queensland. Although the Federal Government provides all the funds for a high school library, or any other school library, the State Government insists that a member of the National Party open that facility. The p. and c. associations and the headmasters of schools throughout the State are not game to ask a member of the Federal Government to open a facility. Headmasters know that if they speak out against the National Party in Queensland there is a good chance that they will lose their job or be shifted off to a far-away western town. That has been the case in Queensland for at least the last 15, if not 30, years.

Sir William Knox: 50 years.

Mr SMYTH: Mr Knox has been around for a long time; he is showing his age.

People in country areas have seen a number of small schools close. The Government has applied the magical number of from eight to 10 as the minimum student number for a viable school. Many country agricultural areas rely for labour on itinerant workers, whose families need education facilities. However, the National Party Government insists that, if school student numbers do not reach 10, the school is closed and the students are taken by bus to the nearest school.

The people of Guthalungra, which is in the northern part of my electorate, were astounded to hear on a Thursday that the school would be closed on the following Friday. There was no communication at all with the p. and c. association or the local students. The State Education Minister said, "OK, it has to close. They will be moved out." He did not make any arrangements to have the parents told where their children would be educated or how they were to get there. A number of these families already lived about 20 kilometres from the school, so that placed a further strain on them.

This Government used to be formed by members of the Country Party but, because it wanted to pick up the electorates in the cities, it became the National Party. Yesterday the Leader of the Liberal Party, Mr Innes, said that no old Country Party people were left on the Government side of the House. I think that a couple of them are still there.

Mr Ardill: Mr Booth is one.

Mr SMYTH: Mr Deputy Speaker, I imagine that you are an old Country Party man. Most Government members are ex-Liberals, anyway.

The Federal Government gave the State Government \$75m as compensation for the cessation of logging in the northern part of the State. However, the State Government says continually that that is not enough money to support the people who were employed by the firms that had to close. In contrast, the State Government closed down the Collinsville Power Station. On numerous occasions I have written to the Premier and asked what he intends to do for the people of Collinsville, a town which has had its

population halved, the Bowen Shire Council, which is suffering because of the loss of rate revenue, and the business people who invested \$3m in the town in Collinsville because in 1984 the then Minister for Mines and Energy, Mr I. J. Gibbs, stated that the Collinsville Power Station would remain open for at least another 10 years. Immediately after the 1986 election, the State Government closed it down.

The families of the area are suffering. Businesses that were worth between \$80,000 and \$90,000 have been sold recently for \$13,000. Mr Lester is always saying that the Government looks after the little people in our society, but obviously that is a load of rubbish when Government Ministers make statements such as the one made about the Collinsville Power Station. The Ministers do not really believe what they are saying; they make statements merely to pick up votes.

I am sure that the people of Collinsville, Bowen and the rest of north Queensland realise what the Government has done in that area. Bodies such as the Queensland Confederation of Industry should be studying what the State Government is doing to small-business people. I again ask the Premier: because of his Government's decision to close down the Collinsville Power Station, what compensation will he provide for the people of that area? He has said that he is looking into the matter. I am hoping for a positive answer.

Mr ELLIOTT (Cunningham) (4.45 p.m.): It is a pleasure to take part in the debate on the motion for adoption of the Address in Reply to the Governor's Opening Speech. I have great pleasure in pledging my loyalty and that of my constituents to Her Majesty.

I believe that Her Majesty's representative, the Governor of Queensland, performs a tremendous job. He is perhaps a little different from some past Governors of Queensland. He is certainly a hail-fellow-well-met type and someone who has travelled widely throughout Queensland. Country people certainly appreciate his visits.

Mr Milliner: What about the Governor-General designate?

Mr ELLIOTT: I think that the less said about the Governor-General designate the better. I will not address that controversial area. In all fairness to him, I might say that it is unfortunate that someone who did not believe in the institution should have been selected; but I should not talk about that.

The Address in Reply debate gives members in country electorates an opportunity to discuss problems in their areas. I congratulate the newest sitting member of the House, Mr Perrett, on his maiden speech. He is not the newest member, as another member will be arriving soon. I well remember making my maiden speech. It is a nerve-racking time. Because it was his maiden speech, there were no interjections, so he was at liberty to express his views on various topics. I am sure that he is attempting to represent his constituents.

I congratulate the Jondaryan Woolshed Association. It has had a very successful year with tourism.

Mr Newton: They are doing a lot for tourism in the west, aren't they?

Mr ELLIOTT: That is right, and that is an important point. When I was involved in the tourist scene, I did my best to promote inland tourism. The coastal areas and the Great Barrier Reef are tremendous natural assets. However, just as many natural assets are to be found in inland areas, although they are not so well known. I took a group of journalists on an outback safari through western areas. We went as far as Cork Station, which is well and truly west of Winton, to inspect dinosaur tracks. They were fascinated by everything they saw during the entire trip. Many of them had not seen the heritage of this State. We received much publicity not only in the newspapers that those journalists represented but also in travel magazines, in-house brochures and in-flight magazines. We need to get back to the basics with inland tourism.

As I said, I congratulate the Jondaryan Woolshed Association. Honourable members must remember that it is a voluntary body. It has full-time staff. However, the people

on the board who decide the direction that the association takes are volunteers. At present, they are conducting the Heritage Festival, which started last week-end and continues until next week-end. Many local people visit that festival, and busloads of people come from Toowoomba, Brisbane, the Gold Coast and even interstate.

I extend an invitation to all honourable members to go and see what it was like in the old days. When my son sees something that I was doing 10 or 12 years ago, he says to me, "That's what they used to do in the old days." That makes one wonder about the way things were done 100 years ago. Equipment that is more than 100 years old is being operated at the Heritage Festival at present.

Mr Milliner: I have been there, and I can thoroughly recommend it.

Mr ELLIOTT: That is good. Obviously, the honourable member is a man of good taste. He realises good value when he sees it. The Jondaryan Woolshed is good value for money, particularly during the Heritage Festival.

I congratulate the Jondaryan Woolshed on winning one of the various tourist awards that the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation presents for different categories of tourist attractions. I am sure that the board, which is responsible for the direction that the Jondaryan Woolshed takes, is very proud. The woolshed has a new manager, who is doing an outstanding job. His staff are to be commended. They work far beyond the hours for which they are paid. It is appropriate that the Jondaryan Woolshed should win that award.

I think that it is important to recognise the tremendous job that the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation is in fact doing——

Mr Davis: I don't think so.

Mr ELLIOTT: The honourable member is being totally unfair.

The Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation is fostering greater awareness, greater participation and a much greater professionalism on the part of this State's tourist resorts. Of course, members of the Opposition do not like competition. However, competition is what it is all about if one wants to produce the best runners, the best business people or whatever. The Minister for Employment would know all about that. He was a great 880-runner in his day. He may not run so fast these days, but he is a stayer.

Everyone realises that people work best under competition. I compliment not only Sir Frank Moore and his staff but all of the people who have been involved in the presentation of these awards. I see them as being of great value to this State.

It is interesting to note the work that the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation has been doing in conjunction with the Jondaryan Woolshed since it won that award. The publicity campaign that was put together on this occasion to publicise the Heritage Festival has in fact produced results. Unfortunately, it rained on Saturday. There was quite a crowd, though; 1 800-odd people attended. On Sunday, when the weather was fine, a record crowd of 3 200 people attended. That is a lot of people in anyone's language.

Mr Lester: The Jondaryan Woolshed is now promoted throughout the world, isn't it?

Mr ELLIOTT: Yes, indeed it is. It is the subject of brochures, and it is being well and truly publicised in Japan, the West Coast of the United States in particular, Europe, Great Britain and so on.

On Monday a crowd of 1 200 people attended the festival. That augers well. As long as the weather is kind, I would say that last year's attendance record could be broken this year.

Mr Davis interjected.

Mr ELLIOTT: I am hoping that the member for Brisbane Central will visit the woolshed during the festival. The relative of a more famous family, one could not imagine. I hope that the honourable member will go to the festival to see his heritage——

Mr Davis: I have been up there a couple of times.

Mr ELLIOTT: That is good. I am pleased. We will welcome the honourable member. I am sure that he will be given some damper and tea.

Mr Milliner: Do you realise how lucky you are to be the member for Cunningham? Mr Davis should be the member for Cunningham.

Mr ELLIOTT: He had a go one time. He was not rejected by much. To put it kindly, he was not rejected by a great deal. If I do not deal with the other matters to which I wish to refer, I will run out of time.

Mr Prest: I will move an extension.

Mr ELLIOTT: I would not expect an extension of time to be moved by the member for Port Curtis. He is not noted for his generosity in that area.

While I am dealing with the subject of tourism, I should point out some problems that have occurred. Many people travel to my electorate to visit a multitude of places. Many honourable members would know that tourism is about packaging. Attractions that are of great interest to tourists include the Jondaryan Woolshed, Brookvale Park, the Bernborough Centre and the mine museum at Acland. The area has natural beauty, with its Bunya Mountains national park and other environmental parks. Tourists visit those places in their hundreds.

It is very important to look closely at the state of the roads in that area. Many people are used to driving on bitumen roads in the cities. The people from Brisbane and south-east Queensland are the ones whom organisations are trying to attract. It is a real problem that when the State Government embarked on the "de-maining" of main roads, it in fact "de-mained" some roads about which the people in my electorate feel very strongly as far as the tourist industry is concerned. I know that the Rosalie Shire would back me up when I say that it is unreasonable that the main route to the Bunya Mountains from the Jondaryan/Oakey/Toowoomba side has been "de-mained". Of course, that is the route from Jondaryan, through Brymaroo and Quinalow. People should be encouraged to visit the facilities because a large amount of money has been invested in them. Many honourable members may not realise that there was an airfield at Brymaroo during World War II. Many aircraft were kept at the large camp that was located there.

Mr Davis interjected.

Mr ELLIOTT: At times, I have spoken to some old diggers on Anzac Day. I was told, "We were up there in such and such a year during the war. It was absolutely freezing cold. You couldn't wash your hands. Water in the basins would be frozen solid." In order to catch the public's eye, an added attraction has been created by erecting a Canberra bomber on a sort of stand.

Mr Milliner: A sky hook?

Mr ELLIOTT: It is a type of sky hook. The plane is supported from underneath. A diagram and information are supplied for the benefit of visitors. One might say that it is a memorial to all those persons who gave of their efforts during the war and who trained in that particular area. Queensland is proud of its flyers.

As I said, it is important to examine the state of the roads in that area. The road from Toowoomba through Kingsthorpe and Goombungee is a major arterial road.

Mr Davis: It is not very wide.

Mr ELLIOTT: It has been widened. That shows that the honourable member has not travelled on it for some time. The Jondaryan Shire's traffic counter shows that 902 vehicles use that road each day. If that is not sufficient to classify that road as a main

road, I do not know what is. I urge the Government to reconsider its priorities in respect of that particular problem, which is common to many shires.

All honourable members have heard me speak about Federal funding, and I do not intend to mention it in great detail. However, the Federal Government puts its priorities on lowering the price of beer over and above——

Mr Newton: And muesli bars.

Mr ELLIOTT: That is one way of looking at it. However, I am speaking about the more serious nature of the Federal Government's priorities as they relate to road-funding.

Only 18 per cent of the revenue from fuel excise goes towards road-funding throughout the Commonwealth, although legislation was enacted precisely specifying that that revenue was to go directly to road-funding in both this State and all of the other States. It is ludicrous and ridiculous that only 18 per cent of that revenue goes back into road-funding. I do not need to tell the honourable member for Barambah or any of my other country colleagues how important it is to get road-funding back to the States and local authorities. As a nation, if we do not do something about road-funding we will find ourselves in real trouble with our roads, which will actually fall apart. It is most important that we come to grips with the problem.

In the recent Federal Budget, priority has been placed on winning votes for the Federal Government at the next election. The price of beer has been lowered, but the safety of people on our roads and the long-term viability of roads in this country has been ignored. That is quite unbelievable.

I turn now to education problems in my electorate which are common to other electorates. In respect of the education facilities that are provided for the children of my electorate, I do not have much to complain about. However, the demand for those facilities is increasing. Oakey is growing all the time. Pittsworth is projected to grow again. Its high school has approximately 427 students on the roll, and that figure is expected to increase to 458. As growth occurs, further strain is placed on the facilities at those schools.

The use of the library at the Pittsworth State High School is quite unacceptable. Because of overcrowding at the school, that library is being used as a class room, a projector room and for all sorts of activities. As a result, students are required to use the town library, which is relatively small.

Approximately 50 per cent of the students who attend schools in places such as Pittsworth live in outlying districts. Obviously, they travel to and from school by bus. After hours and on week-ends most of those students are unable to use the facilities that I have mentioned. It is unacceptable that a library cannot be used for its intended purpose. New library facilities should be provided at the Pittsworth State High School.

While I am speaking about growth areas, I will refer to Oakey, which is a major growth centre. The army's Black Hawk helicopters have been stationed there. The population in that area is increasing. Because of the bus program people are able to choose where to go. Kingsthorpe is a very big growth centre. A tremendous number of people are building in that area.

Mr Davis: Small allotments.

Mr ELLIOTT: Yes, that is right. They are small allotments, and acreage.

Mr Davis: I might go out there myself.

Mr ELLIOTT: We might reserve a block there for the honourable member. Is it six feet under or on top?

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Mr ELLIOTT: Because the honourable member is an old Darling Down-site, I thought he might like to be buried there when he dies.

It is important to realise that people are in fact coming back to Oakey. Many of the people who opt for the rural life-style and the acreage life-style want to send their children to a country high school rather than into Toowoomba. They are entitled to do so, and they are doing it. In fact, through the good offices of the previous Minister for Education, who is presently occupying the chair, that situation was brought about. A lot of pressure was put on the people to send their children back to Toowoomba. That was not what they desired to do. The solution did not disadvantage anyone else, so that problem was sorted out.

Because of the growing number of students, the science block at Oakey High School is inadequate. Oakey has done very well with other buildings. Over the last half a decade or so some excellent facilities have been opened. If a few more facilities were provided at the school, it would really be in pretty good shape. It is quite important for us to realise that.

On the subject of roads and safety and so on, I want to mention that, as in many other areas, the Millmerran Police Station is understaffed. We are not complaining about understaffing any more than anyone else is; however, if more police could be provided, we would like to see that. Whilst we would be happy to see more police, at the moment I think the very real need is for some clerical assistance to be provided to help the police so they can be taken away from those more mundane duties that could be handled by clerical people. In that way the police would be able to go back out on the road.

Mr Davis: What about a cardboard copper like on the Gold Coast?

Mr ELLIOTT: I have seen them. They have a car, too.

Mr Davis: What about three or four cardboard coppers?

Mr ELLIOTT: I could have a few cardboard ones, could I? That is very decent of the honourable member. At this stage the Millmerran people would prefer clerical assistants. It is something that has to be considered quite seriously.

Discussions have been held with the shire council and the various officers who are involved in the State Government instrumentalities that provide services to that town. Consideration has been given to the possibility of walking away from the old, traditional and rather introspective approach that many of those departments have. It is time that all of those departments were considered together and the question was asked: how can one department help another by looking after its phones and so on? All of those people should be put together so that, with not very many more people at all, a far better service to the public could be provided. At times some people are not overly busy, yet at other times they are very busy. All those people could be housed under one roof, and switchboards could be connected so that one section could answer another section's calls, look after it and help it. If it were private enterprise, that is what would happen. One firm would not have the same work done by various branches, which would allow demarcation problems to occur. That is the sort of thing that needs to be considered. It is hoped that a discussion will be held with the Premier and other members of the Cabinet to look at how some of those suggestions could best be handled. With some common sense, it could be done.

While I am on the subject of safety, I would like to raise another matter, which I have raised before, concerning Hermitage, as it is called. In that area flooding occurs in a creek which is not well defined but runs across the main Millmerran-Pittsworth road. As all honourable members would now realise, that has become the main truck route from Melbourne to Brisbane. Most of the trucks go down that way and it has become a national highway. People come steaming up through there on a fine, clear day and do not realise that the day before a massive storm had occurred in the catchment area. They are suddenly confronted with a quarter of a mile of water across the road without any warning whatsoever.

The Queensland Government must come to grips with the planning that is required. Local planning has been carried out by the Department of Primary Industries soil conservation officer, who is excellent at his job and knows what he is doing. He also enjoys the support of the local land-holders. However, if something is not done, not only will the Government be continuing to ignore a safety issue, but also the course of the creek will alter owing to flooding, which will extend along the road and head west. If it extends further west, it will cut through other valuable agricultural land and the use of a whole lot of very arable and valuable land will be lost. Some erosion problems that have turned into very real damage to the land have started in a similar way. The Government needs to take that problem into account and come to grips with it quickly.

I turn now to look briefly into the Wheat Board's operations. Perhaps people think that, on the one hand, I am saying that the Government should free up the Barley Board's control and that permits ought to be issued while, on the other hand, I am arguing for something totally different in relation to the Wheat Board. That is not quite so. What I am saying is that control ought to remain with the growers. The Wheat Board should be controlled by its grower members, and I want those people to be able to make the decisions.

Mr Davis: What about deregulation?

Mr ELLIOTT: I do not wish to see either the level of deregulation or the way that it is being suggested by the Federal Government brought into Queensland at this stage. If the same situation applied to a group of union people who were being dictated to in the way that Mr Kerin is trying to dictate to people involved in the wheat industry, the result would be a nationwide strike. The unions would not have a bar of it and they would not be dictated to in the way that the Federal Government is trying to dictate to the people involved in the wheat industry at the moment. This State Government will back up the wheat-growers of this State—make no mistake about that—and ensure that they will be able to continue to operate their industry the way they wish to. In other words, the Queensland Government will do what the industry wants its parliamentary representatives to do and not what an airy-fairy group in an ivory tower in Canberra 71 wants it to do. I was absolutely astounded that Mr Kerin did not attend any of the meetings. Instead, he sent a poor unfortunate lady to Dalby and she was a lamb led to the slaughter. There were approximately 1 000 growers at Dalby, and only two people spoke against the general consensus that was expressed at the meeting—and obviously the Labor Party sent those two along. Everyone else was absolutely and utterly opposed to what Mr Kerin was suggesting.

The Federal Minister for Primary Industries should look into what the industry wants. The Federal Minister is totally out of step. As I said before, if the same type of action were applied to any other group of workers in this country, there would be an outcry from the ALP and from all the unions. They would not wear it for one minute.

Before I run out of time, I wish to mention the disaster that struck Cooyar. I wish to thank the public for the incredible level of support that was given to the people of Cooyar, not just through the financial appeal that raised more than \$100,000 but also through the support that was given by service organisations, such as Rotary, that operate in the community. Everybody did a marvellous job. I also wish to thank all the officers of the public service who helped to get the people back on their feet.

The disaster was unbelievable. I have never seen such devastation. People were totally shattered. However, the community is now starting to get back on its feet again. A new hall will be opened on 10 December or thereabouts. I am very pleased to have been associated with the support that was given. It meant a great deal of work for many people, but I am pleased to say that it was certainly a success.

Time expired.

Mr PREST (Port Curtis) (5.15 p.m.): Having listened to the maiden speech made by the honourable member for Barambah, I join with my colleague the honourable

member for Wolston, Mr R. J. Gibbs, in saying that Mr Perrett's contribution left us in disbelief. During the by-election campaign for the seat of Barambah and since that time he has joined with other cranks to form this new political party, the Citizens Electoral Council, whose platform is to allow the voice of the people to be heard. At the very first opportunity that the honourable member had in this House to allow the voice of the people to be heard, he voted to gag the debate. He did not have his name down to speak in the debate on the four referendum questions, which is when the voice of the people could have been put forward. By voting to gag the debate he stopped 82 other members in this House from putting forward the voice of the people in their electorates whom they represent. I give my advice freely and with good intention, but I firmly believe that his actions in this House will have to change, otherwise he will go down in history as being a oncer. I have never before heard a member of Parliament who has so much hatred for politicians and yet wants to be one.

I have pleasure in speaking to the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply and join with the Governor in saying how pleased I am that Queensland has been visited by Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, His Royal Highness the Duke of Edinburgh, His Royal Highness Prince Edward and Their Royal Highnesses the Duke and Duchess of Kent, and the people in my electorate are now looking forward to a visit from the Duke and Duchess of York. It was indeed a great pleasure to be present at the official opening of World Expo 88 by Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, and also to read in the *Sunday Mail* of 28 August that, according to the world's super-rich table, she is now the fourth-richest woman in the world.

As an Australian I am proud to celebrate the Bicentenary, as a Queenslander I am proud of World Expo 88 and as a western Queenslander I am proud of the Australian Stockman's Hall of Fame and Outback Heritage Centre. All three events have been great for this State and will continue to bring benefits to Queensland.

I listened to the Governor's Speech and will return to it later after I have spoken about a very important issue that needs to be aired and acted upon immediately. From time to time requests are made for the public to come forward and give information to police that may help to solve a crime or lead to the arrest of a person or persons who have committed a crime of some kind. People acting in this way are seen to be good citizens, and some people may see it as their civic duty to assist the police in their work. Those people who can assist do so without giving a second thought as to what repercussions their actions may have, such as being called upon to be a witness in a court case, the effects it may have on their health if they worry about the evidence that they have given, the conviction of the person and how it may affect their family life now or in the future.

I wish to bring one particular case to the attention of the House. It is a very important case. For some nine years the police had been looking for a man who had held up a bank, finance company and building society. These hold-ups had been committed in most States, including New South Wales and Queensland. This man was a dangerous criminal and the police knew that he would shoot to kill when cornered. That man was Paul Mullin, also known as Mick Hay. Even though this man was continually holding up banks and building societies in this State, the police never had a clue as to his whereabouts. The police knew that it was only a matter of time before someone got in Mullin's way and he would shoot to kill.

I believe that young Farquhar would have been one of those persons who would have received a bullet. As it was, Farquhar tackled Mullin as he tried to escape after Mullin had held up and robbed the Suncorp Building Society at Toombul. Luckily for Farquhar, a witness was able to give valuable information to police, which proved to be so vital that the police were able to plan a raid in the finest detail on a house at Virginia on 29 July 1987. During that raid Paul Mullin was shot dead and his girlfriend, Susan Clarke, was arrested. In the end she pleaded guilty and was sentenced to six years' gaol. It must not be forgotten that during that raid Mullin shot dead one police officer and seriously wounded another.

What has happened to the witness who gave that assistance and help to the police and that great assistance to the public, the banks and their employees, the innocent customers who could have been killed or seriously wounded in any future hold-up and the finance companies and their employees in having Mullin's life brought to an end? Since July 1987, when the shoot-out took place, that witness has suffered a deterioration in health and has not been able to go about normal duties because police feared for the life of the witness and put the witness under police protection to the extent that, during the visit of Her Majesty the Queen to Brisbane to open World Expo 88, which required all police in Brisbane, particularly the members of the Tactical Response Group, to be on duty, that witness was sent to the country.

During that time a finance company gave notice that it would exercise its powers of sale on the home of the witness because of arrears of two monthly payments on the house that the witness had been paying off. Believing this to be an injustice to a person who had played such an important role in this case, I thought it was merely a matter of telephoning the police in charge of the case and being told that a reward would be paid to the witness, so I could have assured the finance company that the payment of the arrears and any future payment would be assured. However, this was not to be. There was to be no reward and no assistance for the witness who supplied the information.

I then contacted the office of the Minister for Police, Mr Gunn, who assured me that he would investigate the matter. However, one week later the finance company again said that it would take action and intended to take possession of the witness' house. I immediately contacted the office of the Minister and asked what had been decided about a reward for the witness. His office requested a half an hour to again consider the position. When I again contacted the office, I was advised that a payment of \$2,000 would be forthcoming—that was just enough to make three monthly payments, just enough to bring the account up to date in June.

I asked whether any further consideration was to be given to a reward for the informant. However, I was fobbed off. I said I intended to press on, and I will continue to do so. For vital information relating to Mullin, the Minister for Police was prepared to pay \$2,000. He said no reward had been offered or even considered because the police knew whom they were looking for. However, it must be remembered that they knew whom they were looking for since Mullin broke out of Sydney's Long Bay gaol in 1978. Imagine the cost to the police of searching for Mullin in those nine years, yet Mr Gunn is prepared to pay only \$2,000 to the informant, even though that informant now stands to suffer the loss of home and property. In addition, the informant is now receiving constant medication for illness brought on by worry caused by the informant's involvement and loss of employment. I believe that we must press on and get some financial assistance for this person.

On 28 May I contacted the media and Mr Tony Koch wrote a small story on the plight of the informant. Mr Gunn's response to that article in the media was issued on 30 May. He said—

“An elderly person who informed on bandit Paul Mullin will get a reward.

The Police Minister, Mr Gunn, said yesterday the recommendation was made a fortnight ago.

...

Mr Gunn said he was amazed that Mr Prest and the informant had not heard about the reward.”

Obviously Mr Gunn was not shouting from the roof-tops about the lousy \$2,000 reward that he begrudgingly made. To say the least, the informant and I were terribly disappointed at the size of the reward.

Surely the Minister for Police, Mr Gunn, and his Government do not expect any person to place his or her life or that of his or her family in danger for such a token reward. If this is how the police and the Government value one's support and public attitude, my advice to any person would be to hear nothing, see nothing and say nothing.

I did not let the matter stop there. I have continued my pursuit for justice for this person who assisted police. That person deserves more—much more—than that person will ever get. I contacted the banks. Honourable members should not forget that banks display a sign that states that up to \$10,000 will be paid to any person giving information that leads to the arrest and conviction of any person or persons having held up or stolen from such bank. However, on contacting bank security, I was told that, because Mullin had been shot dead, he could not be convicted. So ends the reward. I believe that is a crude and snide way for the banks to fail to live up to their responsibility of honouring the “Reward” signs in the banks.

On 29 May, the banks again appealed to the public to come forward. The Commonwealth Bank offered a \$50,000 reward for information leading to a gunman’s capture. The bank association also offered \$10,000. That was an offer for a person who held up one Commonwealth Bank, whereas Mullin held up, all told, approximately 19 banks, financial institutions and TABs.

I again took up with an officer of the police Hold-up Squad, Detective Sergeant George Sharry. He agreed that the witness was entitled to a reward and he said that he would support us in our claim. Following that, I contacted a member of the association of banks in Melbourne. He, too, said that the witness should be rewarded and that he would talk with an officer of the Hold-up Squad in Queensland. Time was getting on and still no money.

In July, Susan Clarke was to appear in court to answer charges. The report given by the informant on this accomplice was so detailed and factual that Clarke’s lawyers could not base a case on her behalf, so she pleaded guilty and was given a six-year gaol sentence. It is quite obvious that the report given by the informant saved Heaven knows how much in court costs when Clarke pleaded guilty; again a saving to the Government. However, again when Clarke was to go to court the informant was taken out of Brisbane because police feared for the life of the witness. That occurred in July.

The finance company again has issued a 30-day notice of exercise of power of sale on the home of the witness. So we are back to square one. There is no reward for the witness. There is no work for the witness, as the police fear for the life of the witness who is whipped out of Brisbane into hiding. The finance company is to repossess the home of the witness. Mr Gunn, the Minister for Police, will not provide further help. The banks and the finance companies are dodging their responsibilities. I believe that to this date both the Government—especially the Minister for Police—and the finance companies and banks have all failed to live up to their responsibilities.

I ask the honourable members what they would do if one of their family was in the same position as this witness. Some time before the July shoot-out in the dawn raid on the house at Virginia at which two people were killed and another seriously wounded, this witness had to be so trusted by the police as to the report that the witness gave and the information it contained, and the witness had to have so much trust in the police that the witness would have had so much to think about, including the worry of what the witness knew and had told the police in private, that it must have caused many sleepless nights. No doubt the witness would never have been able to confide in others just what the witness knew and had told the police. Is it any wonder that the witness’ health has deteriorated? Imagine the strain placed on that person when that raid did take place and it was made known that Mullin was shot dead. But, worse still, one police officer was killed and another seriously wounded. There must have been many thoughts of what could have happened and whether it was the information that the witness gave that caused that dreadful killing and wounding of the police officers.

That worry did not end on that day in July 1987. Really, it had only just begun. It has been a worry since the day that the witness came under police protection, because fear was held for that person’s life. That person was unable to work because of police protection and unable to make house repayments. There was a threat that that person’s home could be lost. That person was whipped out of Brisbane on two occasions. The

second time was when Susan Clarke, also known as Sue Chandler, was to appear in court.

Can honourable members imagine just what that witness has been through? Would it not have been so much easier, as I said earlier, to hear nothing, see nothing and say nothing? No, the witness thought that justice must be done. So why do not the State Government, the banks and the finance institutions, which were held up and robbed by Paul Mullin not only in Queensland but also in other States, do the right thing and pay the reward to this witness whose information led police to Paul Mullin and Susan Clarke? The Minister for Police in this State, Bill Gunn, should make sure that this witness is compensated.

I read in the *Courier-Mail* some time ago that Ian Henders, one of the police officers who masterminded the ill-fated operation to capture Queensland's public enemy No. 1, Paul Mullin, has left the police force a broken man. The article further states—

“Sergeant Henders retired from the force medically unfit on April 20—just three weeks before a coroner's inquest began.

. . .

‘You can imagine the pressure leading up to the raid and the catastrophe that followed . . . it was just too much for him,’ said his ex-boss, Insp. Brian Johnston of Redcliffe.”

Detective Sergeant George Sharpy said that the number of hold-ups in Queensland had fallen in the past year. He stated in a newspaper article as follows—

“‘The reduction of armed hold-ups this year could stem from the arrest and conviction of multiple offenders . . .’”

Detective Sergeant Sharpy asked that anyone with information on any of these hold-ups that are still occurring telephone the police. I ask: why?

Members of the Opposition feel great sympathy for the police officers who are trained to cope with these sorts of situations. The Opposition believes that those police officers who have suffered from failing health owing to this raid and shoot-out with Paul Mullin should be compensated to the extent that their families can live as normal a life as possible. The Opposition believes that the police union will see that these officers are adequately compensated. This Government has a responsibility to ensure that if they suffer from work-related health problems, police officers are able to look after their families.

I believe that this Government should ensure that this witness is adequately compensated. I am disgusted that some 19 banks, finance companies and, I believe, a couple of TABs that have been held up, or are believed to have been held up by Mullin, are dodging their responsibility. They should come to the party and pay.

I have in my possession a telex from Mr Redmond to the Minister for Police which states—

“Dear Sir

I refer to your Principal Private Secretary's minute of 2 August 1988 concerning a reward”—

and I will not mentioned the witness' name—

“... claim has been assessed and I will be writing to the National Bank today and recommending that a substantial reward be paid.

I will request this reward be paid as soon as possible in view of . . . unfortunate financial circumstances.

Any reward paid would be on behalf of all the banks who were held up by Mullins or other persons associated with him and any amount paid would be at the banks' sole discretion.

I will also write to the Suncorp Building Society to inform them about . . . assistance to police in locating Mullins, but as this society does not currently have a reward scheme I am unable to anticipate what their reaction will be."

The telex was signed, "J. P. McMahon for R. J. Redmond."

I believe that the banks and the Government are dodging their responsibility. From that telex it appears that this informant might receive no more than \$10,000. There were 19 hold-ups. All of the banks concerned have signs up in their premises stating, "Anyone giving information leading to the prosecution, arrest and conviction of people stealing from this bank could receive up to \$10,000."

In this instance one reward will be paid, and it might be \$10,000 at the most, which means that each of these institutions will get out of this for approximately \$531. Good heavens, if one is any sort of a gambling man it costs that much to have a day at the races. There is no doubt that this witness took a great gamble.

I believe that this Government and, in particular, the Minister for Police, should impress upon the banks that they should come clean and give justice to this witness. I can assure honourable members that I do not intend to give up at this point and that the Opposition will pursue this matter to the bitter end.

Finally, I want to talk about what the Mayor of Gladstone has called the "cowboy cops". I refer to the RID team that came to Gladstone. Some people were caught and charged with drink-driving offences. However, the Mayor was very critical of the RID team and claimed that the police officers concerned were not in uniform, that they were dressed in football shorts and so on. That is a shame.

Police officers should be dressed as police officers. If the police uniform is worn, it may act as a deterrent. On the night in question, the police were very selective about whom they charged. When I looked at the people who appeared in court, they appeared to me to be working-class people. Some had an blood-alcohol reading as low as .05. However, they were charged, appeared in court and lost their licence. I repeat that I know of some influential people in the town who, although they had much higher readings than persons who were charged, were told by the squad to go home, to park their cars and not to drive any more that night. Those persons were not charged. Honourable members know that that happened. Although Inspector Barry Penman said that he did not know that the police were coming to town, it was common knowledge among the business people around the traps that the police were coming to town and that they should be careful. Those who were game enough to go out and drive——

An honourable member: Game?

Mr PREST: Yes; they were very game. They were tested but told to go home. They were not charged.

I believe that statements have appeared in the media in Brisbane about the police not doing their job because the RID squad can apprehend 18 drink-drivers in one night, whereas the police in Gladstone are catching only 18 a month. The police are very selective about the people they book. The message is, "Do not be a worker in Gladstone or you will cop it; you will have the book thrown at you at every opportunity."

Great development will come to Gladstone. One example of such development is the proposed gas pipeline. When it is eventually constructed, it will mean a boost of billions of dollars to the city of Gladstone. The gas pipeline should not be allowed to pass through the grounds of the Gladstone South School, cutting through its tennis courts, the cricket practice wickets or the junior playground. Letters have been written to various Ministers and to QAL, which, I must say, is one company that believes in safety at all times. If a problem arises, QAL would be against the location of the gas pipeline through the schoolgrounds. Although the gas pipeline is welcomed, I do not want to see it pass through the schoolgrounds. There are many other places through which it could pass; it need not pass through a school that is attended by 600 or 700 children.

When the gas pipeline is eventually constructed, many other industries will be attracted to the area. Numerous other facilities and services will be needed to cope with the massive number of workers who will be attracted to the area because of the \$1 billion worth of investment in the city.

I thank the Minister for Family Services and Welfare Housing. He is the only Minister who has ever given consideration to taking back the rental houses that have been held by QAL, QEC and others. For years those houses were left vacant by other Ministers. However, the Minister for Family Services and Welfare Housing saw that those homes were not being utilised properly. He took them back and they were rented out immediately to families in need. I thank the Minister for that. If increased development takes place in Gladstone, more of that type of housing will be needed for the workers who come to the city. Gladstone will need not only housing but also teachers and teachers' aides. All honourable members know that at present there is a great shortage of teachers and money for the TAFE college. Mr Lester knows about that matter and I have written to him about it. The people of Gladstone want him to do something about that problem. Because of a lack of funds or a lack of teachers, courses are discontinued half-way or mid-stream. People might complete Stage 1 but are unable to undertake Stage 2, or they might be half-way through a certain course and it is dropped until the following year.

At the beginning of the year an extension to the college was completed. Although the hospitality and tourism industry in the area will boom, none of the facilities are being used. There are no teachers in those facilities, but I am sure that many people would be waiting for appointments at that college. No teachers or finance have been provided. In the next Budget I would like to see additional funds made available to the TAFE college to allow it to operate as it should. With increasing development in industry, many tradesmen will be needed. I sincerely hope that Mr Lester will do his part. In the past Mr McKechnie has done his part and will continue to do so. I do not wish to see a repeat of the very hard times that were experienced in the past with the expansion of industry in Gladstone.

We should be prepared for expansion in industry and explosions in population. Now is the time for Governments to start making plans and tell us what is happening. Following propaganda or talk about a great expansion in Gladstone, real estate agents are jumping on the bandwagon. Rentals are increasing, and housing prices are increasing at well above the State average, as revealed at a Real Estate Institute of Queensland meeting in Gladstone on 17 August 1988. During the past month a 15 per cent increase in residential prices has occurred because of the confidence that has been expressed in the development that is to take place. Shops are already being sold and tenants are being charged an increase of 50 per cent on present rentals. Within six months another 50 per cent increase will occur.

What does the ordinary person in Gladstone get from that sort of development? All that he gets is increased prices and charges and a lower living standard. We do not want those things, which should be taken care of by this Government.

On 26 April, during the Adjournment debate in this House, I spoke about the shut-down of the electricity-generating unit at the Gladstone Power Station and the resultant loss of jobs. Mr Tenni, the Minister for Mines and Energy, interjected and said, "That is not true." I said—

"It was interesting to hear the Minister interject earlier, 'That is not so.' I raise this matter tonight in order to give an assurance not only to the power-workers of the Gladstone Power Station, but also to the business people of the city that a shut-down is not on."

I stated that our economy would not be affected. However, within one month, Mr Tenni was reported as saying that the axe was about to fall on the QEC staff; that at least 80 tradesmen would be made redundant and lose their jobs. It is obvious that when the Callide B station comes on line early next year, there will be a further reduction in staff.

Mr Tenni is very lucky to be a Minister. As Quentin Dempster has said, one of Mike Ahern's greatest problems is that his ministerial talent is very thin on the ground and he does not have much to choose from. Mr Tenni is very fortunate to be there. But who knows; following the results of the inquiry, Mr Tenni might no longer be there.

Of the industry that is coming to Gladstone, ICI is to employ only 100 workers and Mimproc will be employing 40 workers. I am concerned that at least 80 and possibly 120 jobs will be lost at the power station. Jobs are being lost by railway workers every day. The running staff is being reduced considerably. There will be no additional people employed. All that will happen is that the slack will be taken up by those who are losing their jobs. Yet costs continue to rise. There will be nothing in it for the ordinary person—only higher charges and lower living standards.

Time expired.

Mr MENZEL (Mulgrave) (5.45 p.m.): In rising to speak to the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply, on behalf of the constituents of Mulgrave I pledge allegiance to the Queen. We are privileged that we live in a democracy such as we do and that we have the Royal Family as our head of State.

It is unfortunate that Bill Hayden will be Australia's next Governor-General. We have seen the stigma that has surrounded that appointment. It is rather unfortunate. I will not go into details. It really makes a mockery of the position of Governor-General when it is filled by an avowed republican. It shows the depths the Hawke Government will go to in order to pay off an old debt, namely, the blood on Bob Hawke's hands when he deposed Bill Hayden as Leader of the Labor Party. As Bill Hayden said at the time, a drover's dog could have become Prime Minister. It is rather unfortunate.

Mr De Lacy interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Row): Order! The member for Cairns is not in his correct seat.

Mr MENZEL: I am sure that members of the Labor Party who belong to Bill Hayden's faction would agree with me.

Before dealing with the Address in Reply in detail, I would like to congratulate the new member for Barambah on his speech and wish him many years as a member of Parliament.

Mr Comben: How long before he joins you.

Mr MENZEL: Every member of Parliament is entitled to express his views. It is unfortunate that in a maiden speech the honourable member for Barambah is knocked by members of the Labor Party. I guess that, one way or the other, they have their point of view and everyone else has another point of view.

The member for Barambah made quite a few telling points that, if heeded, would do the Parliament and the people of Queensland and Australia a lot of good. There is nothing wrong with supporting the old-fashioned traditions of the family and other things. It is unfortunate that the Labor Party might sneer at that. I am not too proud to say that even though an honourable member might not belong to the same political party as I do, if he makes a good point, whatever his political party, I am prepared to commend him for it.

One thing that does disturb me—it was raised earlier today by the Premier—is the report in today's *Courier-Mail* that Senator Walsh threatened to blackmail the Queensland Government and the people of Queensland by cutting Queensland's grants next year because the State Government has spent money on advertising its referendum campaign. I believe that the Queensland Government has a clear responsibility to the people of Queensland, and probably Australia, to wake them up to the pitfalls of the referendum.

The referendum is the result of a very, very sly and dangerous move by the Democrats. They pushed the Labor Government into putting the referendum forward.

It is a referendum that is not needed. The referendum will cost the Federal Government \$40m of tax-payers' money to try to deceive the people of Australia. I believe that, not only in my own electorate but also in Brisbane, the referendum will come out overwhelmingly as "No", "No", "No", "No". I have spoken to many people about it, and without doubt the consensus is that the referendum proposals will be rejected overwhelmingly. It is fortunate that the people have woken up to the fact that the referendum is a well-conceived confidence trick by the Labor Party and the Democrats. The Democrats talk about one vote, one value. What a joke! They are elected to the Senate on about 7 or 8 per cent of the vote. What a mob of hypocrites they are! What are the Democrats talking about when they speak about one vote, one value, when each State has 12 senators regardless of its size? In other words, the Democrats and the Labor Party are advocating that, for the smaller States such as Tasmania, they interfere with their representation in the Senate by reducing their numbers. What a disgraceful act! Tasmania will be next on the chopping-block. The people of Australia should be very wary of the con trick that is being played.

As for four-year terms of Parliament—if a Government is bad, even three years is too long. People also should consider that aspect of the matter.

Mr Comben: With Mike Ahern, six months is too long.

Mr MENZEL: Then the honourable member will have to vote "No".

If a Government is performing and doing things in the right manner and in a democratic way, and acting in the interest of the electors, it can remain in office for many years and will not need a four-year term or a longer term than the present term of three years. A good Government would not need a longer term. It could do without it because it would not have any problems being re-elected.

I ought to remind the House of an incident involving the spending of Government funds. A few years ago, Bob Hawke came up to Lizard Island on a fishing expedition. He flew up to Cairns on a VIP jet and found that the jet would not be able to land at Lizard Island. He asked the RAAF to provide a propeller plane to ferry him to Lizard Island. I would like to know how much that cost the tax-payers.

Mr De Lacy: I would like to know if he caught any fish.

Mr MENZEL: I will get on to Senator Richardson and his love boat escapades, if the honourable member wishes to talk about other things. If the honourable member for Cairns is embarrassed, I will move on to another topic.

Mr Comben: What about the helicopter?

Mr MENZEL: I will talk about helicopters. Senator Richardson hired a helicopter in north Queensland to spy on the poor timber-workers in case they are going round cutting trees. The boundaries of the World Heritage area have not yet been decided, but Richardson has hired a helicopter. I am sure that many Labor supporters in the area are disgusted that tax-payers' money is being used to hire that helicopter. I forget who owns the helicopter—and I do not think that I should mention names, anyway. It is probably the case, though, that the owner is a friend of Senator Richardson. Obviously, Senator Richardson is probably hiring the helicopter only to prop up one of his cigar-smoking, black-tie mates who are so popular with members of the Federal Labor Party—apart from trying to crack the whip over innocent timber industry employees.

Mr Veivers: I have knocked off cigars.

Mr MENZEL: The honourable member had better watch himself. I do think there is any problem with the honourable member for Southport joining the Labor Party, but there is no doubt that members of the Labor Party in Canberra seem to mix a good deal with the cigar-smoking, black-tie types. They have certainly forgotten their support base and the people who put them in office.

Mr De Lacy: Where did you get all these original thoughts from?

Mr MENZEL: If the honourable member did his homework, he would know that everyone in north Queensland knows about the helicopter that is spying on people on the Atherton Tableland. The honourable member should know that.

I will not go further into the love boat episode, but I mention that I heard on the news that Senator Richardson is in further trouble. Apparently someone recorded a car-phone conversation between Senator Richardson and Paul Keating. Quite a few allegations were made. I suppose quite a lot will be heard about the allegations during the next day or two. Hopefully, it will bring Senator Richardson down. I say "hopefully", but point out that Senator Richardson is probably the best thing that the National Party has going for it in Queensland at present.

For the good of the country, Senator Richardson should be dismissed by Mr Hawke from the Ministry—although it would not necessarily be a move that would be to the best political advantage of the National Party. It would be for the good of the country if a bit of common sense came into the debate on the World Heritage listing in north Queensland, and it would do the Labor Party some good—certainly in north Queensland. I am certain that many people would agree with what I am saying. Without doubt, Senator Richardson is the best thing that the National Party has going for it. The National Party would like the Labor Party to have more people such as Senator Richardson, because if the Labor Party had more people like him, the Federal Government in Canberra would be brought down much faster.

A lot is heard in the media and from the Labor Party and others about the gerrymander. The Labor Party is the greatest exponent of the gerrymander in Australia. Everyone knows that it will take 52.3 per cent to remove the Federal Labor Government from Canberra. In Queensland the greatest examples of gerrymanders are the Federal seats of Leichhardt, Herbert and Kennedy.

Kennedy zig-zags in and out from the coast and takes in all of the conservative areas along the coast and inland. It is a massive electorate and has been made into a safe National Party seat. I will not quote any one person's comments in particular, but if anyone is lucky enough to get National Party endorsement in Kennedy, he or she would not have to campaign. He or she has got the seat made. The Labor Party has been hoping that the same would happen in Leichhardt and Herbert. It has eliminated the conservative vote in both those Labor electorates, hoping that the Labor Party will be there for life. I believe that things have gone so bad for the Labor Party in Canberra that even those two seats, especially Leichhardt in which I am a constituent, are liable to be lost.

The sitting member for Leichhardt, Mr John Gayler, has his problems. He was mentioned in the Fitzgerald inquiry in relation to Mexican Pete's restaurant. A former police superintendent has claimed that John Gayler was financed by a friend who owned Mexican Pete's, and it is alleged that Gayler tried to get the casino reopened. That matter must be dealt with at a later date and I will not make judgment upon it. However, the fact is that factions of the Labor Party are also after John Gayler. I do not know whether Mr De Lacy's faction is involved, but there is talk that a former candidate in the State seat—I will not mention his name either—is telling people that he has the numbers to do Gayler over for Labor pre-selection in Leichhardt. There should be quite an interesting set of circumstances leading up to the endorsement, disendorsement or otherwise of John Gayler. The slogan was "Gayler must go" and apparently some people in the Labor Party have caught on to that slogan as well.

The Federal Government has said that the Queensland Government should not make advertisements in relation to the referendums. However, the Federal Government is spending \$40m of tax-payers' money on the referendums. It has cut funding to the Queensland Government by \$470m for two years in a row but on the other hand it has hardly slashed any of its own spending in the process. The Federal Government has thrown it all onto the States to bear the brunt of the so-called belt-tightening. The Federal Government cannot have it both ways. It will have a massive Budget surplus. Queensland needs more tertiary places, teachers, hospitals and nurses and better roads,

but the Federal Government is cutting back the whole time. There is only one good thing to come out of the Federal Budget. People reckon it is a "BB" Budget—Bond Brewery Budget—because the Federal Government reduced the tax on beer in order to help its black-tie, cigar-smoking mate Alan Bond. He is really the only beneficiary. Once again, one of Australia's millionaires or a couple of individuals have gained from the Budget. I do not know how much Alan Bond will have to put into the Labor Party's coffers at the next Federal election. No doubt he has been looking after the members of the Labor Party and in turn the Labor Party has been looking after others.

Sitting suspended from 6 to 7.30 p.m.

Mr MENZEL: Before the dinner recess I was mentioning the problems of the Federal Government, Senator Richardson, Paul Keating and the Prime Minister. As honourable members have probably just heard on the television news, yesterday a car-phone conversation was recorded.

Mr Austin: I heard that he used a swear word.

Mr MENZEL: Apparently Richardson said, "I hate that little—". I will not repeat the other word.

Mr Austin: You do not want to embarrass the Hansard staff.

Mr MENZEL: That is right.

That is an example of the unity and the strength that the Labor Party has talked about. I might add that the Labor Party has a couple of journalists on side. I do not know how much Laurie Oakes is paid by the Labor Party or the Federal Government, but I do not think the Nine Network should pay him, because he does such a good job protecting the Hawke Government, the Labor Party and its black-tie, cigar-smoking image. The honeymoon is over for Mr Hawke; everything is coming out into the open.

I wish to speak about the sugar embargo that Keating and the Labor Government have decided to lift, without consultation with the sugar industry or the Queensland Government. As honourable members would be aware, the Federal Government wishes to abolish the sugar embargo. That will have a detrimental effect on the sugar industry and the economy of Queensland, just as World Heritage listing will destroy the timber and tourism industries of north Queensland.

It is all very well to remove the sugar embargo while the price of sugar remains high. But the industry is very volatile; the price has many peaks and troughs, with the troughs lasting longer than the peaks. When prices crash, large sections of the sugar industry will not be able to compete. Mills will shut down, cane-farmers will go out of business and the sugar industry will collapse. Perhaps sections of CSR have made representations to Mr Hawke to remove the embargo because CSR wants to concentrate its efforts on the Ord River and the Burdekin area. That is unfortunate.

Mr Randell: Why do you think the Federal Government did not have any consultation with the Queensland Government or industry?

Mr MENZEL: Because it is anti-Queensland. There is no doubt that it has an anti-Queensland attitude. It is just one more nail in the Federal Government's coffin. The Federal Government is cutting funds to Queensland and, by cutting back wherever it can, trying to cause unemployment in this State.

Over the past two years I have been in Western Australia a few times. I was there after Christmas last year and saw that millions upon millions of dollars of bicentennial road funds have been spent not on main highways but on side roads. A person might drive for three or four hours on those roads before meeting another car. They certainly are beautiful roads. I might add that the speed limit is 110 kilometres per hour. Only five or six years ago those roads were in very, very poor condition. Queensland has been starved of Federal road-funding. Labor members opposite seem to be quite happy about that; they are laughing.

I call upon the Minister for Main Roads to do what he can to try to spend more on roads in my electorate. I ask that the Gillies Highway be upgraded as soon as possible with more passing lanes. Since I became the member for Mulgrave, two sections of passing lanes have been constructed and other improvements made, but I want much more done. I ask the Queensland Government to try to upgrade the Gillies Highway in a similar fashion to the upgrading of the Kuranda road. Now that the Palmerston Highway is just about completed, I ask that in the next Budget the money be diverted to the upgrading of the Gillies Highway.

Mr Randell: Haven't you got some Federal Labor Party members up there who should be fighting for Queensland?

Mr MENZEL: That is true; but they are certainly not fighting, because there is a Labor gerrymander in the Federal divisions of Leichhardt and Herbert. Those members think that they are sitting pretty.

Mr Davis: A what?

Mr MENZEL: A Labor gerrymander.

Mr Davis: How can it be a Labor gerrymander when there is 10 per cent either way?

Mr MENZEL: The Labor Party openly admits that there is a Labor gerrymander in the electorates of Leichhardt and Herbert, and it believes that the members do not have to do anything because they will be re-elected. However, I believe that things will change.

Mr Randell interjected.

Mr MENZEL: Speaking of Mr Gayler—as I said earlier, a former superintendent of police claims that a person who made a large contribution to Mr Gayler's last campaign acted on his behalf and went to the superintendent to have the casino above Mexican Pete's Restaurant reopened. That has been reported to the Fitzgerald inquiry, and no doubt action will be taken. Mr De Lacy was also mentioned, but to a lesser extent.

Turning to my own electorate, I appeal to the Minister for Justice and the Treasurer to consider appointing a clerk/typist to the Babinda Court House. The clerk/typist who was previously employed has been removed. I acknowledge that the Government is in dire straits financially because of reduced Federal funding of \$450m for two years in a row. I realise that funds are difficult to obtain. However, I ask that the Government reconsider appointing a clerk/typist at the Babinda Court House. It is an extremely important area. The clerk of the court has other duties to perform and leaves the court house to perform duties as chairman of the local sugar cane prices board and the Babinda cane disputes tribunal, when he is not available at the court house for long periods.

Another problem exists at the Millaa Millaa school. Although Millaa Millaa is not classified as an area which is cold enough to have heaters installed in the school, I ask the Government to reconsider installing heaters. The town of Millaa Millaa is situated in the clouds, so to speak, literally, and it has moist, cold days for a large part of the year. The children suffer from those conditions. In this day and age they deserve better treatment. I appeal to the Government to install heaters. When my electorate included the upper Barron area, which is now in the Tablelands electorate, I was successful in an application to have heaters installed in the Upper Barron State School. Mr Speaker is nodding his head. At that stage, he was the Minister who obviously gave approval, for which I thank him. A similar need exists at the Millaa Millaa school. Both areas have similar problems. The mere fact that they are both in north Queensland does not mean that the schools do not deserve heaters. I ask that heaters be installed.

Mr Davis interjected.

Mr MENZEL: That is not my electorate. I am sure that the honourable member can adequately look after his own electorate without my help.

It is my duty to make some comments about the Fitzgerald inquiry. I am all for cleaning up corruption; the sooner the better. However, there has been a trial by media and trial by hearsay. Many people who have been named in hearsay evidence or otherwise have been virtually sentenced by the media through their names being splashed across newspapers and TV screens for months and months, yet they have not been charged with any offence. The next time that the Government sets up an inquiry, hearsay evidence should be banned from publication until it is proved to be correct. That is a civil liberty that should be granted to all persons. It is my view that, because of that media coverage, the inquiry did start off on the wrong foot. However, I assume that it was done on purpose.

It is wrong for people to be named in hearsay evidence at an inquiry when they cannot defend themselves. I agree that direct evidence should be made public. I agree that, if someone is tried and convicted in court proceedings, it is all right for that to be made public. However, I believe that hearsay evidence is another matter. That is a different set of circumstances.

I will return to matters affecting my electorate. The far-north Queensland region is developing at a fast rate. Much overseas money is coming in. The Federal Government allows that to happen. It is not the State Government but the Federal Government that is allowing people from overseas, mainly the Japanese, to invest money in Cairns.

I am not against the Japanese buying land in north Queensland. I believe in free enterprise. There are arguments for and against it. However, it is the Federal Government that is allowing Japanese money into Cairns, as well as the Gold Coast——

Mr Davis: Are you against it?

Mr MENZEL: I did not say that I was against it, but I can understand why some people are concerned.

There is plenty of land available for purchase in north Queensland. Bramston Beach is a beautiful spot. Plenty of Crown land is available there for residential development. I know that the Government is considering the matter and intends to open up that land. However, many young married couples or couples intending to marry who want their own house block so that they can build their own “castle”—their own little house—are finding that land is getting beyond an affordable price range.

It is the dream and the right of all Australians to own their own home. Therefore, I ask that the Government open up much more land at Bramston Beach, where a great deal of land is available. There is a great demand for it. I believe that the Government should expedite the opening up of that land.

Mr Comben: It would make a good national park.

Mr MENZEL: I do not think that anyone wants that land to be made national park. There are national parks everywhere in that region. People want a quarter-acre allotment on which to build their own little house. That is only right. I do not know that the member for Windsor would want to forgo his house and land so that it could be turned into national park.

I do not think that people should adopt a selfish attitude. Everybody should be able to have land available at an affordable price on which to build his own little house. That is important to people. I think that that is the right of the citizens of Australia.

It is important that the Government consider all Crown land for residential development as soon as possible because there is a huge migration of people from the southern States to the Cairns region. The development that is taking place there is quite exciting. However, quarter-acre blocks of land and less are selling for between \$50,000 and \$100,000. It is ridiculous to expect anyone to afford a house after paying that amount of money for a block of land. People just cannot do it. Land sharks are just bleeding people who are desperate enough to pay these ridiculous prices.

The Hawke/Keating Government is allowing millions and millions of dollars worth of Japanese money to be invested in this country——

Mr Davis: Do you want it stopped?

Mr MENZEL: Obviously the honourable member for Brisbane Central is quite happy about the Japanese forcing up the land prices in this country. I know the opinion of the member for Brisbane Central. He is quite happy to see the price of land going up.

Another way in which the Federal Government demonstrates that it is against the small people is through its demand that the Federal Health Department approve any Government-subsidised prescribed drugs. That approval might take between four and six weeks. In that time, people could die. What about pensioners and others who cannot afford to pay for those drugs? The member for Brisbane Central is very quiet now. It is the little people who are suffering. Many people, particularly pensioners, need those drugs in order to survive. They are in a fragile state of health and they cannot afford to buy those drugs. They are told by Dr Blewett, "Tell the doctor to prescribe a cheaper drug while we decide whether or not you deserve the more expensive one." That is an absolute disgrace.

Once again the Federal Government has proved that it could not care less about small people. It pays them lip-service, but it really does not care about them. The poor people are suffering from the Federal Government's decision, not the millionaires—not the Alan Bonds, the Packers and all the other friends of the Labor Party. They are not suffering. They will pay the price if they need an important drug. However, poor people who need those drugs in a hurry cannot wait for between four and six weeks to receive possible permission.

Time expired.

Mr D'ARCY (Woodridge) (7.46 p.m.): In rising to speak to the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply, I wish to outline some of the problems that have been created by this National Party Government in the electorate of Woodridge. Queenslanders may think that the problems in Woodridge are unique. That is not true. The problems that are evident in Woodridge are endemic to Queensland. It should be noted that in Woodridge the problems are more prominent because the electors are severely disadvantaged by the gerrymander of this Government. Lack of a hospital, poor educational services, understaffed and overworked police, poor roads and non-existent public transport could just as well have been used as South Coast by-election issues or as complaints in any other populous electorate in Queensland.

Mr Austin interjected.

Mr D'ARCY: Those were the issues. I point out to the Minister that at some time I could go to his electorate and find out from the people what the issues are. They would be the same issues as are raised anywhere else in Queensland. Although the issues are exactly the same, the Minister has not even managed to pork-barrel in his populous electorate.

Mr Comben interjected.

Mr D'ARCY: As my colleague the shadow Health Minister pointed out, the nurses in the Nambour Hospital have a bone to pick with the Minister.

The effect of the gerrymander is not just to disfranchise Queenslanders who are deprived of their democracy. Queenslanders no longer have an honest Government. It is a corrupt Government that has deliberately deceived them by depriving them of money that they pay in taxation. More people in Woodridge pay more car registration, electricity accounts, pay-roll tax, boat and trailer registration, fire levies and stamp duties than those in the electorate of Roma and most other National Party electorates. That is theft by corruption.

The Government, led by Mr Ahern, continues to promise Logan City a hospital. It is supposed to be in next week's Budget, but I believe that the Government does not intend to deliver the promises that have been made by the member for Springwood in this House and to the electorate on behalf of the Government when he was big-noting himself. It will be very interesting to see how he gets on after the Budget and how he defends some of the decisions. He will be one of the first casualties of the failure of the National Party in metropolitan areas.

The Expo rent hike was first noticed in electorates such as Woodridge. In the last 12 months, rentals for ordinary two and three-bedroom homes have risen from round the \$75 to \$80 a week mark to about \$130 a week. That has placed a severe strain on local resources. Cities such as Logan and its surrounding areas are developing very rapidly. Over the last three years the population of the electorate of Woodridge has increased by about 20 000. The people in the electorate of Woodridge are the poor cousins in the provision of housing. Problems have been created by the Queensland Government because of the rapid expansion of Logan City, which now has its own suburbs, where only poorly developed services have been provided. People have been allowed to move into those areas before proper services were provided. The problem is magnified manyfold by a shortage of housing in those areas.

Woodridge was once regarded as the cheaper housing belt, but it is now beyond the means of the average working family. The Housing Commission has not been able to cope with the sudden change from reasonably short rental lists. People are now being told not to bother applying for accommodation. Six months, 12 months, three years or even up to six years are the periods that are being quoted to people who ask about waiting times for housing.

Vacancies in emergency housing, which were applied for prior to Expo, have been filled. Many church groups in the Woodridge area were given emergency housing, and that decision by the Minister for Housing was applauded. The rise in the rent subsidy from \$30 to \$50 per week is so restrictive that it keeps most working class families and others out of the market.

People are desperate for accommodation. As a last resort people are moving into areas such as Woodridge and other outer suburbs. The next step is caravan parks, which have been filled during Expo, or cars, back yards and tents. We tend to think that this type of thing does not happen in Australia. However, it certainly does happen, because people are being forced by this Government into accommodation of that type.

The gerrymander in Queensland is such that the people of my electorate do not have an opportunity to express their concerns. They pay more and more in taxes but are not provided with adequate services. The police in the area are overworked beyond comprehension. Recently I received a letter from the Police Minister saying virtually that he was not interested in the problem. In answer to the problem of juvenile crime in the area, Mr Gunn said, "The matter of juvenile violence in the Woodridge area is under control." I would like him to speak with the local police, because they do not believe that it is under control. I am not sure who writes Mr Gunn's letters these days, but he is far out of touch with reality. After all, Mr Gunn was the Minister for Police during the period within which the Fitzgerald inquiry is uncovering problems. Obviously he was as blind to the problems then as he is to the present ones.

The police in my electorate are understaffed and overworked. They cannot cope with the crime rate or live up to the public's expectations of them in that regard and are unable to provide the necessary services. The problems have been foisted upon them by this Government.

A fairly long article written by Ken Blanch appeared in this week's *Sunday Mail*. As far as Logan City and Woodridge are concerned, it was a very disappointing article because it outlined a series of problems and painted a picture of despair without giving answers to the problems. It was almost as if Mr Blanch had got his information from Ministers who were either not interested in the problems of the area or had given up.

Although a large number of socio-economic problems can be fixed by Governments—and will be fixed by a Labor Government—there are answers to some of the problems. If the Government took the opportunity to implement some economic policies to encourage youth employment and introduced technological changes into areas such as Woodridge and Logan City, many of the problems could be addressed instead of being swept under the carpet.

Because it is based on a small-business premise, the area is quite exciting. Most of its businesses involve four or five men and are reasonably innovative. Many of them fail because there is not enough support and infrastructure at a governmental and local government level. The population of the area is growing rapidly. As a result, it is an exciting area in which young families can live.

I turn now to another serious problem which exists in the area, for which this Government and the Premier stand condemned. I refer to the bungling of the toxic waste problem in Diamond Street, Kingston. Over 12 months ago the black sludge that was oozing under people's homes was tested by the Health Department, whose report proved that the substances were toxic and had originated from material dumped in the shafts of disused gold mines. When I saw Mr Ahern, the then Health Minister, he was deeply concerned. He promised to visit the area and he promised immediate action. In the year that has passed, despite his great moral concern, Mr Ahern has not visited the site or even the area. No action has been taken. The people of Kingston could have saved the political pollsters in this State a great deal of time and money by predicting the trade mark of the Ahern Government—it is weak and indecisive.

In the case of the toxic waste dump at Kingston, although the Government has called for bureaucratic report after bureaucratic report and scratched around in the dirt, it has done nothing. Even the Logan City Council saw the magnitude of the problem and acquired five of the most affected properties. The people involved are not interested in the legal argument about who is responsible; they are not interested in the history of who did what. There lies a tale of greed, deceit and sheer incompetence.

The people in the area want action from the Ahern Government to remove the waste from the affected shafts and areas. Is it too much for the citizens of Queensland to ask that their Government, which was elected by them and which has already accepted the moral if not the legal responsibility, take some action? I wonder how a member of this House or Mr Ahern himself would react if his family had to live on top of a toxic waste dump which had, as this one has, the potential to cause serious health problems.

I would like to raise two other points in relation to this matter. The first relates to the possibility of the shafts containing PCBs. According to some reports that have been produced, PCBs were dumped in 44-gallon drums by an oil company, a mining company and even the Government itself. Because of the corrosion of the drums and the pollution of the large water-table that runs under the site, horrific problems could occur. The Kingston problem would then assume massive proportions for the whole of south-east Queensland.

The second point relates to the sheer and utter incompetence of the performance of the Health Minister, Mrs Harvey. Because of her inability to understand the magnitude of the toxic waste problem, she tried to turn it into a political issue instead of what it really is, namely, an environmental issue that has moral obligations for the Government. Even the Premier, Mr Ahern, in all the meetings I have had with him, understood and respected the people and the problem. My complaint against him is that of his inaction. But Mrs Harvey has lied, cheated and deceived the people of Kingston. If ever there was a case to sack any Minister, it is——

Mrs HARVEY: I rise to a point of order. I take offence at the member opposite misleading this House and using unparliamentary language. I ask him to withdraw all those statements.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Row): Order! I ask that the honourable member withdraw the words that he used, namely, "lied", "cheated" and any other words that

were used. I made a ruling earlier that similar words should be withdrawn. I have given a direction; the honourable member will withdraw the words.

Mr D'ARCY: I withdraw.

If ever there was a case for sacking a Minister, it exists over her handling of this sensitive issue. From this issue also rises——

Mrs Harvey: How do you know? You have been ducking for cover the whole time. Where were you when I went out to Kingston?

Mr D'ARCY: I am glad that the Minister entered the Chamber. I was not going to mention this, but I will refer to a couple of her other faux pas.

Today when I was at one of the leading hospitals in Brisbane, one of its senior doctors said what a disgrace the Minister was. He pointed out to me two cases, one in relation to what Mr Comben has already raised, the other in relation to her visit to the AIDS council conference in Hobart. I did not intend raising those matters, but as the Minister has come into the Chamber, I will do so. I believe that the Deputy Director of Health has asked her delegation for a report, which she has virtually refused to give him. That has occurred even though it was an AIDS council-funded conference and the Minister organised the delegates from the Health Department. It was partly funded by Commonwealth Government money. Perhaps in the Federal House some questions could be asked about her attitude to a dollar-for-dollar subsidy. The same doctors point out that when she recently had a holiday with her family in north Queensland, approximately five limousines were ordered by the Health Department to cart her family around.

Mrs HARVEY: I rise to a point of order. Mr Deputy Speaker, the member is deliberately misleading the House. I have had no holidays with my family for five years, and I have never hired limousines to drive anybody around, let alone my family. I think what the member opposite is saying is absolutely disgraceful.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The Minister has made her point.

Mr Prest interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I warn the member for Port Curtis under Standing Order 123A. I am dealing with a point of order and the honourable member has no right to interject.

Mr Prest interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Does the honourable member want to leave the Chamber? He will do so very shortly.

Mr Prest: It is up to you, Mr Deputy Speaker.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member may leave the Chamber.

Whereupon the honourable member for Port Curtis withdrew from the Chamber.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: I now ask the member for Woodridge to withdraw that last comment. The Minister has denied it, and I have already asked the honourable member to desist.

Mr D'ARCY: I will withdraw that comment, Mr Deputy Speaker. I was reporting what is well rumoured among medical circles in Brisbane. The Minister has set up such a reputation that anything can be said and believed by serious medical practitioners at leading hospitals in Brisbane.

Mrs Harvey interjected.

Mr D'ARCY: It went much further, but I will not go on with this because it is not worth it. The Minister's attitude to her responsibilities and to the people of Queensland,

and the way that she has flouted the trust of the people of Queensland, are quite unbelievable. I should have brought into Parliament a memo that one of the departmental officers leaked, showing what the Minister is now allowed to handle. The Minister is virtually in the nursery brigade; she is in the play-pen. These days, she is only allowed to answer correspondence from members of Parliament, evidently. Officers of the department have the Minister totally under control.

These are two other points I wish to raise in relation to the Kingston matter I mentioned earlier. The first point relates to the possibility that the shafts contain PCBs. The second point is the most important problem regarding the overall situation. It is important that this Government and this Parliament introduce necessary legislation—if the present Government does not do it, a Labor Government will—to cover disposal of toxic waste in Queensland so that all future Queenslanders will be protected and problems that have occurred in Kingston cannot occur again. Legislation is absolutely essential because this State has no adequate laws to deal with toxic waste disposal for the whole of the State. Queensland has no adequate laws that can be abided by in local authorities and by councils throughout Queensland. It is absolutely essential that this State learns from the problem that has arisen in Kingston.

The local council knew about the problem at Kingston and knew that the dumping had been carried out, because the council had organised it. It had written to me as the member for Woodridge and, following many requests that I had made, told me that the land would remain open parkland. However, when I visited the area in recent times, I found that a housing estate was scattered all over the land. A local newspaper reported that when the mayor was a member of the Albert Shire Council, he actually moved a resolution that the development of that estate should go ahead on that site.

When the Government eventually grasps the nettle, it will cost the people of Queensland probably in excess of \$1m to solve this problem. It is a disgrace that no laws exist in this State to cover the disposal and use of toxic waste material.

Another problem that must be addressed relates to legislation that should be introduced to make it compulsory for local authorities to list all problems associated with properties on the relevant search documents. It emerged in the Kingston area that many properties affected by toxic waste were sold to interstate buyers who were totally unaware of the problem of toxic waste material, despite the fact that solicitors had carried out council searches. It is essential that that problem is addressed, because at present searches that are carried out at local authority offices in connection with the sale of property are a sheer waste of time.

I now wish to address what I regard as the most serious shortcoming of the Queensland Government in Queensland's developmental period over the last 15 to 20 years. In recent times, many top environmentalists and scientists have visited Australia. Some of them have charged Queenslanders with the total rape of the Queensland environment. I am not what one would regard as a raving greenie or one who supports the whole case, but throughout my time in this Parliament I have looked seriously at the environmental issues facing Queensland. Australia as a whole has a lot to be ashamed of in its 200 years of Western civilisation, but over the last few decades, Queensland in particular and its National Party Government have the worst record of any State.

Dr David Suzuki recently accused Australians of "mindless reaping" of our national resources. He stated—

"Modern Australia is an ecological disaster, characterised by a squalid history of greed, shortsightedness and ignorance."

Another observer, the British naturalist Dr David Bellamy, spoke of the enormous environmental disruption in this country which, he said—

"... bore a strong resemblance to the devastation of famine-torn Ethiopia."

Many times recently has Australia been described as a Third World country.

I turn now to one particular issue relating to Australia's coastal lands. One could easily talk about the desert lands and the problems of encroachment, salinity, the sub-artesian and artesian bores in this State and the failure of this Government to look at the overall development of these lands. I do not have time to do that. The area that is probably regarded as Queensland's most precious is its long and narrow coastline. It is Queensland's greatest natural asset and treasure and should be kept for future generations. Years ago in this Parliament I advocated the protection and use of the mangrove areas. This Government has slaughtered the mangrove areas of Queensland at a rapid rate by allowing greedy developers to merely con Government departments.

In the early 1970s the Director of Fisheries, a Mr G. Harrison, was a member of several committees. At the time it was proven that one acre of mangrove swamp was worth 80 acres of the most fertile land on earth in regard to its reproductive capacity. In Queensland many studies have been carried out, some of them by the Government itself, into the mangrove areas.

I wish to refer to a report issued in 1974 by the working committee on long-term planning of the area between Jumpinpin bar and the Nerang River bridge. It was compiled by the then Director of the Department of Harbours and Marine, Mr A. J. Peel, who is quite famous in this Parliament. Mr Harrison was on that committee at that time together with many others, and the Minister at the time was Neville Hewitt. The recommendations of that committee were quite extensive and covered an area which now, some 20 years later, has been completely despoiled. The committee's recommendations—none of which were adhered to by this Government—were as follows—

“The Committee considers that as many islands as possible be retained in their natural state with as little development as possible.

All existing Vacant Crown Land areas of islands should be retained as ‘Public Open Space’ . . .”

That is a joke today when one considers what this Government did to the Coomera River at Sanctuary Cove. There were acres and acres of mangroves and prawn-breeding grounds along that river. Michael Gore got hold of the area, ripped out the mangroves and put bulldozers through. That is typical of the attitude.

These recommendations were made by an intergovernmental committee, and the report goes on to state—

“The Committee considers it desirable that as much land as possible be reserved along the waterfront to enable the greatest possible public enjoyment of the waterfront land as well as to ensure public access to the waters of Moreton Bay and adjacent rivers and creeks at all points in the region.

The Department of Primary Industries also considers that it is desirable to control waterfront land for pollution abatement purposes.”

It goes on at great length and mentions the Gold Coast and Southport Spit, which today are nothing but concrete jungles.

In its conclusion the report says—

“The tidal fringes of islands and the sand banks between Jumpinpin Bar and the Nerang River Bridge are generally unstable and fragile and would require special protection from ocean breakthrough if developed for real estate purposes.”

That is exactly what has happened in that area. Land that is worth between \$30m and \$50m has been developed from land sold by the Government for a pittance—for a few thousand dollars. The mangroves, which were the natural fish-breeding habitat, have been destroyed. Queensland has no planned development of its shoreline. That is what I am arguing for: planned development.

At any given region along the coast developers have got in and bought a bit of freehold land and then managed to con one Government department into giving them approval for something. Then it is like the domino theory. They go to another Government department, whether it be Primary Industries or Local Government, or to a Minister

and get approval for something else. Then they go to the next department or Minister and say, "Look, I have approval to do this on my block of land. I want an approval to do something else." I am glad that the Minister for Local Government, Mr Randell, is in the House. He could speak about some of the approvals that he has granted for development on Fraser Island.

One co-ordinating committee should have studied the sites along the Queensland coast and planned the development with the co-operation of all the relevant departments. However, this State has had the crazy situation of developers ruling the roost by organising the National Party. It has been a disgrace.

The other day I was at the mouth of the Mary River and found that about 40 acres of mangroves have been bulldozed. There will be no development; the company that was to build the marina has gone broke. However, the bulldozers are still knocking down the mangroves. In this State it used to be a crime to knock down mangroves. I think that the statute-book provides that it still is a crime. However, that does not matter to developers such as the Gores, the Williamses and the others. Keith Williams is a personal friend of mine, but I tell honourable members that they could sit with him and argue with him about the use of mangroves and he will try to convince them, against all the available scientific information, that mangroves are useless.

Over the last 20 years all the scientific information in the possession of every Minister of this Government must have been passed on by Keith Williams, because that is what they believe, that the mangroves in this State are useless. They are our greatest wealth. There is nothing wrong with development along the coast. However, if it was done properly, Government departments would have a co-ordinating body that would pick out the land that would be approved for development, ensuring that the natural beauty remained. What is occurring now is an absolute disgrace. Queensland will end up with a biological desert along its coast. I have here an article from the tourism section of the *Courier-Mail* headed " 'Resorts threaten gamefishing'—scientists' warning to State", which states—

"At least 70 percent of the commercial species of fish, crabs and prawns depend on mangroves for their existence."

That is true. Mangroves are the basis of the chain, yet I do not know that this Government, whenever it has approved development, has ever asked that one acre of mangroves, or even one tree, be retained or replanted. Once an area of mangroves has been destroyed, it is almost impossible to have it re-established. In most areas, such as on the Gold Coast, sand has been pushed over the mangroves.

I see that the member for Southport has just entered the Chamber. The destruction that has been caused in the Southport area has been caused by this Government. That development had not taken place 20 years ago. The development has occurred against every piece of information available and against every single report that the Government has commissioned. I advise the member for Southport and the other members who represent the Gold Coast to get a copy of the report that was written in 1974 on the long-term planning of the area between Jumpinpin bar and the Nerang River bridge. They have probably never seen it. It is a vital document. Since 1974 not one tenet of that document has not been broken by this Government. It has ignored every recommendation and raped the area in a greedy passion to help sheer incompetent developers.

Mr BEARD (Mount Isa—Deputy Leader of the Liberal Party) (8.15 p.m.): It has been a great year for Queensland since the first session of Parliament with the Bicentenary being celebrated in Queensland, particularly Expo, the visit of the Queen and other notables. On behalf of the people of Mount Isa, I place on record what great pride we feel for the Expo that has been conducted in Queensland this year. I have accompanied one or two of the bush kids who have come from the outback to see Expo. It has been wonderful to see their reaction to it. However, behind the great Expo and the great celebrations of our Bicentenary, a number of things are really worrying the people of Queensland. I have spent a great deal of time attempting to find out their real concerns.

Heading them all are the economy and unemployment, lack of Government accountability and poor Government credibility, law and order, health, education, transport and communications.

From time to time, emotional issues such as immigration, land ownership and heritage legislation steal the headlines and dominate them for some time. However, those things, serious as they are—to be dealt with at another time and in another place—do not affect the ordinary person in the street in his everyday life to nearly the same extent as those others I have just mentioned. The economy is at the background of our whole lives, and the management of the economy is the major and primary duty of Government. When it fails us, it really gets us into strife. It is largely a Federal issue, but this State also has a responsibility for managing the economy of the State.

The Federal Budget was released a short while ago. I am happy to say that the Federal Treasurer is going to use the \$5.5 billion surplus to repay some of Australia's debt, because that overseas debt, and the fact that we are living beyond our means, worries me more than just about anything else in this country at the moment. However, I would like to let the Federal Treasurer know, along with all the other people who have let him know, that it is the average middle class tax-payer who is paying that \$5.5 billion. An average middle class tax-payer in Australia nowadays means most of the working people. It can be called fiscal drag, bracket creep or whatever one likes, but with wages increasing at an average of 6 per cent and with more increases to come in September and in 1989, those people are moving into higher and higher tax brackets. So Australia's total tax revenue next year will rise by 9.9 per cent compared with an inflation rate of 4.5 per cent, and income tax will increase by 13.6 per cent. The average Australian is far worse off, and getting worse off all the time, yet he is providing that surplus which, as I say, rightly is being used to reduce Australia's overseas debt.

I will mention a couple of other initiatives in the Budget. Most people are pleased to see a reduction in beer prices. In particular, I was pleased to see a reduction in the price of low-alcohol beer. It is high time that the shocking excise on that product was reduced and people were encouraged to choose low-alcohol beer, which will reduce alcoholism, the road toll and everything else. However, I question the priorities of a Government that puts the price of beer ahead of reducing the excise on petrol. Petrol affects everyone in this life—drinkers and teetotallers alike. When I live in a city in which I buy petrol for 66.9 cents a litre and I know that 37 cents of that is excise and I see so little of it coming back in the form of roads or road maintenance, I wonder where the Federal Government's priorities lie.

Another feature of the Budget is that hundreds of millions of dollars in defence contracts were awarded in Australia which almost totally ignore Queensland, as the ALP Government in Canberra plays get square with the National Party Government in Queensland, which spends all its time fighting with the Federal Government. But the total ignoring of Queensland is perhaps reflected also in the factional fights within the ALP which see a New South Wales parliamentarian replacing Bill Hayden as he leaves the Ministry, so that Queensland is left with very, very junior representation indeed in the Federal Cabinet—a total ignoring by our friends in Canberra of one of the two major wealth-producing States of this nation.

Our friends in Canberra in the ALP have formed in many important matters an unholy alliance with the National Party Government in this State. I talk about regulation and deregulation. The classic example was legislation passed in this House on 26 April this year which effectively nationalised the pipeline grid in this State. It did that in alliance with the ALP. Now we are looking at a situation in which potential major industrial users of industrial gas in this State are not ready, willing or able to sign contracts to commit themselves to using gas because they will not have any control over the tariffs that will be charged for moving that gas. Grand announcements are made such as the one about a \$100m pipeline being built in Gladstone to tap the Surat Basin and the Denison Trough. Of the 15 or 16 petajoules of potential gas consumption in

Gladstone, 13 petajoules will be used by QAL, if and when it agrees to sign a contract with the State Government to use that gas.

What large potential consumer of gas in this State would sign a contract with this Government, having regard to its record for hijacking profits from the railway lines which transport our coal to the coast—

Mr FitzGerald: Does anyone use electricity in this State?

Mr BEARD: I am talking about gas, and I am talking about companies that want to switch to gas, that want to use gas, but will not accept a contract with this Government.

There is a possibility of major superphosphate-fields being developed in the west, and of Mount Isa expanding its power-generating capability. However, what company will agree to sit on the end of a pipeline owned and controlled by this Government, with tariffs set by this Government? The record of this Government is so shocking that they just will not be in it. I repeat: the ALP and the National Party formed an unholy alliance to pass that legislation in this Parliament.

I turn now to the great tragedy in this State at present, that is long-term unemployment, particularly amongst younger people. I must ask: is the dole—unemployment benefits—without any controls the answer to this problem?

Recently some initiatives have been taken, to which I pay tribute. The Queensland Government is to be applauded for talking about setting up free trade zones and enterprise zones in this State. I hope that the Government goes ahead with them, and the sooner the better. The Government has to come to grips with the unemployment problem, which completely alienates our youth, particularly our indigenous youth.

Accountability is something about which honourable members have heard a great deal since the former Premier left this Parliament at the end of last year and this State got a new Government led by Mr Ahern. Much has been heard about the long-promised—long-deferred, I should say—public accounts committee to be established in this State. So far that is all that has happened—much has been heard about it. When will a public accounts committee be set up? When will it begin operations? I am still waiting to see it. Queensland still does not have a public accounts committee—

Mr Alison interjected.

Mr BEARD: Let the Government bring it in.

When accountability is mentioned in this State, honourable members see the arrogance of power. It has been mentioned time and time again, so I will not go on about it.

Honourable members witness the untrammelled use of Government aircraft. They see individual and personal expenses being paid by Government departments. Honourable members cannot even marvel at the audacity of someone knocking off \$2m or \$3m, they have to witness what I call the grubbiness of people taking \$50, \$60 and \$70 from Government departments to pay personal expenses.

Gags and guillotines are still being used in this Parliament to force through legislation, effectively disfranchising many people in this State who are represented by members who want to speak on legislation but cannot. Honourable members witness the use of Government funds for advertising in relation to the referendum. Honourable members see a former Cabinet Minister who represented the South Coast talking about electorate-rigging.

These things do not happen just in Queensland. There is a malaise in this country on the part of Governments which may have been in power too long, which get some sense of invulnerability and think that they can continue to do what they like. In New South Wales a former Labor Cabinet Minister is in gaol. One, who is now deceased—I therefore will not mention his name—was widely reported as abusing his power as a Cabinet Minister in the Labor Government of New South Wales.

Honourable members see things that might even be termed trivial. They see Keating's expenses and accommodation claims. They see him travelling to Hong Kong on an expired passport. In itself, that is a fairly trivial thing. However, it demonstrates the attitude of the man. He is not subject to the same laws as ordinary people. I do not travel to Hong Kong on an expired passport. I do not take these things for granted.

Honourable members see resignations of Federal Cabinet Ministers who leave under a cloud. They see funds given to the Labor Government during the last Federal election campaign. At the very time that that Government was demanding to lock up the forest in north Queensland, it was accepting donations from a Japanese-owned woodchip company and not reporting those donations but diverting them into its own little slush fund somewhere else. The first point is accepting the donation; the second point is the sheer hypocrisy of taking it; and the third point is lying about it and locking it up. Such behaviour leads to public cynicism, political apathy and complete loss of credibility in Government. We have seen members such as the newly elected Independent member for Barambah enter Parliament on a Citizens Electoral Council platform because people are becoming more and more disenchanted with political parties that abuse power.

The subject of law and order is one that troubles every person in Australia at the moment. The Fitzgerald commission is peeling away layer after layer and is showing how deeply entrenched in our State this corruption is. Queensland is not the only State that has corruption. I commend the Government once again for at least having the Fitzgerald commission. Let us see what would happen in the other States if they had such an inquiry. As those layers are peeled away and more and more senior people in the Police Department are named and the shadow falls closer and closer to the members of the Government or members of Parliament, one despairs whether we will ever get the corruption cleaned up and get back to living in the decent country in which we all thought we lived.

This has led to complete demoralisation in the police force. Young policemen I know are feeling alienated from the public. They are feeling abused and spat upon because they are being lumped in with the criminals at the top of the force who abused their trust, betrayed the trust of their friends and comrades and their support in the police force.

The police force's morale is not helped at all by the budgetary constraints placed upon it by the State Government. As the crime rate rises all round the State, there are hardly any policemen on the beat. There are insufficient police cars to do the job. One hears about members of the mobile squad who have to spend a whole shift sitting in their office because the car that they normally drive is being serviced and a spare car is not available for them to do their eight-hour shift. One hears about police in mobile squads going out on shift in their car with only one torch or no torch at all. Police officers are expected to pursue criminals in the dark without a torch.

Police do not have the benefits of modern aids that police have overseas. Overtime has been refused and police stations are closed. While that is happening, the incidence of crime against the person, crime against the home, crime against the family and crime against cars is increasing. The four things that affect people most in everyday life are their own personal safety and that of their family, their home and their car. It has become almost inevitable now that if a person lives long enough, he will have his car stolen and probably damaged or stripped.

In Sydney now, a person wonders not whether his home will be burgled, but when and how often. That is something that is starting to creep into Queensland.

Assault on the person is increasing. Nowadays, how many people are game to walk round parts even of Brisbane? A few years ago, a person could do that. We must increase the police budget and get morale back into the police force to let police officers know that they are a valued part of society and that we rely on them. And for Heaven's sake, when they do go out and catch some of these criminals and when these criminals do appear before the judiciary, let us have no more of this smacking on the wrist and saying, "Be a good boy", and no more bonds for a couple of years and a couple of

hundred hours' community service. Let some of the young hoon who habitually steal cars—not one, two, three or four, but 30, 40 or 50—and who break into numerous homes night after night be put away so that they cannot continue to do that. They will then see that there is no profit in it.

Mr Lee: Even the police were helping them, too, don't forget.

Mr BEARD: The member for Yeronga, unfortunately in respect of one or two isolated examples, has a good point.

When those persons are put away in prison, let us look at where we are putting them. Recently I read in the newspaper about a chap who was gaoled for stealing a car. He said, "I went in knowing one way to steal a car. I came out knowing five different ways to steal them." I commend Mr Cooper, who very early in his tenure initiated an inquiry by Mr Kennedy into the prison system. That must be done. For Heaven's sake, whatever Mr Kennedy recommends, let this Government give the department the money to improve prisons. In my opinion, there is absolutely no reason why young people who are put in gaol overnight for trivial offences, or first offenders, should be subjected to the threat of rape, assault or, on occasions, even murder within a gaol. If we cannot at least protect young prisoners from the long-term hard cases in gaols, where are we as a civilisation?

I will mention health briefly. I will leave the major subject to my colleague Mr Sherlock, the Liberal Party's Health spokesman, who will refer to that matter. As I come from a remote location, I must draw the attention of the House to the fact that in many western hospitals and, for all I know, in many northern hospitals in isolated parts of the State, insufficient staff are available to run an effective hospital system.

Mount Isa has a beautifully equipped hospital. The Mount Isa Base Hospital is one of the best equipped hospitals in the State, but it is underutilised. From my observation, the major reason for that is that it seems that there are just not enough experienced doctors there to run the place properly. That is not the fault of the doctors who are there. They are doing a wonderful job. They are working incredible hours, they are working under incredible pressure and they are not being paid nearly enough. What we have at that hospital is a whole series of doctors coming to the hospital with one, two, three, four or five years' experience and dealing with cases that they need to refer to colleagues for a second opinion and assistance.

Somehow or other we have to come to grips with the shortage of medical staff in this State and the problems that prevent doctors who might otherwise be willing to serve in the west of the State from going out there. What is wrong with them? Is it too soft in the cities? It is too tough in the west? Are they too well paid in the cities? Are we not paying them enough in the west? What are the reasons? What are the problems? There used to be a sense of adventure in this country. People used to want to work in remote locations.

Mrs Nelson: Do you know that they went out west in the past because they were bonded to go?

Mr BEARD: Whatever the reason, I do not like bonds. Somehow or other the west must be made attractive enough to people so that they want to go there.

One of the reasons for the lack of willingness in many people to go and work in the west is the iniquitous fringe benefits tax, which was introduced under the pretext of knocking off the fat cats in the cities who were having three-hour lunches and driving Volvos. Because of the way in which this Federal Government administered the fringe benefits tax in 1986, potential employers in remote locations have been prevented from making those locations attractive enough for people to want to live and work in the west.

As a personnel officer for 20 years with a major employer in western Queensland, I know what I am talking about. I was engaged on five overseas trips to recruit staff from southern Africa and the United Kingdom to work in Mount Isa. The engineers

who were graduating in Sydney and Melbourne were not interested in going to Mount Isa. Where is the great Australian sense of adventure that used to exist? It is no longer there. By introducing ill-conceived, maladministered and dishonestly marketed fringe benefits taxes, the Federal Government has not helped the situation.

There are a couple of other points relating to health which I will leave to my colleague Mr Sherlock. As to education—once again I must mention remote locations. I thank the present Government for the fact that finally, after years and years, the Kalkadoon State High School and the Barkly Highway Pre-school are to be air-conditioned. That still leaves the Camooweal State School, which lies on the very fringe of this State, to be air-conditioned. I will not rest until that has been achieved, together with the air-conditioning of the Central Pre-school in Mount Isa and the Mount Isa college of TAFE. In the climate in which we live and work in Mount Isa air-conditioning should be standard. It should not have to be argued or fought for; it should be installed when a building is erected.

I pay tribute to Mr Littleproud, the Minister for Education, who heeded my constant calls for the appointment of a speech therapist in Mount Isa, which was without one for approximately 2½ years. Until now nothing could be done for those 130 children who had been recommended for speech therapy. I believe that the Minister worked as hard as I did in endeavouring to appoint a speech therapist in Mount Isa.

The Federal Government has shown its complete ignorance of what makes this country run in the west. On 1 January 1989 a means test on assets will be introduced for Austudy assistance. As a result, the people who live and work in the west of the State, battling for a living under the most adverse circumstances, and who happen to own a farm, a cattle property or something else, the value of which might be several hundred thousand dollars but the income-generation from which is quite minute by city standards, will be means tested on the value of those assets to determine whether their children can be given Austudy, particularly when those children are required to attend boarding-schools. That represents the complete lack of understanding of the Labor Government in Canberra of where the machine of this nation is. It is certainly not in Canberra. It is certainly not in Sydney or Melbourne. The machine that drives this country is out in the west where people are creating export incomes. Those people are being ignored and spat upon by the Federal Government, which does not understand what drives the whole country.

I am worried that at present Canberra is entering its third generation of public servants. There are public servants in Canberra whose fathers and grandfathers were public servants in Canberra. They went to school in Canberra, having been born there, and have grown up in a public service atmosphere. They think that Canberra is Australia. If I could be a dictator for a year or two, I would do something like making it compulsory for the public servants in Canberra to spend seven years somewhere else in order to learn what drives this country.

Mrs Nelson: Do you support Mr Tenni's referendum to sell it off to private enterprise?

Mr BEARD: Is the honourable member referring to Canberra?

Mrs Nelson: Yes.

Mr BEARD: That might be one of the best ideas that Mr Tenni has had all year.

I turn now to one of the biggest problems that is experienced by country children who are trying to obtain a tertiary education, namely, getting a satisfactory TE score. When it comes to obtaining a TE score, they suffer the same problems as the children who live in the cities suffer. It is one of the most traumatic experiences in the lives of parents as well as of children. In the bush, when students finally obtain their TE score, that is only step 1. Step 2 then starts. Where are they going to live while they attend a university or tertiary college? Where is the residential accommodation? About one in

five of the applicants to colleges is accepted. In some colleges it is one in three. Room is just not available.

A previous speaker referred to the effect of Expo on rents in Brisbane. With rents increasing, students cannot afford to live. No flats are available. I know of at least two cases in the last two years in which children from the west turned down the opportunity to attend university because suitable, safe and affordable residential accommodation with reasonable facilities could not be found for them. Until the Federal and State Governments grasp this nettle and say that they will help to provide residential accommodation for country children at tertiary institutions, it cannot be said that equality of educational opportunity exists in this country. It does not. That problem has to be faced. I certainly will not stop talking about it until it is faced.

In relation to transport and road-funding—thank you very much, Federal Government! It has effectively reduced road-funding by \$21m for this financial year.

Mr Ardill: You have a bitumen highway out there.

Mr BEARD: The honourable member is quite right. A few months ago the final link between Kynuna and Winton was bitumened and people can now drive on bituminised roads all around Australia. Let me tell honourable members something about those bitumen roads out there. I understand from engineers that roads are designed to have a life of about seven years. If that is the case, at any given time, one-seventh of the road networks in Australia should be under maintenance. Over the last 30 years I have driven extensively on the western and northern roads of this State, and if I can be convinced that at any given time one-seventh of those roads is under maintenance, I will walk from here to Bourke. The maintenance is just not being carried out. The roads are collapsing and falling to pieces. Unless the nettle is grasped shortly, those roads will be irretrievably lost and the whole process of building roads will have to be started again. Earlier I referred to the excise on petroleum of 37c a litre. Some of that should be put back into rebuilding and maintaining our roads.

I want to talk briefly about other aspects of transport. Years ago within this State, for very good reasons various bus companies were given contracts or licences to carry passengers intrastate. This encouraged them to build depots in towns such as Mount Isa and to put good buses on the run. I accept that that was a great thing. However, there has to be a sunset clause in that. People are now faced with the spectacle of waiting three or four days—sometimes a week—to get on a bus out of Mount Isa because only Pioneer and Greyhound are licensed to carry passengers intrastate, while McCafferty's and Deluxe buses pass through Mount Isa en route from Darwin or Alice Springs to Brisbane with empty seats. They are travelling interstate. They are not licensed to carry passengers intrastate. It is time that that regulation is taken out and the industry is deregulated, and, at least as step 1, McCafferty's and Deluxe, and any other bus companies that so desire, should be allowed to pick up the excess that Greyhound and Pioneer cannot handle. Down the line, step 2 would be complete deregulation so that the bus runs can become competitive.

Mount Isa has waiting-lists of up to 28 people wanting to catch a plane, as tourists in Darwin at the other end of the line fill up the plane. In order to travel on the Inlander to Townsville, one has to book three months ahead. The timetables on that route have been changed so that boarding-school children going back to school in Charters Towers or Townsville arrive in the middle of the night. Pensioners travelling to Townsville so they can change trains to go to Brisbane no longer link up with the Sunlander. Therefore, they are not able to buy a concession fare on the Sunlander. The Queenslander travels between Townsville and Brisbane and pensioners have to pay full fare on it. That means they have to spend overnight in Townsville or else pay the full fare on the Queenslander.

It seems to me that it is the old self-fulfilling prophecy. I have the distinct impression that the Railway Department is not very particular about carrying passengers on trains. It makes the service a little bit worse, then a little bit worse, then a little bit worse and

people gradually stop using it. The Railway Department eventually says, "No-one is using them. We will take the passenger services off." It is the old self-fulfilling prophecy.

Mr Ardill: And build the Gold Coast railway.

Mr BEARD: Yes, I will buy that.

It is up to the Governments of this nation to give people who live away from the main centres of population reliable, safe, regular, comfortable and quick transport, otherwise the time will come when no-one will be out there generating the nation's wealth and the export income on which we all rely. We will only have ourselves to blame for that.

I could go on about communications. Recently, Birdsville was supplied with an automatic telephone exchange. That was publicised very heavily. Beautiful! Thank you very much, Telecom. That is great! However, there are still people out there who do not have automatic telephone communications. We cannot sit back and rest on our laurels.

Our indigenous population in the west has a number of problems that have to be addressed. At present, I am trying to assist an Aboriginal group obtain funds from the Department of Community Services for a night shelter. A night shelter is a property that is staffed by trained people. Indigenous people who are alcoholics and have lost control of themselves can go there for a night instead of being arrested and taken to the police station and locked up, thereby generating hostility and enmity between the police and indigenous people. Instead, Aboriginal people can be directed to a night shelter where their own people will accept responsibility for guarding them under supervision during the night and for counselling them the next morning before release. At these night shelters, these people can get help for their alcoholism.

Alcoholism has become the great killer of Australia's native race. If members of Parliament stand by and let it happen, we stand condemned. For the life of me, I cannot understand why this State and this nation have not legislated to allow an emetic to be added to methylated spirits which would prevent its being consumed. In New Zealand, that has been done for years and years, yet in my electorate alone people have been killing themselves by drinking methylated spirits. Apart from that, there are all of the problems that make people drink methylated spirits. That is a hell of a big issue that must be faced one day, but at least the symptom can be dealt with. Let us put something in the methylated spirits that will prevent people from drinking it; otherwise, as honourable members stand back and allow people to do it, it is as bad as murder.

Unfortunately, the Federal Government thinks it can solve the problems of indigenous people by throwing money at them. That is not the correct solution to the problem. It needs a great deal more thought. I wish to give the House a simple example. In my home city, a successful small business was being operated by a woman and her husband. They worked very hard to build it up from nothing. Two or three competitors came into the same type of business but could not compete and dropped out of business—it is called free enterprise! This woman and her husband had a very successful business and they hired a lady of Aboriginal descent who was a top employee, a model worker. They could not speak highly enough of her. Our Federal counterparts in Canberra approached this woman and said, "Listen, you don't have to work for these people. We can help you set up your own business. There is a grant here of \$25,000 which you do not have to start to repay for six months. It is a low-interest loan and we will find you the premises. If you get staff, we will pay them under the CDEP for six months; you do not even have to pay them. You can go into business yourself. Furthermore, don't worry about the administration because we will look after that for you. We will help you with the book-keeping and everything else." The woman has gone into business. Who could resist it? Who blames her?

What happened to the enterprise that previously employed her? It is out of business. The net result to the city is nil. The city still has the small business that was providing the service that was required. One hard-working couple is out of business but a lady

now has a business that she did not have before. If interfering Federal bureaucrats want to help our indigenous brethren, they should come up to Queensland and find a need for a service that is not being met at the moment. They should look around and say, "Hey, this could be done here. I could help you. This town has not got this type of service yet. Let me help you to provide this service." If that were to happen, everyone would win. Indigenous people will not be assisted by destroying white businesses that have helped to train them in the first place. In Mount Isa alone, that has happened for the second time within the last three months.

Mount Isa also has a problem with the education of children. There are 100 full-time truants of primary school age. These Aboriginal children are full-time truants; they never go to school. Over several months, I have chaired meetings of interested people. Those meetings have been attended by concerned Aboriginal teachers and teacher aides and concerned white people. We cannot solve the problem. It is very difficult to get to the children because we cannot get to their parents. However, there are Aboriginal people in Mount Isa who are trained and who are willing to undertake the training of these children if only they can get the resources from the Government. I must ask the Minister for Education and the Minister for Community Services to look seriously at the provision of a bus to pick them up and of an indigenous truant officer who will counsel the children and help them get to school. Unless these children get to school and unless they are brought into the mainstream of Australian life by going through Australian schools, they will never properly enter Australian society. They will be as alienated as their parents are, and the problem will go on and on. Aboriginal people need self-help programs and not the efforts of a misguided Federal Government that thinks it can solve every problem by throwing money at it. The problem will not go away by doing that.

In the short time allotted to me, I have endeavoured to cover a number of problems that exist in my electorate, in this State and in this nation. Unless we, as members of Parliament, address these problems, we are not worthy of the money that is being paid to us.

Mr BOOTH (Warwick) (8.45 p.m.): In rising to speak to the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply to the Governor's Speech, I wish to pledge my loyalty and that of my constituents—although I do not think there was any doubt about it—to the Governor.

In his Speech, the Governor said that it had been an exciting year for Queensland. He mentioned Expo. The success of Expo surpassed even the most optimistic expectations. It has given the State a lift that was not predicted. Some people are crediting its success to only one, two or half-a-dozen people. The real story is that it has been a Queensland success, achieved by Queensland people, and the tax-payer footed the bill. It is quite foolish to suggest that the success of anything relies on one or two people alone. Expo has proved that Queenslanders as a combination can do a job. Its success has shown that Brisbane has come of age. It will be of great benefit to the city of Brisbane and to Queensland as a whole.

Surprisingly the Ekka was also reasonably successful. Perhaps I should say that under the circumstances it was very successful. This proves that the amount of money that is generated in this State cannot be as bad as some people would suggest. One cannot attend such events without having the wherewithal to pay. I attended both and thought that the people looked equally happy at both. The children appeared to prefer the Ekka. This was probably due to the presence of the animals and the different format. The grounds are not all concrete. There is a bit of grass around, although it was not very green. That surprised me because the grass is much greener up on the downs this year.

One should be a bit careful about heaping too much praise for success on one person and forgetting or denigrating all the other people who were in the team. I agree with the Governor that it has been an exciting year for Queensland. Nevertheless the

Queensland tax-payer had to foot the bill and there might be some back-wash when the party is over.

Mr Warburton: The Fitzgerald inquiry is almost as exciting.

Mr BOOTH: Yes. I was not going to speak about the Fitzgerald inquiry, but Queensland had to have the Fitzgerald inquiry. I do not agree that the Queensland Government should have run away from it. This Government has to face up to it and take it as it comes. I have not prepared a speech on the Fitzgerald inquiry. At this stage I will not knock the inquiry. The strokes can fall where they may.

I wish to speak about education and follow up one of the points made by the honourable member for Mount Isa. I agree with some of his statements about the field of education. He said some people think that as long as money is spent there will be success. I find this everywhere I go, particularly in the education debate. The President of the Queensland Teachers' Union, Mary Kelly, asks for another \$280m or \$490m, or any other figure she plucks out of the air. She never says a word about how it should be spent. Surely good management is one of the highest ideals in society and one has to manage one's money or resources to the best of one's ability.

I might be rubbished, but I was taught at a two-teacher school. A number of classes were taught by two teachers, who made an excellent job of it. They did not run around saying that they wanted more money or that another \$100,000 a year should be spent here or there. They got on with the job of educating us and they did a reasonable job.

Mr Stephan: A lot of one-teacher schools in Queensland do a good job.

Mr BOOTH: They still do in certain areas. Money alone will not solve everything. I agree with the honourable member for Mount Isa that one must look at how the money is spent. It must be remembered that money cannot be plucked out of thin air.

The electorate of Warwick has had a reasonable amount of money to spend on education. Occasionally the amount is not as much as one would like, but usually there is a good reason why the electorate cannot spend the money or find the people to spend it on. Warwick has had to wait for some months for the appointment of a speech therapist after the resignation of the previous speech therapist. Warwick has now appointed a speech therapist, who will start in a week's time. The problem has been overcome.

Perhaps the most exciting development in education in my electorate has been the erection of the TAFE college. It is an excellent building. I have no doubt that it will do a lot for Warwick. For a time Warwick had a great reputation as an education centre, but then it declined a little. However, it still has Scots College and the Slade School. The Catholic education system is fairly good, but it no longer goes to Year 12. The pupils are assimilated into the high school after Year 10, so there is no problem there.

I am a little disappointed with the courses initially being provided at the TAFE college. Because the college has commenced mid-year, the courses have to be short. Nevertheless, I am hoping that in the new year pre-vocational courses will be offered. Because in recent times—at least for the last 15 years—it has been difficult to make a livelihood from the land, I would like to see rural courses offered at the college. A person's chances on the land must be better if he is properly educated. The rural outlook is now slightly better. For that reason, people will again be showing an interest in the land.

I believe TAFE colleges should offer longer courses and diploma courses. I see no reason why they cannot offer diploma courses of two or three years' duration. That is done in other places in the world; why not in Australia? That might take a while to organise. Perhaps it cannot be done overnight, but the colleges should be capable of handling advanced courses.

For a number of years the idea seemed to be that tertiary institutions should be situated in capital cities or in large provincial cities and that, if a person wanted tertiary

education, he had to travel to one of those locations. If TAFE colleges in the smaller towns could offer diploma courses, many people would not have to travel to the larger centres. If a person can undertake a course in the town in which he lives, whether he lives with his parents or owns his own home, it is much cheaper. Much more could be done in that regard.

Hopefully from the commencement of next year the shearing course will be established at the Warwick TAFE college. There are some good and proper reasons for that. More sheep pass through the Warwick sale yards than through those of any other centre in Queensland, so plenty of people in the area should be able to volunteer to make their sheep available for people to gain practical, hands-on experience in sheep-shearing.

Mr Ardill: What about your association with Jacky Howe?

Mr BOOTH: That is right. There is a member of the Opposition telling me what I should be saying. Jacky was a famous guy. I have some interesting history for the member for Salisbury. Jacky Howe died the day before I was born. When he heard that I was coming, he must have thought that it was time to get out. Jacky is one of the stars of Warwick. The park that is named after him has a monument to him that is becoming quite famous. Nearly every day as I go to town I see people having their photographs taken in front of the Jacky Howe memorial. Some said that he lived too long ago and that people would never relive that sort of history. They were wrong. That memorial has been built and it is of great interest.

While I am speaking about the TAFE college, I shall say something about the Small Business Development Corporation, which should be playing a greater part in trying to institute more practical business courses than are run at TAFE colleges. If that is not practicable, it should co-operate with TAFE colleges to endeavour to establish that type of course. Often I speak to people aged between their early 30s and early 40s who have reasonably profitable small businesses but who are not quite satisfied with their results. They say to me that they wish they had gained more experience when they were young and had the opportunity of doing a course that would have helped them. The Small Business Development Corporation should liaise with TAFE colleges to see if such a course could be established. It is imperative to get the best help possible for people who have those sorts of problems.

The Warwick woollen mill is in my electorate. When it started up, it was given the right——

Mr Casey: That is not your only problem.

Mr BOOTH: I will get to the honourable member's problem. I have him listed. I was pleased when I saw him enter the Chamber. I said that I never like to talk about anyone behind his back.

Mr Casey: I couldn't leave you by yourself; not after last night.

Mr BOOTH: I think the honourable member heard me and decided to come down to the Chamber.

However, I will move on to the woollen mill. The people who started the woollen mill were promised a freight subsidy. I believe that they drew a little bit of it. It was then purchased by another operator from Melbourne, who has been very good. He got rid of some of the problems that the woollen mill had with scouring, smells and a decarbonising plant that was not working too well. He got rid of the smell by pushing the effluent away some distance before he put it into ponds and had the operation running fairly well. He was working six days a week, three shifts a day, but he has had to cut down to four days a week. The falling-off has been caused to some extent by several things, including the rise in the Australian dollar and also some slight rise in the price of wool. However, he can still get substantial work. Nevertheless, one of his great

problems is freight. Sometimes he has to freight back to Sydney. It kills the profitability when he has to bring it from there and send it back.

I would like some genuine efforts to be made to reintroduce the freight subsidy. It is not good enough to send a letter stating that as from a certain date the freight subsidy has been not only reduced, but wiped.

I turn now to police stations in country centres. Sometimes it appears to be difficult to obtain even minor improvements at police stations in country towns and cities such as Warwick. The line of communication appears to be one of the difficulties. The police do not seem to be able to ask for the improvements themselves, and I find great difficulty in getting into the act. For many years—it has been corrected recently—the Warwick Police Station did not have decent washing facilities. In these days of the AIDS epidemic, it is only fair and decent to provide a good hot-water system so that a police officer can wash himself quickly if blood gets onto him.

Another matter that I have noticed is that our senior police officers have very poor housing. The present subinspector in Warwick lives in a house that is well below the standard one would expect an inspector to live in. That house should be upgraded. I know that money is short, but surely a reasonable standard of accommodation can be provided for inspectors and other senior officers. They are not whingers to any great extent. They seem to be reasonable people. However, at present the inspector at Warwick does not live in the residence that was set aside for him; he lives in the watchhouse-keeper's residence. That residence is alongside the watchhouse and is not any grand building. However, that officer rejected his residence to reside in the watchhouse-keeper's residence.

I note that the member for Mackay has entered the Chamber and seems to be anxious to talk about the Warwick dairy.

Mr Casey: I think you ought to.

Mr BOOTH: I pointed some things out last night. I might even repeat some of them.

Mr Casey: But you were a bit wrong, you know.

Mr BOOTH: No, I was not. Before I get to that, I will lead up to it.

Mr Casey: Why didn't you vote for them today?

Mr BOOTH: Vote for them today? All the honourable member wanted to do was to upset the Government's business and take control of the House, and he failed. He has another nine motions and he would have been able to put the lot.

Mr Casey: I put the wood on you and the National Party to see whether you were interested in Warwick, and you were not.

Mr BOOTH: The honourable member for Mackay got cleaned up last night. He did not do too well up there last night. He told those people that if he was in power he would take all the milk from the coast and send it up to Warwick or the pool. He did not tell them that at the South Coast. He did not tell them that down there. That is why Judy Gamin gave the Labor Party a flogging. That is why the Opposition's preferences were cut up and used, and it will stay that way until the Opposition has the courage to do what should be done——

Mr Casey: What I told them last night was that we would bring equity back into the dairy industry.

Mr BOOTH: The honourable member did not tell them how. He was trying to lead those people up a dry gully and leave them stranded. I think that in a few weeks' time they will realise that. They will realise the con job that the honourable member has attempted to perpetrate on them——

Mr Casey: You stood for the Gold Coast instead of Warwick.

Mr BOOTH: I stood for what I thought was right. That is what I will always do. I suggested that they try to make a deal with the Gold Coast. That is a different thing——

Mr Lee: What did he say down the South Coast?

Mr BOOTH: Down at the South Coast he said nothing. The member for Mackay was a disgrace to the Labor Party. That is why they only got a handful of votes.

Mr Casey: You go and ask Hollindale what I said down the Gold Coast.

Mr BOOTH: The member for Mackay was strangely silent. That is why he is on the back foot tonight.

I want to say a few words about what did happen. First of all, the problem of transferability was going to affect the industry. I tried to stop it in the hope that negotiations could get under way before transferability was introduced. The Minister for Primary Industries did not see fit to listen to my advice——

Mr Casey: The member for Gympie wouldn't back you, either.

Mr BOOTH: The member for Gympie has always been one of the best battlers in this land. He is a great battler for the underdog.

Mr Casey: He didn't back you on transferability.

Mr BOOTH: Of course he did. He is a great battler——

Mr Casey: The Minister for Finance didn't back you, either.

Mr BOOTH: The Minister for Finance does not know much about it. I do not know that I would be worried whether he backed me or not. The Minister was a bit like some of the people who the member for Mackay brought with him last night. They did not know very much about it, and they struggled a bit.

Mr Casey interjected.

Mr BOOTH: I do not know. The member for Mackay was sitting beside the Leader of the Liberal Party. I thought he was one of the Labor mob.

The Leader of the Liberal Party is not in the Chamber at present. He had his riding boots on and his houndstooth coat; it was a real picnic races job. I will say one thing for the Leader of the Liberal Party: he did not say that he was anything that he was not. He said, "I do not know much about it." That brought him up a bit in my estimation.

Mr Palaszczuk: Aren't you the expert?

Mr BOOTH: For a long time I thought that I was.

The member for Mackay is telling me that all he has to do is take all this milk away and send it up there. I can tell the Leader of the Opposition this: if he says that he will take all the milk away from some of these places and put it in the pool, he will lose about 10 seats. That is why the member for Mackay was not game to say a word down on the Gold Coast. The honourable member did not say one word about it.

I will say this: the advice that I gave to the people last night was to try to negotiate either with the South Coast dairy or the downs dairy because I think that they are in an impossible position now. The member for Mackay is trying to keep a festering sore going, and he might succeed. Then again, the people might wake up to what a con man the honourable member really is.

Mr Stephan: Do you think that they will be amalgamating with either the South Coast or the downs?

Mr BOOTH: I had no way of ensuring that, but I did the next best thing that I could do. I arranged an interview for them with the Premier tomorrow afternoon. I

arranged that in good faith, in the hope that something helpful will come out of that meeting.

I do not want to talk all night about the Warwick dairy. I think I have already exposed some of the areas in which the member for Mackay is a bit weak.

I also want to draw to the attention of the Parliament the Commonwealth Government's expenditure on capital works in this nation. Queensland has in excess of 16 per cent of the nation's population but can only expect 8 per cent of the total capital expenditure in the capital works program. That is shocking. Surely with the capital works program that the Commonwealth Government is trying to implement, it would be in its best interests to try to give Queensland a fair go.

Mr Lee: They hate Queensland, that's it.

Mr BOOTH: This next part will shock the honourable member.

At the same time, 32 per cent of the capital works expenditure will be carried out in the ACT. Guess how much of the population it has—2 to 3 per cent! We said earlier that the Finance Minister might not understand the dairying industry. He will understand those figures.

Mr Casey: If I were you, I would be talking about Warwick, not Canberra, at the moment.

Mr BOOTH: I will get back to Warwick. The honourable member is reaching for a drink of water. He is like the guy who is in an argument and starts to smoke; the honourable member is starting to drink.

At the recent conference in Darwin, Mr West, the Federal member, announced that \$300m worth of capital works would be carried out in New South Wales and Victoria, at a time when Queensland, which is the tourist capital of Australia, has the most embarrassing international airport in the world. We have been told for years that Queensland would have a new international airport.

Mr Austin: What has the member for Brisbane Central done about that?

Mr BOOTH: The member for Brisbane Central has probably tried hard, but he was not capable of doing much. He is a nice guy. I think that he would have done his best. His best was not good enough.

Although Queensland has 16 per cent of the nation's population, it accounts for close to 30 per cent of the nation's development. Surely that is important. There is no doubt that the wealth of Queensland has been siphoned off to pour capital works into Labor States. The sad thing is that not one word has been uttered by members of the Opposition against that blatant bias against the State.

Some members in this Chamber claim to be brilliant speakers. They even travelled to Warwick last night and received a bit of a flogging there. Although they claim that they are brilliant speakers, not a word was uttered to protect the State of Queensland. They would rather that it all went to the Australian Capital Territory or somewhere else. They wonder why in the last three by-elections their votes have been used for only one thing—to be cut up as preferences. I did not think that I would ever see the day when this great Australian Labor Party could not even run second. Members of the Labor Party cannot even run second in a blue-ribbon seat. I would not know how many people they would get there, but it would not be many.

Mr Stephan: Oxley will be quite interesting, won't it?

Mr BOOTH: The Labor Party used to say, "You will never take the Oxley seat." I am inclined to think that whoever receives the nomination from the National Party will probably win it. That is the shocking situation that members of the Opposition are in. That is why their leader is afraid.

Mr Casey: We have got the Federal seat that contains Warwick.

Mr BOOTH: That is correct. However, I do not think that that will last long.

Mr Casey: Why didn't Bob Sparkes come and defend you last night?

Mr BOOTH: I did not need anyone to defend me. I did fairly well. I was able to defend myself. I did not need Bob Sparkes to defend me.

Mr Casey: You voted with them up there last night, but you voted against them down here today.

Mr BOOTH: I voted the way that the honourable member knew I would vote. How many times has the honourable member ever crossed the floor? He has never crossed the floor, but he has been kicked out of a party.

Mr Casey: You voted down here for the Gold Coast today instead of Warwick.

Mr BOOTH: I voted exactly as the honourable member knew I would vote. He was trying to upset the Government's program, and he did not succeed. I do not think that he will succeed tomorrow, the next day or any other day that he tries.

Mr Casey: Do you reckon you will succeed tomorrow? Do you reckon you will change Ahern and Harper tomorrow and get them to save Warwick?

Mr BOOTH: I do not know about that. I will have an excellent discussion. I bet I will do a lot more than the honourable member can do. He was conning the people that he would do many things. The honourable member has never made one statement in this House on what he would do with growth milk. Why does he not do it?

Mr Casey: You were not even here in 1976 when I spoke on the Bill.

Mr BOOTH: The honourable member has been here since 1976 and he has never seen fit to make a statement on the milk industry, but he said he did it before that. I will even believe that he might have done so. But he has been so darned lazy that he has not done it since.

Mr Casey: You were not even here.

Mr BOOTH: The honourable member can come in with another interjection. I will handle his interjections. He is trying to tell honourable members that he was successful last night. Having watched him tonight, honourable members would see that he has not been very successful. I do not wish to continue in this vein. I am a very peaceful person who likes to be tolerant.

We are living in an exciting age. The Governor was right when he said that this State has come through an exciting year. Forgetting the Fitzgerald inquiry, which must go down in history, it has certainly been a year during which this State grew up.

I do not believe that we can afford constantly to chase big things such as Expo, and I do not believe that this Government would want to. When the Government chases something, gets it and makes it a success, that is great.

I did not hear any Opposition members say, "We want Expo" or "We will take it." I am not trying to take away anything from the people who said that they did want it. Not only did Queenslanders get behind Expo and attend it, but also they have done many things as a team, which has been great. People from overseas have worked in with Queenslanders to create a great team. Expo has done a lot for the rest of Queensland. Hoteliers and restaurateurs in Warwick have enjoyed an upturn in clientele. I have been told that although things were a bit slack before Expo started, many of those people have experienced a threefold increase in turn-over. Motel units and restaurants are full, and the proprietors are appreciative of what has happened.

A few months ago I visited Bundaberg. The proprietor of the motel——

Mr Casey: What were you doing there?

Mr BOOTH: I do not intend to tell the honourable member what I was doing there. I met a lot of nice people in Bundaberg.

An honourable member: Was the missus with you?

Mr BOOTH: Yes, the missus was with me.

People in Bundaberg appreciate what Expo has done for the State. It is foolish to be always knocking ourselves. People moan that the economy of this State is going down and down and down.

The new member in the House, namely, Mr Perrett, spoke about how bad his electorate is. I wondered how he tied that statement in with his comment that the member before him had been a wonderful success in the electorate. However, I do not want to be nasty.

Citizen-initiated referendums could not be held for every little thing. Many people claim that they are wonderful things and say, "If we want to build a road here, we will have a referendum to see if we build it or not." The first thing that they would have to ascertain is whether sufficient funds are available to construct that road.

Mr Casey: Why didn't you get the Speakership?

Mr BOOTH: I did not get enough votes. I did pretty well. I was quite pleased.

Mr Casey: How many votes did you get?

Mr BOOTH: I believe I was pretty close. I came away that night fairly happy.

Mr Casey: Austin didn't vote for you.

Mr BOOTH: He might not have. If the honourable member can tell me the names of some of the honourable members who did not vote for me, they will keep for another day. Mr Austin possibly voted for me. I did not go away with bitterness in my heart. I have found out that in this life, if you are beaten, you are beaten and when you win, you win. I have had more wins than losses. That is what I am interested in.

Mr Randell: You have got your self-respect.

Mr BOOTH: I believe I have some self-respect. The only person who has not respected me tonight is Eddie, but I am sure that he will come right.

Recently, the Warwick electorate has done well, principally because of the upturn in the cattle industry.

Mr Casey: Members of the Citizens Electoral Council were very quiet last night, too.

Mr BOOTH: Yes, they were very quiet.

The upturn in the cattle industry has brought with it a slight increase in land prices, which is the first good thing that we have seen for a long time in the country. Although the increases are not huge, they could be as high as 10 per cent. Sales are also taking place. I appreciate all of those things.

I am proud to speak to the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply to the Governor's Speech.

Mr ARDILL (Salisbury) (9.14 p.m.): It is always a pleasure to listen to the member for Warwick talking in his good-natured way about what he knows best: his own area of Warwick. However, we are not here to praise other members of Parliament; we are here to reply to the Governor's Opening Speech.

I have a great deal of sympathy for the Governor of Queensland. Having to present the lack-lustre speeches of members of the National Party of Queensland could not

possibly be a very pleasant job. The Governor, of course, has one other disadvantage: he was born at Burringbar in New South Wales. However, he rose above that and he has now become a very great Queenslander; so it is a pleasure to reply to his Speech.

Queensland is a great State. It has great resilience. Despite all the terrible deeds that have been done to the State, it continues to survive and flourish. Despite its shocking beginnings as a European outpost where violence, hopelessness and starvation supplanted 40 centuries of ordered existence; despite the frauds and crimes that have been perpetrated over a century and a half, from the thief who stole 7½d. from the first Treasurer to the corrupt allocation of the Expo land to Sir Frank Moore, one of the National Party's cronies; despite the violence of convict floggings, through the black wars to the hanging of innocent victims, to the bashing of singing Christians; despite the gerrymander which precludes the people of Queensland from electing the Government of their choice; and despite the recent period of 20 years of unparalleled corruption, which has destroyed the fabric of life in this State, Queensland will survive and continue to flourish.

The victims of corrupt, unrepresentative, inefficient or ineffectual Government are the ordinary people of the State. The vast majority of people, of course, seldom are assailed personally by corrupt cops or bureaucrats. They may and do have their living standards reduced by those activities. They lose their cars or their treasures because of a police force whose numbers and morale have been reduced to bedrock. Their children's education standards are lowered. Their local government rates are increased because of State Government activity or lack of it. Their safety on the roads is impaired. As stated by Mr Beard, their transport options are reduced, removed or made more costly. Their land is made more costly by foreign ownership and competition, but they still survive. They complain, but they survive. It is only when they come up against violence or death or the stone wall of silence that they personally realise what has happened to this great State, because of an unrepresentative, uncaring, self-satisfied and self-seeking Government.

The people who come into my office seeking help and Government services, which this Government fails to provide or fails to provide in sufficient quantity or quality, are amazed that the Government fails them. If they come from interstate or overseas, lured by the Government's advertising campaign—one of the areas in which this Government excels and unstintingly spends the public funds—they are more than amazed; they are also very angry. What they should know is that they now have a chance to insist on representative government in Queensland by voting "Yes" to question No. 2 in Saturday's referendum.

Many of our services are deficient, but none more so than the most important function of Government since medieval times: personal security of the citizen, responsibility for which rests with the most unsatisfactory performer in the present Government, who was in the House a few minutes ago but who unfortunately has left—the Deputy Premier. Whether he has too many portfolios or whether he is unwilling or unable to carry out his duties is a moot point.

The Deputy Premier is responsible for the Works Department, which is unable to provide the most rudimentary maintenance on State schools and is unable to provide sufficient protection from the weather for the young students of Runcorn Heights State School, which is in my electorate. No provision has been made for a covered shelter for the senior students for the one-hour lunch period. While eating their lunches they are expected to stand either in the hot sun or, during driving rain, in drafty passage ways or outside the entrance to toilets. To add insult to injury, the students are told that that accommodation is satisfactory. In point of fact, it is a public disgrace. It is even more disgraceful when the attitude of Ministers toward ministerial expenses is considered.

The Deputy Premier is also the Minister for Main Roads. He basks in the glory of building the national highway, but fails to mention that every cent of funding comes via the Federal Government from petrol tax. Every cent of that funding comes from the Federal Government that he chooses to denigrate. The Main Roads Department is

starved for the funds needed to upgrade and put a bitumen surface on country highways throughout the State. Even more disgraceful is the fact that the department is unable to provide safe roads for citizens or solve the traffic chaos on the Gold Coast. The Gateway Arterial Road, so-called—it is not an arterial road—is a prime example of the construction of an unsafe road as a result of financial constraints.

When I went to the recent South Coast by-election, my eyes were certainly opened. I was firmly convinced that my electorate of Salisbury was being bled to enable pork-barelling of National Party electorates. Imagine my surprise when I found that the good residents of South Coast regaled me with the same justified complaints that I hear in Salisbury: complaints such as schools being short of teachers, teacher aides and rudimentary teaching material; lack of Government community services across a whole range of usual Government activities; traffic chaos brought about by Government inactivity; and a lack of public transport, which no other city of similar size in Australia would be expected to endure.

What I also found was a surfeit of Government propaganda and a surfeit of polling booths, which was astounding. Two of the booths for South Coast were in sparsely populated areas, right on the boundary of the electorate. One of them was in an office of the white-shoe brigade. Another polling booth was five kilometres outside the nearest point of the electorate boundary. All of those booths turned away more prospective voters than they accepted. People were under the impression that they were in South Coast but were in fact in the electorates of Nerang, Currumbin or Surfers Paradise. The Government has strange priorities—but I digress.

The Deputy Premier's singular failure lies in an inadequate police force and inadequate gun laws. This month, my electorate has had its regular gun hold-up in Sunnybank. The Commonwealth Bank was held up at peak shopping time, and citizens were fired upon by the criminals. Luckily no one was struck this time, but many people are still suffering from damaged nerves. It took 20 minutes for police to arrive at the scene. This state of affairs cannot be allowed to continue.

The Government must provide a police presence in the major shopping centres of Brisbane and in the provincial cities of Queensland. The Government cannot afford to put Queensland shoppers, bank staff, chemists and traders at risk continually. Is the Government waiting for someone to be killed, as it did before taking action in respect of unsafe building sites?

Mr FitzGerald: Are you reading this speech?

Mr ARDILL: I am reading from notes.

As I travel around the State, I can see a regular police presence in country towns; yet in city shopping centres, which have infinitely more people and constitute a much greater financial prize, gun-bearing criminals who put people at risk can be kilometres away from the crime before police are aware of it. The claim is often made that professional criminals will find ways to obtain guns outside the law. However, the community has much more to fear from amateur gunmen who terrorise people unfortunate enough to come face to face with that type of crime.

In view of the evidence and allegations that have been presented at the Fitzgerald inquiry, it is not surprising that the morale of the Queensland police force is so low. The cancer of corruption links the Commissioner of Police, two assistant commissioners, three superintendents, sundry inspectors and numerous senior sergeants, sergeants and policemen of other ranks to bludgers, prostitutes, SP bookies, murderers, drug salesmen, political figures, cronies and corrupt businessmen, and has all but destroyed Queensland's police force.

The evidence of verballing people such as the unfortunate Mount Isa Aborigine and the protection afforded chosen people is less well known to the population at large but it is no less damaging to the people of Queensland and no less a tragedy to those involved.

The police force in this State suffered enough public enmity because of the blatant political use imposed upon it by the former Premier. If the former Premier made great political use of the police, the criminals whom he promoted made great use of him either with or without his knowledge.

Eventually the people of Queensland will come to realise that the cause of all this corruption is the political system of this State. Heinous as the zonal system is, it is not the principal problem preventing responsible representative government; it is simply the lack of equal numbers within the zones and throughout the State which provide the National Party with its mantle of safety and perception of invincibility. Within the same zone is the massive electorate of Cook, which has 50 per cent more votes than the other "remote" seats of Roma and Balonne. The Country Zone is the first line of defence in the National Party's war against democracy. Within a mantle of 22 pocket boroughs which the Westminster Parliament abolished in 1832 but which have survived in Queensland until 3 September 1988, the National Party has been able to sit on its hands for 20 years, with the connivance of some Liberal Party leather-seekers, and preside over the stench of corruption which is only now coming to light. 3 September is the day of judgment.

I mention that the National Party has 22 safe seats, as accepted by all honest and knowledgeable political commentators. Last year in my speech to the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply I claimed that the figure was 23 seats, but that was disproved by the arrival on the scene of the new member for Barambah, whose speech I listened to with a great deal of interest. I hope that the honourable member for Barambah will not be further disappointed by the lack of other independent members elected to this House and I hope that he will not disappoint the members of the Opposition by opposing the referendum.

Mr Davis: His voting record hasn't been too good lately.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I suggest that the honourable member for Brisbane Central keep his remarks to himself.

Mr ARDILL: Everyone in this Chamber hears a great chorus of "States' rights"; little is heard about people's rights.

In Queensland the Westminster system has not yet been allowed to work. The Westminster system has survived for 300 years and the honourable member for Barambah is flying in the face of the experience of 300 years if he expects that tradition to change. A system of referendum-orientated independents is not a desirable system of government. It would lead to indecision, an unstable economy, ineffective control over the entrenched power-brokers in the community and would provide no defence whatsoever to the criminal controllers who are now being called to account by the Fitzgerald inquiry. Because of the rorted system in Queensland—not because of the Westminster system—which has been established with ruthless efficiency over many years by the National Party Government, its hand-picked minions and a supine Liberal Party, this fine balance has been locked onto the Right side of politics and the wrong side of the law.

The specious arguments that members cannot service large electorates in terms of geographic size is totally demolished by the service provided to his electorate by the Labor member for Cook. The member for Warrego, who spoke with great heat about the problems of large western electorates, failed to admit that his electorate is a prime example of the gerrymander when Quilpie, which is 210 kilometres from the centre of the electorate, is in the Longreach-based electorate of Gregory; areas near Springsure, which are 100 kilometres from Emerald in Peak Downs and 450 kilometres from Charleville, are included in the electorate of Warrego. In point of fact, all the area south and west of Roma should be in the same electorate. It would still have the same number of voters as Salisbury. That area does not need three members voting in this House thereby outvoting the people of Salisbury by three to one; the area needs three electorate offices, fully staffed as they are now, which the member could visit in turn.

Mr Borbidge: Do you know what variation there is in Westminster?

Mr ARDILL: There is no variation whatever. That is the Westminster system.

The Salisbury electorate is facing the problem of the eminent closure of Comeng. The people of Warrego do not face the problems of the invasion of their security that the people of Salisbury suffer because of the lack of police; they do not have a shortage of housing and they are not facing the likelihood of the closure of Comeng. The problems facing Comeng have been caused by the State Government's failure to provide contracts for this heavy engineering company, which designed and built Queensland's existing air-conditioned trains as a pioneering venture in the 1950s.

It is within the power of the State Government to protect the jobs of the Salisbury workers and to preserve a company with the know-how to carry out heavy engineering works and rolling-stock construction in the future. After providing the only employment that many Salisbury residents have had in decades, the closure of the workshop will be a personal tragedy to them. The effect on their families, including school-aged children, should be apparent. What should be equally apparent is that Queensland needs this industry to protect its long-term economic future.

As I said, it is less well known that the State's air-conditioned trains were a product of a display of this company's pioneering expertise in the 1950s. Those were the first air-conditioned sleeping-cars to be built for State railways in Australia. They were designed following personal discussions with Labor Transport Minister Jack Duggan. Later the design was copied in South Africa and elsewhere overseas. I call on the Government to show some of Jack Duggan's foresight and call tenders for 15 new sleeping-cars to update Queenslander and Sunlander services. Our 35-year-old sleeping-cars should be replaced by trains of this generation. However, the Government is proposing to reduce Sunlander services and replace them with a totally unsatisfactory overnight sitting-car service. In this day and age, the Government's proposal should not receive a moment's consideration. My proposal will not only improve tourist services but also retain the skills and skilled work-force in the interests of Queensland's future.

I wish to speak about the problem facing education in this State. In reply to a number of my submissions, I am pleased that the Minister has stated his inclination to seek additional funding to overcome the disaster of last year when funds were at a totally unrealistic level. That is borne out by the fact that the Minister had to use \$4m allocated for capital works just to retain in employment the teachers already within the system. Of course, everyone knows that more teachers and more teacher-aides were needed. In replying to my letters, the Minister said that, while he believes that more funds should be put into education, that may not be the opinion of everyone in the Government. He said that all departments will be looking for additional funds. In the long-term interests of this State, it is essential that funds be made available to the Education Department. Those funds are the right of the children of this State, who are its future.

As I said, this State will survive even the most unsatisfactory Government that it has had in its century and a half of existence. However, unless we provide a proper education system, it will certainly not survive as an important and growing part of this great nation of Australia.

Mr CAMPBELL (Bundaberg) (9.35 p.m.): I rise to speak in the Address in Reply debate to deal in detail with some aspects of the Governor's Speech. After we got through the niceties of the Governor's Speech in welcoming everyone here and dealing with Expo, we got to some aspects of what Queensland's economy is all about.

The Governor's Speech indicates the basic inability of the Government to service the needs of the State. He said—

“Of course, society's basic needs always will include adequate health and welfare services, acceptable housing, and an economic and industrial climate capable of ensuring job security and a satisfactory standard of living.”

Has this Government met those basic needs of adequate health? I say, "No." For the first time in decades, this Government has done away with the free public hospital system. It is now charging patients for services rendered. Not only is it charging the public for services rendered, but the money that is collected is not even kept within the hospital system. If the Government is going to charge people for health services, that money should be kept within the health services. However, all the money collected by the various hospital boards is put straight into consolidated revenue.

However, worse is to come when we talk about adequate services. While the Government reduces services to young mothers and babies, the Minister is prepared to spend Health Department funds on attending swanky National Party dinners and so on.

In Bundaberg—and in other parts of Queensland—the Government is reducing the number of nursing sisters in the maternal and child health centres. In Bundaberg, there used to be two nursing sisters who looked after the young mothers and babies not only in Bundaberg but also in the other electorates of Burnett and Isis. Those services for our young mothers have been reduced and are not there. So how can the Governor say that Queensland has adequate health services? They are not as good as we had last year.

Not only has the Queensland Government reduced services to our young mothers, but it also has taken the milk out of the mouths of our schoolchildren. Who took away the free milk system in schools last year? It was the Government, and it is its members who are supposed to be protecting and looking after the dairy industry.

I turn now to welfare services. A great increase has occurred in reported child abuse in Queensland. It is something that Government members do not want to know about, but it is happening to families in the supposed Sunshine State of Queensland. Within three years, in some areas there has been a 300 to 400 per cent increase in the number of reported child abuse cases. Furthermore, two years ago, the annual report of the Family Services Department said that the Government could not fulfil its statutory requirements to the children who were suffering child abuse. It said that it could not even look after the abused children of Queensland. So it cannot be stated that Queensland has adequate welfare services.

I now turn to the provision of acceptable housing. I will look at the way that the Government treats people who have difficulty obtaining public housing. Queensland has the most unjust system of Housing Commission rental in Australia. This State has the highest rental charges in Australia.

Mr Sherrin: That is a lot of nonsense.

Mr CAMPBELL: I will tell the honourable member what happens. This Government robs Peter to pay Paul.

Government members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Booth): Order! Persistent interjections will not be allowed. I know that they are keeping honourable members from going to sleep; nevertheless, I think that it is getting a bit out of hand. I ask the honourable member for Bundaberg to continue.

Mr CAMPBELL: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker.

I want to point out that the poor people of Queensland live in unacceptable housing. The Federal Government introduced a family allowance supplement. One family with six children were able to receive the full amount. That sort of thing is happening throughout Queensland in Housing Commission homes. That family got an extra \$132 a week from the Federal Government to help to improve their standard of living. But what does this benevolent State Government do? Out of the money given to that family to help them out of a crisis situation, the Queensland Government takes an extra \$27 a week in rent. That \$27 a week is taken from the money that has been given to those poor people by the Federal Government. And this Government claims to be a caring and compassionate Government. How dare it!

The Queensland Government claims that this State has an economic and industrial climate capable of ensuring job security and a satisfactory standard of living for Queenslanders. In 1986-87 Queensland had the lowest household income in Australia. It was \$11,478 per household, or 12.5 per cent below the national average. Should I congratulate the Queensland Government on keeping the people of Queensland poor? The only industrial climate in this State is cronyism. The cronies are the only people who do well.

Queensland also has the highest bankruptcy rate in Australia. How can the Queensland Government claim that this State has an adequate economy when it has one of the highest unemployment rates in Australia? The Queensland unemployment rate is 8.2 per cent, compared with the Australian average of 7.4 per cent. How can the Queensland Government state that this State is doing as well as the other States?

Now that I have annihilated that statement, which was contained in the Governor's Opening Speech, I will examine another one—that Queensland is doing well and that the key economic indicators prove that this State is doing well. I will examine overseas trade. In 1985-86 Queensland was the export leader with \$7.6m in export sales. For the first 10 months of last financial year, Queensland had slipped into third place. Should I congratulate the Queensland Government on the outstanding achievement of coming first in export sales and, within two years, coming third? I do not think that that is anything for the Government to be proud of.

In 1985-86 Queensland's gross State product increased by 9.3 per cent, but was behind the national growth rate of 11.3 per cent.

A Government member: Where did you get those figures?

Mr CAMPBELL: That is according to the latest information that the Opposition can obtain.

I now want to challenge the supposed sound economic management of both private enterprise and Government. I will demonstrate the soundness or otherwise of the Queensland Government's economic management when it comes to the beloved organisation that it set up two years ago called the Queensland Industry Development Corporation.

The only report put out by the Queensland Industry Development Corporation was its 1987 report. It did not even put out a report for the public to read in 1986. Two aspects of the QIDC should be of real concern. The two major executives of the QIDC have resigned. As soon as one sees the major people of an organisation leaving, one asks oneself why. One asks: is this a sinking ship? Is something not quite right with the QIDC? So many people who deal with the QIDC are not happy with its performance.

There are two aspects of the QIDC that cause concern. I refer to the schemes that the QIDC has taken over, the Rural Reconstruction Board and the Agricultural Bank. The Government is supposed to look after farmers. Does the Government realise that the bodies administering those schemes have not had to account to this Parliament since 1985? Since 1985 neither a Rural Reconstruction Board report nor an Agricultural Bank report has been presented to this Parliament. The only report that has been issued was in 1987. It was a skimpy report that stated, "I am not going to tell you what has happened to those schemes. I will report it later."

Mr Casey: Haven't they sacked their top people in that time?

Mr CAMPBELL: They have. I will mention again that the top two persons have been sacked.

Mr Casey: I wonder what is going on.

Mr CAMPBELL: I also wonder why the top two persons have left.

Let us see what is said in the corporation's annual report. On the Government Schemes Division—that is the old Agricultural Bank and the Rural Reconstruction Board—the report said—

“The corporation administers various schemes of assistance on behalf of the State Government and within the framework of Commonwealth or State agreements.

The financial statements for these administered government schemes are to be prepared separately and forwarded to the State Minister responsible.”

The reports have not been presented to Parliament. A report was not presented in 1986 or 1987, and it appears that a report will not be presented this year. Why are those accounts not presented to Parliament so that members know what is going on?

The first annual report of the QIDC that I have been able to obtain makes provision for bad and doubtful debts of \$3.55m. After administration of the QIDC for only one year, a provision is made for doubtful debts of \$3.55m. Let us see what happened to the schemes that the corporation took over.

In the last report of the Agricultural Bank presented to this House, debts written off totalled \$14,000. From the inception of the Rural Reconstruction Board, which occurred over a decade before 1985, the bad debts over all that time—they were not all bad debts as there was some writing-down of redundant assets that was allowed under some schemes—totalled \$690,000 on advances totalling more than \$163m.

What has happened to the administration of the QIDC? It has a bad and doubtful debts provision of \$3.55m and yet the Government has decimated the well-run schemes that were helping farmers. A report is not even presented to Parliament. The Government does not want to know about it and it does not want to help the farmers. If the Government wanted to help farmers, it would make the QIDC report to Parliament to make certain that it was getting value for money for the farmers' schemes.

Let me turn to some of the other aspects. The Government has said that Project Pay Packet will help the unemployed. For the first time in years of misleading Queensland, the summary report of the Special Committee on Employment in Queensland was issued. Since I have been a member of Parliament, three such reports have been issued but nothing has ever happened. In the latest report, which contained a report on employment, the truth was told for the first time. Under item 3, “The Unemployment Situation”, the facts are set out. Let members opposite listen to this and be proud of it as a Government! The report states—

“(a) The unemployment rate in Queensland has been consistently higher than the national average since early 1984.

(b) The unemployment rate of females is historically higher than for males. The last five years, however, have seen this differential reduced. The number of unemployed males is higher than for females, although this difference is also reducing.”

Congratulations for nothing! The report continues—

“(c) There are significant regional differences in unemployment rates, with consistently higher unemployment rates outside the metropolitan area.”

On behalf of all the young kids who live outside Brisbane, I say, “Thanks for nothing.” The report continues—

“(d) Unemployment among youths seeking full-time work has been above the national average for the past two years.”

Again, that is nothing to be proud of. The report continues—

“(e) Unemployment rates for all age groups are above the national average.

(f) Aborigines and Torres Strait Islanders have unemployment rates three to four times that of the State as a whole, and these rates are uniformly high throughout the State.”

That is something about which the Government cannot be proud. It is about time that the Government took positive action on that matter. It is very important that that be done.

I turn now to housing. The Government is supposedly doing something about the problem with public housing. Supposedly, 2 300 new homes will be provided. Let me look at what has happened in the past in relation to public housing finance. The majority of the funding comes from the Commonwealth. The latest figures available in relation to public housing finance are those for the period 1985-86. They reveal that although the average per capita expenditure on public housing was \$115, Queensland spent only \$99.30. That shows what a lousy job the Queensland Government is doing in that regard.

In Queensland, Federal Government funds provided \$92m or 88 per cent of the funds that were spent on rental housing. State funds provided \$12m or 12 per cent, representing \$40.74 per head of population. When compared with the Australian average, Federal funds accounted for only 52.5 per cent of total rental housing funds, whereas the average State contribution was 7.5 per cent. However, Queensland provided only 12 per cent of funds for public rental housing. That demonstrates this Government's lousy attitude to providing homes for the poor people of Queensland.

Let me turn to the rental housing stock that is held by each State. New South Wales has 102 222 rental units. Victoria has 51 007 units. Queensland, which has 27 577 units, is behind Western Australia with 30 792 and South Australia with 56 028 units. In relation to providing welfare services for Queenslanders, this Government cannot even beat South Australia or Western Australia. In other words, Queensland comes fifth.

I turn now to the train the Spirit of Capricorn. Although it can travel at speeds of up to 120 kilometres an hour, few people will travel on it, because it will not be suitable for public use. Bundaberg is the only city through which the Spirit of Capricorn will travel between Rockhampton and Brisbane. It will be diverted around all other cities and people will have to be transported from those cities to meet the train. It will stop in Bundaberg, probably because the traffic will not stop for it.

Mr Austin: We'll get it to go straight through Bundaberg, if you like.

Mr CAMPBELL: The Spirit of Capricorn is going to rip through Bundaberg at around 12 noon. It will arrive in Brisbane at about 4.30 or 5 o'clock. People will then disembark. If they wish to visit a specialist here in Brisbane those people will have to obtain overnight accommodation and visit the specialist the next day. There will be no train available to take them home that night, so they will need an additional night's accommodation and then catch the train at 7 o'clock the next morning. That process involves two nights' accommodation and three days' travelling to visit a specialist in Brisbane. At present, people can travel on the overnight Capricornia, arrive in Brisbane at 7 a.m., visit a specialist, get on the train and be home early the next morning, which involves only one day in Brisbane. Because of this new, modern, fast train, people will be required to spend three days and two nights just to visit a specialist in Brisbane. If this Government thinks that that will help the people of Queensland, it is wrong.

Mr Milliner: Do you think Mr Austin will travel on the train down from Nambour?

Mr CAMPBELL: I do not believe that Mr Austin will travel on the train. Does he not use the helicopter, or is that only for the Premier?

As to fire services and Expo—I turn now to a Bill to amend the Fire Safety Act. In common with most people, I believe that Expo has been great for Queensland. However, I wish to express my concern for the safety of the public in relation to the fire services that are provided on the Expo site. I do so because it was not until three people were killed in the construction accident in Queen Street caused by unsafe practices that the Government decided to do something about it.

I want to put on record that there are concerns. My first concern is that Expo did not come under the jurisdiction of the Fire Safety Act. Many of the displays in the

various pavilions are made from polystyrene foams. They do contain fire retardants, but those buildings have a very heavy fire load. They do not have sprinklers. The problem with any fire that occurs there will not be the fire itself but the smoke from it, which could be very damaging to people's health. It is probable that if such a fire were to occur, it could lead to the death of many people.

Five fires have occurred at Expo. The one in the Alien Encounters ride was difficult to locate because no map showed what was actually inside the building. Maps showed what was outside the building and where the hydrants were but not exactly what was inside the building. The Polynesian Village is made of very dry materials, and that is an area in which care must be exercised.

It is believed that the fire in the sky needle was caused not because of some design fault but because someone turned the cooler fans off, which led to the plastic overheating and igniting. Such things can happen, not because of the design but because of human error.

Big fire-fighting vehicles such as the turntable and the HP, which has a cherry-picker, can gain entrance to Expo by only one entrance. Those vehicles cannot reach all the areas of Expo.

The pavilions contain thermal and smoke alarms but no sprinklers. Somebody said that the Pavilion of Promise has only two doors.

Mr Palaszczuk interjected.

Mr CAMPBELL: Probably. He would probably get something out of it.

People line up in groups at the entrance of the Pavilion of Promise. If a fire breaks out, only one exit is available. If a fire occurred between the exit and where the film was being screened, real problems could be created.

I am raising these issues because I think it is about time that they were put on record. No-one would listen about the unsafe practices in the construction industry. No-one really cared that workers were being killed when employers sent them down trenches without shoring. Employers found guilty of such practices were unlucky if they were fined \$4,000 for killing two workers. That is the price that is put on workers. However, when members of the public are killed, someone does something. Then it is forgotten. I think it is very important that that be mentioned.

Another matter that could be very important relates to the main water-main at Expo, which is plastic. I do not know—and other people do not know—if such a main has ever been fully tested under fully operational conditions of a fire emergency.

Mr Austin: Round it off. Your voice has gone completely.

Mr CAMPBELL: I think it is very important that the Minister receives an assurance that it has been fully tested.

Mr Cooper: We've beaten you by months. You will be aware that there has been inspection after inspection. All those fires have been tended to within the space of two months.

Mr CAMPBELL: I realise that. It is on record. The people know. I do not want some international occurrence——

Mr Cooper: We beat you long ago, son.

Mr CAMPBELL: The Minister can say that. It is on record. In case anything happens, I just wanted to say here tonight that I have some concerns.

Mr Deputy Speaker, thank you very much for allowing me to take part in this Address in Reply debate. I believe that many aspects of the Governor's Speech, particularly those claiming that Queensland is a State that is in good health, have shown that it was not a very commendable document. Much has to be done, and the Fitzgerald inquiry is showing that.

Mr EATON (Mourilyan) (10 p.m.): First of all, I wish to point out the economic mismanagement of public affairs by this Government over the past few years. I wish to quote from the annual report of the Queensland Government Development Authority. That report shows that the Queensland Electricity Commission, the QEC, owes a total of \$3,812m. As at 30 June 1987, the Commissioner for Railways and the Railway Department had a net total debt of \$1,524m, including the commissioner's assessed share of the State public debt. The Queensland Water Resources Commission shows a total debt as at 30 June 1987 of \$203m. The newly formed Government department that will look after the rural industries in place of the Agricultural Bank and the Rural Reconstruction Board, the QIDC, had a total debt of \$224m as at 30 June 1987. Mention is also made in the report of the Expo site, but it is believed that it can pay for itself. I could refer to other departments that are mentioned in the Government's own publication that is circulated annually titled *Departmental Accounts Subsidiary to the Public Accounts*.

Mr Austin: Your leader last week said we didn't publish those figures, and you're getting up here tonight and reading out of the Government's books.

Mr EATON: Yes, that is exactly right. I am reading them out of the Government's own books. I mention at this stage a debt that I will refer to in greater depth at a later stage. The Forestry Department owes more than \$356,745,744m. There is a note at the bottom of page 2806 of the report on departmental accounts as follows—

“Debt service charges on Commonwealth and Special Project Funds advances have been met in full as they become due. However charges on Loan Fund advances have not been met in full since 1960-61. Interest charges have not been met in full since 1965-66. Unpaid interest amounting to \$136 868 001 has not been capitalized.”

The total debt of the State Forestry Department is \$7m less than half a billion dollars, a total of \$493,613,745. My concern about this matter is that although the Forestry Department has been selling Queensland's timber and forestry assets for many years, each year it has been going further into debt to the tune of \$20 or \$30m. Reference to previous departmental accounts will show that the situation I have outlined has been the case for many years. Even by selling Queensland's assets, each year the Government has been getting further into debt. It is no wonder that members of Parliament have such a difficult task trying to battle with conservationists and those who want to stop logging that is being carried on in the rainforest areas. Our task is made more difficult because of the mismanagement of the State Government.

Before I deal in depth with forestry management, I wish to refer to the Government's administration of the Land Management portfolio. I wish to focus attention on the administration of the Lands Department in dealing with the assets of the people of Queensland, particularly Crown land. Everybody would know that Governments are custodians of the welfare of the people who elect them and are also custodians of the assets of a State. However, I wish to cite an instance of the Government selling, for \$2,186, the lease on a 3 000 hectare Cape York Peninsula property to a north Queensland company. In turn, it sold the same property for \$14.2m a month after the 10-year leasehold period was up. Although private enterprise could make a profit of \$14m out of the land, the State Government had sold it for only \$2,180-odd. I am sure that the people of Queensland are not happy with that type of Government action because they expect more from responsible Governments.

I wish to quote from an article that was published in the *Courier-Mail* dated Monday, 31 August 1987. It refers to two north Queensland cattle stations that went on sale for \$45m. Part of one of the cattle stations is known as the Tully River station and lies approximately 35 kilometres west of Tully. The Lyndhurst station, which is 310 kilometres west of Townsville, is owned by the American-based King Ranch company. The two stations were being offered as one package.

I have to admit that King Ranch did a great job in developing that property. It is probably the best grazing land in the whole of Australia. I saw the last 400 bullocks that

were turned off that country and in the middle of a drought they were in fat prime condition. The property included land at the top end, adjacent to the Kareeya Power Station. It is always wet in that area and people who are familiar with it do not know what a drought is because there is always mist or fog, even when it is not raining. Those people were allowed to purchase 48 000 acres for the sum of \$48,000. A few years later they purchased more land and converted it to freehold. Together with another cattle station, these properties are now worth \$45m. Yet Queenslanders are not allowed to take part in this development. Queenslanders are entitled to get onto the land. They have their own ambitions to settle and work on the land as their fathers did. They are being denied the opportunity to do this by this Government.

I refer to a revocation order made by the State Government in this House in about October of last year. I refer to the revocation of a section of State forest 29. I agree with the Government's decision to rescind the State forests order because this area was not proper forest. Subsequently the Government allowed the person who held a grazing lease and rights to that area to take over the lease as a long-term lease and then convert it to freehold. That area consisted of a total of 11 150 hectares of land.

I would have no objection to that taking place if that person had been dependent on that land for his living; but he was not. He was a businessman who owned several businesses and employed managers to operate those businesses on his behalf. The Government had a great opportunity to put the area up for ballot to enable a person who possessed the necessary qualifications, such as not being a land-holder and having suitable experience, to settle on the land and raise his family in the type of environment which he enjoyed and which, I am sure, most families today would enjoy.

The Opposition receives many complaints from genuine people who want to know when the Government will start putting land up for ballot. The Government says that because of the present economic situation it does not want to create hardship for people by making land available, putting it up for ballot and forcing people to borrow money and go further into debt. In many instances the Government is allowing big business to take over.

In the last few days a well-known property in the gulf country was sold for a few million dollars to Australian Estates. That area consists of hundreds of thousands of square miles which could have been cut up into blocks and put up for public auction. It would have been a golden opportunity for the Government to take back those leases and cut the land up into living areas. I have been through the area and know it only too well. The Government could have balloted four or five grazing blocks in that area. At the present time one could not say that the beef industry is not buoyant. It is one of the few industries that are fairly buoyant and, owing to the trade agreement recently signed by Japan, it has a good solid market into the immediate future.

In my own electorate there are hundreds of young and middle-aged people who are wanting to know how they can get onto the land. Under the old system when the ALP was in Government, when leases expired or came up for sale or the person who held the lease did not wish to carry on, the Government would pay the person for his improvements, cut up the land and put it up for ballot. I am sure that many a National Party member sitting in this House knows that his father got his chance in this way. I know of one Minister in particular who got his chance in life through the fall of a marble in a land ballot. That is why the Minister was where he was before he came into Parliament. I know that he has worked hard but he is part of a Government that is denying that same opportunity to many young people in rural communities today.

People on the land have children and in many areas the children have to leave and go out into the work-force. Sometimes this is because they have been educated and the type of career that they have chosen and their academic qualifications mean that they have to leave home. However, many a young person in Queensland today would dearly love to come back and work on a farm. There are dozens of people in my electorate who are forced to leave home and go out to work because the farm will no longer support them. Very rarely does one see what is known as a family-unit farm.

Queensland and Australia were developed by those family-unit blocks. We do not want to go back to the hardships that many of those people faced, but at least they had the incentive and the opportunity to leave home and go out and make their own way. Many persons on the land today left home at 14 or 15 years of age, as was done in those days because of hardship, went out to work and saved a few shillings a week from wages. They battled on living in bark huts and tin huts. Eventually they married and had their own families. Each generation wishes to make things better for its children, but by its actions this Government has done away with the incentive and the opportunity for many young people who today are genuine, concerned citizens who wish to play a role in the community and society and wish to get themselves on the land.

Those who live and work on the land are perhaps the best citizens to be found. Many have played a role in war and know how to survive. They can handle droughts and other difficult circumstances and know how to live within their means. Today, in this fast-lane society, everything is instant or take-away. People get it today and pay for it tomorrow, which is causing as many problems as it is solving. People who operate under that system find that they take things now but cannot pay for them tomorrow; they cannot service their debts. This Government is not creating the incentive and opportunity for young people.

The system applied by the Labor Party carried through right up to the change of Government. When land became available, through the Agricultural Bank the Government made the necessary money available to develop the block of land. Before a person could enter a land ballot, he had to have the amount of equity required by the department. If he won the ballot, immediately he obtained the title to the land the Agricultural Bank helped finance him to get him started. Members of this House have fathers who got their start in that way. We have to look at what are today termed those old-fashioned methods that helped develop this State and country. While I do not expect a return to the horse-and-buggy days, some of those old principles have to be adopted. In those days the citizens of the State had the two things that are missing today: opportunity and incentive. If they were prepared to work, they could make a go of things.

I wish to speak about the way that the Government has badly mishandled the State forests. Since this Government came to power, to my knowledge and to the knowledge of anybody else whom I have spoken to, not once has it had a competent Minister in charge of forestry. Not once has a Minister for Forestry known anything about rainforests. He may have known about gidgee or tea-trees.

The rainforests of north Queensland and the coastal belts of the State are unique. Although other countries of the world and other parts of Australia may have similar species, university tests have proved that those species do not have the same texture as those in the tropical parts of north Queensland. The black walnut in Italy and France is similar to that in Queensland, but university tests have proved that it does not have the same texture. The maple in Canada and other parts of the world appears to be similar to ours, but, once again, university tests show that it does not have the same texture or quality as the species that grows in north Queensland.

Tonight I will give the House some facts and figures that will show how the Government has mishandled the State's forestry areas. Many good men in the State Forestry Department have made recommendations to the Government, but as I said before, just as in the 30-odd years that the Government has been in power it has not had a competent Minister in charge of the Forestry Department of Queensland, those recommendations have been ignored. The current Minister failed in another portfolio; now he is in charge of forestry. He went over to France and messed things up there as well. Because of the way he handled it, and because of his lack of ability and his lack of knowledge of the timber industry, I do not know what will happen to Queensland in the long term.

I wish to raise the Queensland Government's mismanagement and its incompetence in the administration of the State's public forest estate. In recent years public concern about forest administration has been growing and the controversy over the Federal

Government's decision to proceed with World Heritage listing of sections of the rainforest has again brought forest management issues to the forefront of the public debate in Queensland. During the recent Federal election campaign, the Minister for Lands and Forestry stated repeatedly that World Heritage listing will involve the loss of thousands of jobs in north Queensland and that the proposed listing was just another step in the conservationists' campaign to annihilate Australia's native forest timber industry.

I will go on to prove the Government's lack of knowledge and ability in the administration of the rainforests of Queensland. I will demonstrate to this Assembly the repeated verbiage of the former Minister, Mr Glasson, over the past several months and, more seriously, his statements to this House during the debate on the second reading of the Forestry Act Amendment Act on Tuesday, 4 August 1987. It reveals nothing more than a Minister of the Crown who is either grossly misinformed about key forest management issues in this State or grossly dishonest in his handling and presentation of these issues to both this Assembly and the Queensland public. Either way, the Minister's handling of the Forestry portfolio is a matter for considerable public concern. I believe that, by any reasonable standards of ministerial responsibility, he has no alternative but to resign. I say the same about the present Minister. The two of them have not taken advice when they should have from their own departmental officers who have advised them on matters of conservation and on how to handle the forestry situation in north Queensland.

Mr Muntz: Where were you when the forestry workers were denied their jobs in north Queensland? You were hiding under the kitchen table.

Mr EATON: I was not there. The honourable member went over to Paris and he messed it up. I was trying to help them.

Mr Muntz: You haven't done a thing. Like Mr De Lacy, you haven't done a thing.

Mr EATON: I do not agree with the World Heritage listing in the way that it is, and I am prepared to have that recorded in *Hansard*. I have been dealing with the Federal Government. It is waiting anxiously to see how the Minister is going. It is the Minister's negotiations with the Federal Government that will make or break some of the poor fellows in north Queensland; "don't you worry about that".

The specific matters I wish to bring to the attention of this Assembly are: the rubbery estimates of the sustained yield from the north Queensland rainforest that the Minister and his department have presented and continue to present to both this Assembly and the Queensland public; the rubbery estimates of the employment levels in the north Queensland timber industry presented at various times by the Minister; and the inadequate rubbery interpretation that the Minister has given of the scandalous level of public debt incurred by the Government's inappropriate and inadequate approach to the forest management of this State. As I have told honourable members, it is \$7m short of half a billion dollars.

Mr Muntz: Do you agree with Senator Richardson's attitude on far-north Queensland?

Mr EATON: I do not agree with it; but that does not stop us facing the facts.

Mr Muntz: Why didn't you say so?

Mr EATON: I said so. I said it off the truck when I was with him. If the honourable member looks at the TV replay, he will see that I have said that. I do not agree with what Senator Richardson is doing.

Mr Muntz: What about all your constituents up there who will be thrown out of a job?

Mr EATON: Because of the incompetence and the inability of the Minister, we are in worse trouble than we should have been. He has made a bad situation worse. He went over to Paris and messed up and undermined what the Labor Party was trying to

do, all because he went public looking for a bit of glory. It was nothing more than a glory hunt to feed his ego. I am not happy with the World Heritage area, but the Queensland Government has messed it up.

Time will only permit me to address these few issues in a cursory way. However, while the facts I will bring to light in this speech will I am sure disturb every thinking member of this Assembly, I can assure the House that they are only the tip of a very rotten iceberg. I believe that the level of mismanagement and incompetence displayed by this Government in the area of lands and forest management demands a full and open judicial inquiry. It is not often that I am that hard on Government members. I have written these figures down so that I can quote them and get them right.

Mr Muntz: Next elections in 1989, you're gone. Your constituents won't suffer what you have done to them.

Mr EATON: I will take that chance. At least I am fighting for what I know is right, which is more than Government members are doing. They are only fighting for publicity and glory to feed their egos.

Both the Minister and his department have repeatedly told us all how the forests they manage are renewable resources and how they are practising sustained yield management in our rainforests in north Queensland. The ALP has no problem in accepting that sustained yield management is an appropriate wood production objective for the Department of Forestry. However, the ALP does have severe problems in matching the laudable rhetoric of the department's sustained yield objectives with the hard realities of its failure to achieve those objectives in the north Queensland rainforest and elsewhere. Indeed, it is difficult to understand just what the Minister and his department mean when they talk about the concept of sustained yield. Sustained yield management is a complex subject, though the concept itself is simple enough. From the point of view of timber production, it means that the yield of timber is expressed as the volume of the type of product which can be harvested from the forest at a consistent level for an indefinite period.

Later on, I will cite figures that have reduced from 4 million superfeet in the previous measurements to 60 000 cubic metres, which is another rubbery figure. If the Minister takes an interest in his department, he will dig out some of those old reports and the findings of those inquiries. If he did that, he would find out that what I am saying is the truth——

Mr Muntz: But what you have said in north Queensland is that you want to see the timber industry closed down. You agree with Senator Richardson.

Mr EATON: I do not agree with Senator Richardson——

Mr Muntz: You want to see those people thrown out of work in north Queensland because you agree with Senator Richardson.

Mr EATON: I do not agree with Senator Richardson——

Mr Muntz: Why don't you go down to Canberra and tell them so?

Mr EATON: I have told the Federal Minister. He knows that. Why does the Minister not tell him? It is all right for the Minister to sit in this Chamber and ask why I do not do something. He is the Minister of the Crown in Queensland, and he has messed it up. That is what he has done. The Minister has made the job of the Opposition—which is trying to help—a lot harder.

The Minister has not got an ounce of knowledge about forestry management. Previous Ministers have overruled their departmental officers, who have tried to advise them correctly. The Ministers of this Government have played power politics with an industry that will be killed by a bad decision made in Canberra. I admit that, and I think that the Federal Government will end up admitting it, too.

The Minister wants everybody else to make a statement so that he can go down to Canberra and be the good fellow and belt Canberra, but he will not get off his backside. Mr Muntz is the Minister; he should be able to speak with authority and deal with the Ministers in Canberra. If the Opposition was given the job, it would do it—

Mr Muntz: But you are supporting Senator Richardson.

Mr EATON: No. I have supported some of the things that the Queensland Government has done. I have written letters to Senator Richardson. I do not support everything that the Queensland Government has done, but I have supported some of the things that it has done.

The Minister is trying to make political mileage out of what I say. He wants me to say what he wants to hear so that he can go down to Canberra and come back to Queensland covered in glory. The Minister wants to be able to say that he tried when he did not try.

Given the Minister's newfound concern for the jobs of north Queensland timberworkers—a matter that I will return to later—it may be instructive for him, along with other members of this Parliament, to consider the range of estimates of the sustained yield of the north Queensland rainforest that have been published by his department or its officers over the last 20 years.

Now I will get onto the rubbery figures, as they are called. In the abstract of a paper prepared for the Ninth Commonwealth Forestry Conference, Mr H. E. Volck of the Department of Forestry said the following—

“A Land Classification Committee in 1960/61 estimated that for north Queensland the annual log timber requirements by the year 2010 would be 200,000,000 super feet (Hoppus). It is considered that 600,000 acres of silviculturally treated rain forest will provide this 200,000 super feet of log timber annually in sizes above 72 inches girth breast high.”

I can speak as a north Queenslander, a former timber-cutter, and somebody who knows a bit about timber, even if it might only be a little bit. That is still more than the Minister knows about it. I am sure that all honourable members will be interested to learn that there is approximately 330 superfeet of timber in every cubic metre of timber. That is why there is a difference in the old measurement of superfeet and the new measurement of cubic metres. Even members of the National Party may be able to work out that Mr Volck's 1968 estimate of sustained yield translates into some 600 000 cubic metres in today's terms. The Government today has reduced that to 60 000 cubic metres. It was not an estimate. It was what is called a guesstimate. These facts are admitted by the Government's own Forestry Department.

Admittedly, Mr Volck did stress the need for silvicultural treatment or timber stand improvement to achieve this result, so he did place a question mark after it. Again, I mention that I am quoting the department's own forestry officer. He did indicate on page 19 of his paper that the area of productive and accessible rainforest was then still unknown. However, it is clear that his estimate of the sustained yield was well above the levels that the Minister and his department talk about today.

Mr Volck's paper also gives a clear impression of the totally inadequate level of forestry science that this Government has tolerated during its term of office. In 1968 the Government did not even know what the area of productive rainforest was, and honourable members will see from the equally rubbery estimates that have surfaced periodically since that time that things are not much better today.

In 1975 Mr Volck surfaced again with a paper titled, *Problems in the Silvicultural Treatment of the Tropical Rain Forests of Queensland*. It was apparently prepared for a forestry conference in Brazil in 1975. It reveals the lack of knowledge of the Queensland Government in running its own forestry. Mr Volck said—

“... the sustained yield to the year 2000 is estimated to range between an absolute minimum of 160,000m³ and a maximum of 220,000 m³.”

However, in 1987 the figure was reduced to 60 000 cubic metres, which a lot of people said then was an overestimation.

Mr Muntz: I thought you supported the forestry workers of Queensland?

Mr EATON: I do. I support the forestry workers. Members of the Government have denied them certain rights. They have held back the forestry workers and the Forestry Department in Queensland by refusing to take the advice they offered when they wanted to manage the forests. The Government proposed schemes only at election-time. The Government overrode the decisions of the forestry workers and refused to take their advice on board. As Mr Volck said, 20 years ago the Government did not have a scientific knowledge of forestry; it just went along, taking an income from it without worrying about putting anything back into it at all.

Mr Muntz: You sold your mates down the drain.

Mr EATON: I did not. I would have more friends in the north than the Minister has because I have tried to help people. The Minister is only trying to make political mileage out of the matter. The Minister should get in, do something and find out more about it.

Mr Stocker, Mr Gilmour and Mr Cassells, the rainforest scientist, said—

“Estimates of yield that the north Queensland rain forest can sustain vary considerably.”

On page 6 of their paper they go on to say—

“There is also little agreement on the effective area of productive rainforest available for sustained timber harvesting.”

Clearly, forest management science had not progressed much in Queensland by 1977. As far as the actual estimates of the sustained yield, they noted—

Mr Muntz: Why don't you give some credit to the people of north Queensland who manage rainforests instead of trying to degrade them?

Mr EATON: I am not degrading them. The State Government has held back the forestry workers.

Mr Muntz: But you are not supporting the forestry workers.

Mr EATON: I have great respect for the forestry workers and I know many of them. That is why I know that Government members have killed many programs that they wanted to instigate.

Mr Muntz: Why don't you go to Canberra and support them? Why don't you go and tell Senator Richardson to withdraw the nomination.

Mr EATON: The Minister has made a stupid political statement, and he knows it. I will back the forestry officers all the way because I know them.

The Minister has said that I should back up the forestry workers. I will back up the forestry officers. In many instances the officers are crooked on the Minister because he has failed to provide the goods. He should get someone incognito to go round and talk to the forestry officers. He would then find out what they think about the State Government and the way it has failed to provide for the needs of the Forestry Department. It is all right for the Minister to make political statements. The Minister should go out and talk to the men. He is driving them further into debt.

Nearly three-quarters of the forestry officers did not know what the forestry debt was. Although they had been working in the forestry industry for a life-time, they did not know what that debt was. The Forestry Department kept those matters quiet. The department did not tell the officers.

In 1949 the Labor Government held the McLean inquiry into the timber industry in Queensland. In 1959 another McLean inquiry was held by the National Party

Government. I point out that the two McLeans were unrelated. Both persons arrived at similar conclusions. We find that 30 years later this Government has not done a thing about them.

Mr Muntz interjected.

Mr EATON: That was not because of World Heritage.

Mr Muntz: They will throw you out, too.

Mr EATON: I will take that chance. I stand on a principle and I say what I believe to be right and what I know to be right. I could take the Minister into forestry areas and show him where he has done nothing. The Minister can bring along representatives from *Four Corners* and *60 Minutes*. We can get into the forest and we will see then who knows about forestry. The Minister can appear on television and we will let the whole of Australia judge who is telling the truth and who is not.

For too long Government members have had a good run for their money. They have sold off Queensland's assets and done nothing about preparing for the future. The Minister talks about sustainable yield. All we hear is rhetoric. There is no substance in the Minister's statements. Since this Government came to power, successive Ministers knew nothing about timber other than that it grew out of the ground and that it had leaves on it. That is about the sum total of the knowledge of all Forestry Ministers in this Government since it came to power in 1957. It is a sad thing to have to say that, because the whole of Queensland has had to pay the price of being involved with a Government that in some areas is going backwards instead of forwards.

Mr Simpson: When Labor was in office they used to have an open season on koalas.

Mr EATON: That is not correct. The Government went through a good period when the mining industry and other industries experienced a natural increase, not because of Government planning or Government strategy. The Government just rode on the sheep's back with the natural increase.

Time expired.

Debate, on motion of Mr Austin, adjourned.

STATE ENVIRONMENT BILL

Hon. G. H. MUNTZ (Whitsunday—Minister for Environment, Conservation and Tourism) (10.30 p.m.), by leave, without notice: I move—

“That leave be granted to bring in a Bill to constitute a State Environment Advisory Council to amend the Clean Air Act 1963-1987 the Clean Waters Act 1971-1982 and the Noise Abatement Act 1978-1985 each in certain particulars and for related purposes.”

Motion agreed to.

First Reading

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

Second Reading

Hon. G. H. MUNTZ (Whitsunday—Minister for Environment, Conservation and Tourism) (10.31 p.m.): I move—

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

Following my appointment as Minister for Environment, Conservation and Tourism, a master plan for the new Department of Environment, Conservation and Tourism was

approved by Cabinet. The approved blueprint provided for the development of new initiatives in environment management. These included—

- effecting efficiencies by the consolidation of the air, water and noise Acts and the amalgamation and reduction in membership of the three statutory bodies;
- reducing red tape and time delays through the vesting of executive functions in the Chief Executive;
- establishing a more pro-active approach through prevention, rather than control, in pollution management; and
- creating user-friendly legislation through the declaration of State and regional environment policies and guide-lines.

It is planned to introduce the above initiatives in two stages. The first of these stages involves the constitution of one advisory statutory body and the vesting of day-to-day executive decisions in the Chief Executive. These changes are the subject of the State Environment Bill 1988.

The second stage will entail the repeal of the three existing Acts—air, water and noise—and the proclamation of one comprehensive State Environment Act. This stage will involve new concepts that are designed to give effect to the remaining initiatives that I have mentioned. It will take some time to develop the proposed legislation, because of the need for other authorities to be involved in the environmental management network. Accordingly, I am introducing the Stage 1 interim amendments to the existing Acts in order to facilitate the immediate implementation of the administrative efficiencies that can be achieved.

The amendments now before the House are crucial to the immediate introduction of efficiencies in line with the Savage report and the departmental restructure. The advantages of one statutory body to oversee air, water and noise matters will be reflected in time savings and better co-ordination of environmental issues. The vesting of executive powers in the Chief Executive will enable expeditious processing of the more routine tasks and the elimination of unduly long decision-making procedures. These reduced time delays are of particular importance not only to developers, where time means money, but also to all clients of the department.

The proposed legislative amendments complement the new administrative structure of my department. It is intended that inspectorial staff be multiskilled and that interdisciplinary teams manage designated areas of the State. This approach will enable close liaison with decision-makers in industry and local authorities and thereby enhance the preventative function of the environment legislation.

Other efficiency provisions relate to the consolidation of the three existing trust funds. This is appropriate, considering the amalgamation of resources presently administering the air, water and noise legislation.

The Bill also makes provision for the proscription of excessive noise from swimming-pool and spa equipment. There has been considerable public pressure to have controls implemented over this insidious noise source, and I am pleased to inform the House that the necessary amendments to the Noise Abatement Act are contained in this Bill. My department will, in conjunction with the Department of Local Government, be issuing public relations material on the remedies that are available to reduce noise from pool and spa equipment.

For historical reasons, Queensland's environmental legislation evolved as scattered attempts to control specific types of pollution. The state of the art now requires precise, user-friendly, comprehensive legislation which facilitates service delivery and corporate direction, with the major emphasis on prevention. The State Environment Bill 1988 is the first step towards bringing Queensland to the forefront with interstate and international trends, where it is now recognised that economic growth and environmental management must, and can, go hand in hand. The track record of the air, water and noise administration provides visible evidence that the two—economic growth and environmental

management—can co-exist harmoniously, and the new direction will ensure that this approach is continued.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate, on motion of Mr Comben, adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. B. D. AUSTIN (Nicklin—Leader of the House) (10.36 p.m.): I move—
“That the House do now adjourn.”

Dairying Industry

Mr CASEY (Mackay) (10.36 p.m.): Today in the House during the Address in Reply debate quite a number of comments were made about the dairying industry and certain things that are happening to it at present. The dairying industry, of course, goes right back to the very heartland of the National Party. For quite a number of years after it first came into office in 1957, particularly when it was in coalition with the Liberals, who gave it the tag, the National Party was known as the cow-cocky party because it was very close to the dairying industry. Earlier today a most amazing thing was done by a member from one of the best dairying areas of the State, namely, the member for Warwick, Mr Booth. He voted in favour of the south coast dairying industry rather than in support of his own area of Warwick. That occurred as the result of a division on a motion that I sought leave to move this morning.

Government members interjected.

Mr CASEY: The members who are chanting on the back benches let him down badly. They held their own joint party meeting at which the dairying industry was discussed. Why did they let him down? They pulled the old stunt, “Blow you Jack. I’m all right.” Their areas are okay, they are going along quite well, they are quite happy. They are getting the cream and the people in Warwick are getting the skim milk.

I was absolutely surprised at some of the comments made by the honourable member for Warwick. For a moment, from the way in which he was speaking, I thought that last night he must have been at a different meeting from the one that I attended in Warwick. Unquestionably, because he had not been sticking up enough for them, last night his own people, his own constituents in his own town gave him somewhat of a drubbing when he attended that meeting. As for the Minister for Primary Industries—every time his name was mentioned, they booed and hissed. They could be heard everywhere. They could be heard right down the main street of Warwick and up and down King Street, which contained the building in which the meeting was held.

The member for Warwick spoke about some of the things that I did not talk about last night in relation to transferability at Warwick. At that meeting there was a time limit on speeches, the same as there is here. Let me very quickly say something about Labor’s policy on transferability in the milk industry in Queensland. Next year when the Labor Party comes to government in this State, it will not step in and take the quotas off people who already have them and cut back their market milk quotas. That would disrupt the entire industry. The Labor Party will make sure that transferability is controlled and it will build up the smaller areas and the smaller groups with the growth milk situation. That is really what is needed now.

In 1977 in this House the Milk Supply Bill was introduced, and at that time the Labor Party agreed with most of the legislation, other than a few particular sections of it. I spoke on behalf of the Labor Party in that debate. Mr Sullivan was the then Minister for Primary Industries. As I say, the Labor Party agreed with the legislation, because the industry had to be contracted, and in a moment I will outline very briefly why it had to be contracted.

As a result of that legislation, the stage has now been reached at which, if growth is not properly handled, because of the way in which this Government is distributing

milk quotas, this State will finish up with market milk shortages. Last night Mr Booth said that this Government was the only Government that had ever done anything about the milk industry. I have news for him. He has not studied his own industry well enough. If he did, he would know that prior to 1957, when the Labor Government was in office in this State, and even later in the early years of this Government, the Warwick Co-Operative Dairy Association was winning gold medals for its butter and various other products in Great Britain. That happened because the Hanlon Labor Government in Queensland entered into contracts that ensured that surplus milk products and manufactured milk products from this State were exported to Great Britain and that a good price was obtained for them.

However, in 1974, Great Britain entered the European Community. From that point, Queensland lost its market in Britain. The prices for its products on other overseas markets were reduced. This Government was too slow to slip in, and it let New Zealand capture other markets at that time. The result was a disaster for the industry, which is why it had to be shrunk to the position it is in today. It has been shrunk to the point at which, in order to prop it up, the Minister for Primary Industries is trying to send Queensland milk across to Norco in New South Wales. He is more interested in Norco than he is in the Queensland community.

As for my not talking about this matter on the Gold Coast—the Minister ought to ask Mr Hollindale about that! The Honourable Minister for Environment, Conservation and Tourism, Mr Muntz, would know full well the arguments I have had with certain connections he has on the Gold Coast over the way in which dairies in the south coast dairy area, through this Government, are taking over the milk industry in Queensland. In the recent fiasco, Mr Booth, the Minister for Primary Industries, Mr Harper, and the Premier—despite promises he made in June to the people in Warwick—threw those people out the door.

Time expired.

Reporting of Referendum Issues in *Townsville Bulletin*

Mr BURREKET (Townsville) (10.41 p.m.): Tonight I want to talk very briefly about the referendum and the problems I have been having in getting the message through in the north. Some time ago, I approached the *Townsville Bulletin* and said that, as the member for Townsville, I would like to have some input on the referendum questions. I found out that I was getting nowhere.

However, the member for Thuringowa and the member for Herbert were able to have letters to the editor published, to which I was able to respond. People were able to read some very distorted facts on the referendum, particularly from the member for Thuringowa. In fact, he and Mr Lindsay both made the claim in the *Townsville Bulletin* that the referendum questions in no way related to the election of the Senate. I was able to reply to that statement but I then said to the managers of the *Townsville Bulletin*, "Surely you are going to do something about the referendum questions." They said to me, "Look, we are going to get an unbiased, apolitical person to write an article on the referendums." Mr Deputy Speaker, would you believe that the person they went to was one Professor Henry Reynolds, who happens to be the husband of one Senator Margaret Reynolds. He is a Professor of History at James Cook University and one of the greatest red-raggers one would ever want to meet.

The article appeared in the *Townsville Bulletin* and began by misquoting a letter that I had sent in a couple of days earlier in which I pointed out that the risks of the referendum would be that the north and the west would lose eight seats to the southern metropolitan area. This eminent professor, this historian—the man who researches and tells us the facts of life and the facts of history—misquoted what I had said and said that I stated Queensland would lose eight seats in the north.

Many complaints have been made in the past that the education system is not working; that children are not able to read, write, analyse and spell. I must ask the question: is it any wonder, when academics of the calibre of this so-called Professor

Henry Reynolds cannot read a simple little letter which says, "Eight seats in the west and north"? He came back in an article in the *Townsville Bulletin*, for which he was paid, and misquoted simple little facts. If the education system is failing, it is not the fault of the teachers in primary schools and it is not the fault of teachers in secondary schools; it is obviously because of problems that are being caused by some of the academics.

I must be very critical of Professor Henry Reynolds. I noticed that he has had some other feedback from the public. Apparently someone got a tin of red paint——

Mr Palaszcuk: Did you do it?

Mr BURREKET: Children, ask intelligent questions, please! That interjection shows why difficulty is being experienced in trying to get a simple message through.

The facts are that in the north and west where most of the wealth of this State comes from—most of the cattle and minerals—there is not much representation. That is the one good thing about this system, which was introduced into Queensland by a Labor Government and kept that Government in power for 29 years. Labor would still be in power if its members had not been absolute dills. The ALP split enabled the conservative forces to assume Government in Queensland. All the conservative Government has done is tune up a system which was introduced into Queensland by the Labor Party and on which the Labor Party ran for office for so long.

Why is Australia facing a referendum? The answer is because the Labor Party in Queensland will never ever win power on its own. The Labor Party has gone to Big Brother in Canberra and asked the Federal Government to wave a big stick over Queensland and some of the other States because it cannot win an election on its own.

Time expired.

Closure of Inala Swimming-pool; Teaching Relief Scheme

Mr PALASZCZUK (Archerfield) (10.46 p.m.): There are two matters that I wish to raise: firstly, the closure of the Inala swimming-pool and, secondly, the under-use of the teacher relief scheme in Queensland.

The first point relates to a problem with the pool that serves the suburb of Inala and the surrounding areas. It is a major recreational facility for the district which, as is quite evident, is not overloaded with recreational amenities for its residents. However, the closure of the pool creates serious problems for the 10 schools and their thousands of pupils who currently patronise the pool. The swimming-pool is privately owned and for the past four or five years has been leased by the Brisbane City Council, thus saving the council the cost of building a pool in the Inala area. However, the Brisbane City Council refuses to renew the lease on the swimming-pool.

Mr Sherrin: Shame!

Mr PALASZCZUK: The honourable member might well say, "Shame!"

The excuse given by the Brisbane City Council is the old one that renewal of the lease will create a problem for the council. When one puts the cost of the lease into its proper perspective, one finds that this reasoning by the Brisbane City Council falls rather flat.

Mr Sherrin: There is no Liberal representation in the Parliament once again.

Mr PALASZCZUK: That is typical of the Liberal Party in this Parliament and of the Liberal Party in the Brisbane City Council when it comes to representation in areas such as my electorate.

The cost of the lease is only \$26,000 per annum, which incidentally, is the amount that the council charges its pool lessees. To put the figure into context—the recent salary increase of the Lord Mayor would pay for two years' lease of the Inala swimming-pool. As I have stated, there is no other public swimming-pool in Inala. Its closure will deprive

thousands of schoolchildren in my electorate of swimming and recreational facilities. In a climate such as Queensland's, it is a disgrace.

It is ridiculous for this Government to be for ever urging parents to have their children taught to swim while the Brisbane City Council is penny-pinching and denying the children of Inala and surrounding areas that very opportunity. It is a fact of life that parents and citizens organisations in less affluent areas are hard pressed to keep up with the basic necessities of the schools, let alone provide for a swimming-pool. The Inala State School p. and c. association has saved for 18 years to build a pool, but the school cannot get a Government subsidy owing to a three-year backlog for funding of school pools. Consequently, the children of the Inala State School are deprived of a swimming venue. The answer given by the Brisbane City Council is a gem. It shows how out of touch the present administration at city hall is with the needs of the outer suburbs.

The council suggested that the schoolchildren of Inala be transported by bus to swimming-pools outside the area. What a brilliant idea! However, the problem is that no pools in the surrounding areas are free to take that number of children. The fact that this National Party Government refuses to let the Brisbane City Council buses service Inala seems to have been overlooked. The area has to rely on a private contractor.

By a strange coincidence, a private pool at Acacia Ridge would be delighted to accept the schoolchildren of Inala. It is owned by none other than the Liberal alderman for Coopers Plains, Alderman Greg Stegman. That pool is illegal; it does not comply with the council's own zoning requirements.

I call on the Brisbane City Council to renew the lease of the Inala pool. If it will not do so, I call on it to spend some of the money being used on the Olympic Games bid to build a public pool at Inala. The Education Department and the Ahern Government must also shoulder their responsibilities to provide subsidy arrangements to p. and c. associations to construct swimming-pools at schools. It is high time that the Inala State School p. and c. association was given a high priority by this Government for a swimming-pool subsidy. I call on the Minister to give a high priority to that p. and c. association in its quest this year for a subsidy to commence the building of a pool.

Water Supply and Sewerage Reticulation, Livingstone Shire

Mr HINTON (Broadsound) (10.51 p.m.): I wish to mention one or two of the problems of the major shire in my electorate, that is, the Livingstone Shire, which has very considerable structural problems. I am sorry that the Minister for Water Resources and Maritime Services left the House just prior to my making this speech, because I know he will give me enormous assistance with these matters.

The first is a success story. The water supply for the shire is drawn from Water Park Creek. After a fresh in the creek, the water is muddy and, quite frankly, the supply becomes a disgrace. That reduces the quality of life of the people and has a deleterious effect on the tourism industry. The problem has been solved by the construction of a \$4.8m water-filtration plant. I am happy to say that \$2.3m of Government funding was provided for that plant. That has been of enormous assistance to the Livingstone Shire Council. The switching-on ceremony for the plant is on 30 September. That is a great success story of Government assistance to a shire in my electorate. The shire council and I are very proud of that achievement.

At the other end of the Capricorn Coast I do not have such a success story. The small town of Emu Park currently has a population of 2 000. It is estimated that by the year 2000 that population will increase to 3 500. Even though it is now a small town, it is a rapidly growing area. The problem at Emu Park is that it has no sewerage, which is most unsatisfactory. I am determined to address that problem.

To sewer the area would be quite difficult. The population is scattered throughout the area. It has a very high component of pensioners, who have little capacity to meet what would be, without State Government assistance, the high cost of a sewerage plant. Without that assistance, it would cost \$600 per tenement to sewer the area.

The poor soil type causes much of the land, particularly that adjacent to some of the pensioner units and retirement areas, to become a quagmire, which is a large health risk to those affected. Because the area is hilly, the cost of sewerage would be very expensive. The council has estimated that the total cost of a normal sewerage program would be \$5m. Because the 20 per cent subsidy applies only to the treatment and disposal section, the total subsidy would be only \$240,000. The treatment and disposal section will cost \$1.2m, so we receive only a \$240,000 subsidy for a \$5m plant. That imposes an impossible burden on the council of the area. Therefore, I have brought down a deputation from the council to meet with the Minister for Water Resources, Mr Neal. I am hoping that, once the engineering side of it is completed, we will be putting forward a case to Cabinet for special assistance. I suggest that this is probably one town above all others in Queensland which has a particularly special case for assistance in my area.

I might add that several engineering options have been examined. A common effluent disposal system which will be a cheaper scheme and more within the lines of the council's assistance has been examined, but it is really only for small townships with a limited capacity to grow and would be a substandard scheme. Therefore, the council should press, and will press, for State Government assistance for a normal sewerage scheme.

The engineering side of it is almost complete. We are almost ready to present a case to State Cabinet for special assistance. I am sure that the Minister for Water Resources will give us assistance in that regard.

Redundancy of Railway Catering Staff at Bundaberg

Mr CAMPBELL (Bundaberg) (10.56 p.m.): I rise in this Adjournment debate to bring to the notice of the House changes to staff in the Railway Department and the absurd and inept decisions made by the management of the Railway Department to supposedly rationalise that department.

The department has served redundancy notices on the railway catering staff at the Bundaberg depot. The female staff must transfer or resign from 12 September 1988. To avoid the option of those employees under the redundancy and early retirement scheme, the workers' jobs are technically declared as being redundant but not the workers. It is discrimination against the workers and does not allow them to participate in the redundancy and early retirement scheme.

The Bundaberg railway catering services depot is to close. Its services will now be provided by staff stationed at Rockhampton and Brisbane. That is where the ridiculous, inefficient and bad decision-making of the Railway Department occurs.

The Australian Railways Union has advised that on 12 September the new rosters for catering staff working from Rockhampton to Brisbane and vice versa are to come into effect. The Railway Department hierarchy has decided that Rockhampton staff will travel on Mondays in a bus—the competitor of the railways—from Rockhampton to Brisbane so that they can work the train the next day back to Rockhampton. How absurd, irrational and inefficient it is to bus railway workers 646 kilometres to work a train. But, worse still, the Railway Department, through its inept and absurd management, will bus other catering staff from Brisbane to Rockhampton on Fridays, allow them to stay overnight and then work the train back to Brisbane.

It is absurd to think that under this new regime of fast trains and modern technology, the Railway Department will be bussing railway workers 646 kilometres to work. It makes one wonder who is running the Railway Department. It is unbelievable.

I have also found out that under the new roster system, at midnight or 1 o'clock in the morning drivers have to stand on the side of the road at Charters Towers to catch a bus back to Townsville. Is that how we expect a Railway Department to be run? Is that how we expect modern technology to be used—so that depots will be closed at provincial cities, jobs will be taken away from areas such as Bundaberg and Maryborough,

and workers will be forced to leave their families in Bundaberg to travel by bus to Brisbane and Rockhampton so that they can do exactly the same work?

It is a ridiculous situation and one that I would like the Minister to look into. He should ensure that the department has better decision-makers who will not implement such irrational and unprofitable arrangements whereby railway workers are bussed 646 kilometres to work. The new time schedule will speed the trains from Brisbane to Rockhampton, but the railway hierarchy will bus those staff. That will mean the closure of the Bundaberg railway catering services depot.

Many poor decisions have been made, while hundreds of millions of dollars are being spent to upgrade railway services. However, the most irrational and the worst decision that I have seen the Railway Department make is this one to close the Bundaberg railway catering services depot and to transfer those workers to Rockhampton and Brisbane and then, in the new rosters, force the catering services staff to be bussed 646 kilometres between Rockhampton and Brisbane. It is a disgrace.

Logan City, *Sunday Mail* Article

Mr FRASER (Springwood) (11.01 p.m.): I rise to correct some of the inaccuracies that were contained in a story by Ken Blanch in the *Sunday Mail* of last Sunday concerning Logan City. As a former Deputy Mayor of Logan City, I believe that I know a bit about that city.

Logan City was definitely shown in a bad light by that report. I do not say that the reporter set out to show Logan City in the worst light. I believe that he was trying to demonstrate some of the funding problems that Logan City does experience. However, Logan City is more than that photograph in the *Sunday Mail* showed. That would have to be the worst area of Kingston Road that one could find. There are much better areas in Logan City than that—

Mr De Lacy: They want to upgrade the representation a bit.

Mr FRASER: I will take that interjection. Two Labor Party members and one National Party member represent Logan City. If there were three National Party members, it would be better. I agree with the representation in the State scene.

Mr De Lacy: Is that why you are resigning?

Mr FRASER: I am not resigning. I am sorry to disappoint the honourable member.

I point out to honourable members that Logan City is the second-largest city in Queensland. It has a population of 130 000 people and has some very nice suburbs within its environs. Some of the suburbs that were not mentioned in that newspaper article which anyone would be proud to live in are Rochedale, Daisy Hill, Shailer Park, Loganholme, Forestdale and Greenbank, which is in the western side of the city.

On 9 June this year Logan City celebrated its tenth anniversary. It has gone from a population of some 62 000, 10 years ago, to a thriving city today of 130 000, as I mentioned earlier. Development is going on in the southern end of my electorate, which will eventually result in the largest shopping centre in the southern hemisphere.

The first stage of that shopping centre is under construction at present. It will open next May. That is a \$130m investment. Two further stages remain. At the end of the first stage there will be a Super K mart at one end—which is proposed to be the largest Super K mart in the southern hemisphere—and at the other end, some 400m away, there will be a Myer centre. In addition, along the shopping mall, which, as I said, will be 400m long, there will be some 132 specialty shops, with three other semimajor shops in the development. As honourable members would realise, it is a very large shopping centre development. That is completely different from the picture that was portrayed in the story in the *Sunday Mail* of last week.

Mr Veivers: A booming metropolis.

Mr FRASER: As the member for Southport says, it is a booming metropolis. He drives through Logan City on his way to Parliament House. I know that he would be nothing but impressed by that area.

Mr Veivers: That is true. Sometimes I pass through it rather quickly.

Mr FRASER: The honourable member mentions that he sometimes passes through rather quickly. If he has been in the middle of the Pacific Highway in peak hour, he will be aware that one cannot travel through Logan City as quickly as one would like.

My colleague the member for Woodridge mentioned toxic waste in Logan City. I am completely au fait with the toxic waste problem because I was a member of the council when a decision was made to purchase five of the worst-affected properties in the area. The honourable member strayed a little bit from the truth when he said that I big-noted myself in the Parliament and said that the council had fixed the problem.

I am sorry that the honourable member is not in the Chamber. I inform the House that he is known in the Diamond Street area as the phantom, because when people want to mention a problem to their local member, they cannot even find him.

Mr Muntz: Aren't the Labor Party going to disendorse Mr D'Arcy? Aren't they finished with him?

Mr FRASER: The member for Whitsunday said that the honourable member for Woodridge might be having trouble with his endorsement for the election next year. I am not aware of that, but I am aware of the problems that he has with some sections of his electorate.

Mr Alison: He is probably in the wrong faction.

Mr FRASER: A person would not know which faction he was in because——

Mr McKechnie: You can't find him.

Mr FRASER: The Minister is correct; one would not know, because one cannot find him.

Mr Palaszczuk: Are you running for Mayor of Logan City? Is this your policy speech?

Mr FRASER: To answer the honourable member's question—when the Mayor of Logan City retires, I will make a decision. He does not look as though he is going to retire because he is still in his wheelchair.

Time expired.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 11.07 p.m.