

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

THURSDAY, 5 OCTOBER 1989

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

THURSDAY, 5 OCTOBER 1989

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

PAPERS

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

Reports—

Queensland Police Department for the year ended 30 June 1989

Police Complaints Tribunal for the year ended 30 June 1989

Queensland Police Superannuation Board for the year ended 30 June 1989

Interim Report of the Police Complaints Tribunal for the period 22 April 1989 to 30 June 1989

State Fire Services for the year ended 30 June 1989

Department of Emergency Services and Administration Services for the year ended 30 June 1989

Commissioner for Railways for the year ended 30 June 1989.

The following papers were laid on the table—

Reports—

Financial Report of World Expo 88 for the period ended 31 December 1988

Financial Report of World Expo 88 for the period ended 7 May 1989

Statement of the Expenses of Ministers of the Crown for the period 1 January 1989 to 30 June 1989.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

World Expo Fun Park, Comments by Member for Cairns

Hon. T. R. COOPER (Roma—Premier and Treasurer and Minister for State Development) (10.03 a.m.), by leave: I refer to the speech made on Tuesday, 3 October, in the Matters of Public Interest debate by the member for Cairns, Mr De Lacy, and I wish to inform the House that this matter has been dealt with on a number of occasions. At the outset, therefore, I seek leave to table a copy of the press release made by my predecessor, the Honourable M. J. Ahern, on 30 May 1989.

Leave granted.

Whereupon the honourable member laid the document on the table.

Mr COOPER: The Government firmly and resolutely believes that this investment recommended by the Expo Authority and approved by the Governor in Council on 4 May 1989 was and will be of enormous strategic and financial benefit to Queenslanders.

The facts have been made quite clear on a number of occasions, and I will outline them. \$15.9 million was paid to World Expo Fun Park on 5 May 1989, made up of \$25m purchase price less \$9.1m owing by World Expo Fun Park and a further \$8m to be paid in May 1993—equivalent to approximately \$4.3m in 1989 terms—making a total payment in 1989 terms of \$29.3m, not \$34.4m as stated by the honourable member. This purchase price included freehold land of approximately 5 hectares and a completed

1 200-space car park, which cost \$12m to construct in 1986-87. In May 1989, with some administrative offices, it would have cost \$17m to construct.

The Expo Authority had been owed approximately \$9.1m in land payments and unpaid royalties in October 1988. The only responsibility the authority had was to have the land rezoned as Commercial B, which the contract stated to have a 1.5 plot ratio with 3 storeys as of right with negotiability to 4 storeys, with a total gross floor area up to about 70 000 square metres. On no occasion was the authority approached or indeed did the authority consider any change to this contracted position. The reference to two 40-storey buildings has no basis in fact; nor has it been referred to in any contract made by World Expo Fun Park with the authority.

Although World Expo Fun Park did not conform to its contractual requirement to pay royalties owing and land payments due on 30 October 1988, the company had by this date given notice of intention to take legal action against the authority for alleged failure by the authority to facilitate the successful operation of the amusement park—a claim strenuously denied by the Expo Authority.

Other legal issues had also been raised. The Expo Authority in turn then made a counter-claim for \$14.5m for alleged failure by the amusement park to perform as successfully as Expo and therefore to maximise the authority's royalties. The legal advice received by the Expo Authority was that any attempt to execute these provisions of the contracted rights would immediately lead to the formal legal claim already referred to being commenced, which would have led to lengthy and costly court actions extending over some years. Although the authority's legal advisers were confident of success, the process would be difficult and would be determined by legal argument with no absolute assurance of a successful outcome. The Expo Authority therefore wrote to World Expo Fun Park as part of the necessary steps to set in train preservation of the authority's legal contractual rights.

It was the opinion of the Expo Authority that the land and car park in question would become an important strategic asset for the future redevelopment of the south bank. In the light of the certainty of difficult and lengthy legal battles, negotiations therefore to purchase these valuable assets began in parallel with legal procedures to protect the authority's position.

The honourable member referred to the authority having power to receive financial statements of World Expo Fun Park. It needs to be stated categorically that the revenue situation and financial statements of World Expo Fun Park were under constant scrutiny by the revenue-collection division of the authority from the beginning of Expo. The honourable member's statement therefore is totally inaccurate and irresponsible.

The negotiations with World Expo Fun Park were extremely complex and protracted. World Expo Fun Park significantly reduced its initial claims as a result of a firm and resolute determination by the Expo Authority to achieve this extremely satisfactory result.

Any reasonable person could therefore deduce that, in the light of all these matters and the complexity of the situation, these arrangements have resulted in acquisition of an extremely valuable asset which is now the property of the Government. For the information of honourable members, I point out that the new South Bank Corporation has for some months been working on plans to be released soon which will no doubt include concepts for the future use of this valuable acquisition.

It is tragic that the Opposition has been prepared to misrepresent this situation so well handled by the Expo Authority and endorsed by the Government. These arrangements will ultimately be of enormous benefit to the people of Queensland.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

Opportunity for Members to Meet Interim Police Commissioner

Hon. V. P. LESTER (Peak Downs—Minister for Police and Minister for Employment, Training and Industrial Affairs) (10.08 a.m.), by leave: I outline to the House very briefly that the interim Queensland Police Commissioner, Mr Newnham, will arrive at about midday today.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr LESTER: The way that the ALP members are acting shows their absolute contempt for the interim Police Commissioner.

At 5 p.m., he will be available on the fourth floor of the Parliamentary Annexe for those members of the House who would like to meet him. This is purely a non-political message to the members of the Parliament. Every member has the opportunity to meet our interim commissioner, who will take up duty on 1 November.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT—**Annual Report, Queensland Police Department**

Hon. V. P. LESTER (Peak Downs—Minister for Police and Minister for Employment, Training and Industrial Affairs) (10.09 a.m.), by leave: I have lengthy comments to make on the past, present and future activities of the Queensland Police Department. I seek leave to table those comments and to have them incorporated in *Hansard*.

Leave granted.

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

Today I have tabled the annual report of the Queensland Police Department.

The report prepared by Acting Commissioner Redmond provides a review of the administrative and operational activities of the Police Department for the year ended 30 June 1989.

The report details not only the achievements for the year under review, but also those areas where objectives have not been achieved.

The maintenance of law and order and the preservation of peace in the community are not easy tasks in this day and age and the members of the Queensland police service are to be commended for a job well done.

As required by law, the annual reports of the Police Complaints Tribunal are included with the Police Department annual report. The general management of the Police Department has been subject to the Police Act and Rules with an overview by the Police Complaints Tribunal. During the past financial year, senior staff were provided by the Police Department to attend to the numerous investigations and other matters referred to the Police Complaints Tribunal. During the past financial year senior staff were provided by the Police Department to attend to the numerous investigations and other matters referred to the Police Complaints Tribunal for investigation.

The contents of the eighth report furnished by the Police Complaints Tribunal indicate a very unsatisfactory situation in so far as the Police Department's role in investigating complaints against members of the police force.

As honourable members are aware, the commission of inquiry report recommends the abolition of the Police Complaints Tribunal for reasons shown in that report.

All investigations mentioned in the eighth report have been scrutinised by the Police Department and legal advice obtained or is being obtained from the Crown's legal advisers where necessary.

The official misconduct division of the Criminal Justice Commission will subsequently absorb investigations into illegal activities and misconduct by police.

The Police Department over the past year, has introduced many community based policing initiatives in its efforts to fight crime. The annual report details instances of police involvement in community projects leading to a greater understanding and commitment by police officers and members of the community in working together for the common good.

The neighbourhood watch program is such an example. In the relatively short period of one year, 82 programs have been initiated involving 120 000 Queenslanders and administered by 3 000 trained community co-ordinators in a co-operative effort to protect their own property and the property of others. This is only the beginning and it is the aim of the Police Department to include as many members of the community as possible in the neighbourhood watch scheme.

The tabling of the Police Department annual report each year brings with it all sorts of criticism relating to the presentation of crime statistical information.

Much of this criticism has been without foundation. However, the current annual report displays statistical information in a manner which takes into account the unreported crime factor and separates the victimless offences such as drink driving and prostitution from the other reported offences coming to the notice of the Police Department.

A standard by which a police force may measure its success is to be found in the clear-up of offences against the person and property. These are the offences which affect members of the community the most and include offences such as rape, robbery, fraud, unlawfully using motor vehicles, homicide, serious assault and breaking and entering. Together the commission of these offences creates a massive cost to the community in terms of life, health and property.

For the year under review, a clear-up rate of 36 per cent was achieved, which is a reduction of 4 per cent over the result of the previous year.

To dispel any myths which may arise in relation to the authenticity of the crime tables in the Police Department annual report, an internationally recognised firm of accountants has carried out an audit of the manner and form of collation of crime table statistics and has certified that all data has been presented fairly and in accordance with the presumptions provided.

The prevention of needless slaughter on the roads of Queensland has occupied the efforts of a great many police officers during the past year. Random breath testing formally commenced on 1 January 1989 and for the full review period the number of drink-driving offences detected increased by 3.4 per cent to 29 166 offences. During the same period the number of fatal road accidents decreased by 3.6 per cent, however, the number of road accident deaths increased by five to 479 deaths.

The continuous fight against drugs resulted in an increase of 4.5 per cent in the number of detected drug offences for the past 12 months. This is a pleasing result and in line with department objectives for the review period.

The building program has received a considerable increase in funding with new stations being built at Atherton, Yarrabah, Mt Garnet, Esk, Nerang, Browns Plains, Injune, Runaway Bay and Woorabinda. The new headquarters building is progressing ahead of schedule and plans are progressing for new district headquarters at Boondall, Upper Mount Gravatt and Maryborough and new stations at Innisfail, Petrie, Tara and Mount Crosby.

In total an amount in excess of \$45.5 million has been expended on new police buildings throughout the State during the past 12 months providing much needed quality accommodation.

A further Government initiative was a grant of special funding for additional administrative support staff on a part-time basis enabling the release of police officers from administrative duties.

The Queensland Police Department has just passed through a two-year period of disruption and unease. The commission of inquiry has completed its public hearings and the chairman, Mr Fitzgerald, has presented his report. It is anticipated that the future will be one of change and filled with challenge. Police have continued during the recent troubled times to press on with their duties knowing that their calling is unique and much is dependent upon them. In this they have the respect and gratitude of the people of Queensland.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

Housing Policy of Queensland Labor Party

Hon. J. H. RANDELL (Mirani—Minister for Works and Housing) (10.10 a.m.), by leave: I refer to the housing policy outlined by the Queensland Labor Party. Honourable members should be aware that the Labor Party's policy offers nothing but unrealistic solutions to what it calls the national housing squeeze, or promises initiatives which the Queensland Government implemented years ago.

Mr Goss and his socialist Labor Party have thought of every reason for what they call the national housing squeeze, except their own Labor Party's abysmal mismanagement of the nation's economy, which has pushed interest rates to 17 per cent or more.

The Labor Party claims Queensland has the lowest rate of home-ownership in Australia, but Australian Bureau of Statistics figures show that that is another Labor Party falsity. In any case, the differences between States is marginal. For example, the

rate of home-ownership in New South Wales is 67.73 per cent, in Queensland it is 67.66 per cent and in Western Australia it is 67.45 per cent. The Queensland Government strongly supports and encourages home-ownership and spends more public funds on private home-ownership than does any other State.

The Goss Labor Party claims that there is a lack of proper funding and appropriate policies for housing, but one only has to look at Canberra's appalling financial mismanagement to know where the real problems lie. Rising interest rates, desperate \$200m deals with banks using tax-payers' money to buy votes, outrage by financial institutions, etc., tell the real story of how the Labor Party has betrayed the Australian people by making it virtually impossible to achieve home-ownership.

Mr Burns interjected.

Mr RANDELL: If the Opposition member would listen, he might learn something. I am answering some of his falsehoods. He tells lies and runs away.

The list of Labor's broken promises is enough to alert any thinking Queenslanders to the fact that the Labor Party cannot deliver its promises, even if they were realistic.

In this policy speech of 13 November 1984, Mr Hawke pledged to bring home-ownership within the reach of the ordinary Australian; instead, the Hawke Labor Government has implemented the worst housing crisis Australia has ever seen. What a joke! In 1983, it took 19 per cent of household income to pay off the average home. Today, it takes a massive 30 per cent.

Since the Federal Labor Government came to power, it has abolished the tax rebate for home-loan interest payments, introduced a new capital gains tax, banned negative gearing on rental properties for some two years, progressively cut funding for the first home owners scheme and reduced the value of the maximum grant available under the first home owners scheme.

The Labor Party claims it would create an effective mechanism for Queensland home-buyers to access lower cost and more accessible housing loans. What a joke! The Labor Party is a joke. Informed National Party members already know the Queensland Government has been providing low-interest, affordable home loans to Queenslanders since 1982 through the Queensland Housing Commission. Commission lending for home-ownership is offered more cheaply than in other States in a scheme that other States have awaited for years. The State Government also offers a second loan to many first home buyers to meet the deposit gap.

The Labor Party talks now of more accessible and lower-cost home loans. It was seven years ago that the Queensland Government implemented low-interest home-ownership options. Similarly, the Labor Party's suggestion of stamp duty concessions for first home buyers is a National Party initiative already implemented. The Labor Party wants to introduce something that is already available.

Labor Opposition housing policy also pledges to boost apprenticeship-training programs in the building industry. My colleague Vince Lester knows everything about those programs. It appears the Queensland Government has made too many innovations within the housing sector for the Opposition to contend with; otherwise it would know the Queensland Government was publicly acknowledged recently by the Master Builders Association for boosting its apprentice-training program.

It is understandable that the Labor Opposition cannot keep up with the many Queensland Government housing initiatives. Its total misunderstanding of housing needs is demonstrated so clearly in the policy paper, which reads—

“Labor has earmarked an extra \$15 million annually to fund these programs—
A total of an extra \$45 million over its first three years in office.”

One as yet unmentioned Labor promise is to build, during an imaginary term of office, an additional 1 500 units specifically for the aged. Well, I have sad news for Opposition members, if they will listen. With today's rapidly devaluing dollar thanks to

the Federal Labor Government, the Queensland Labor Party cannot build 500 units—not if it includes land costs—for \$15m, so it is impossible to imagine where all the money for the promised student accommodation and all the other housing jewels will come from. Labor is not living in the real world. It is still living in the Dark Ages.

Already in 1988-90, the National Party has plans to build 730 units specifically for age pensioners and the Labor Party has plans to build 500 units, so where is that party's great deal? The National Party has plans to build an additional 350 units for other pensioners. That is a total of 1 050 units and the Labor Party promises 500, and it does not even state where the money is coming from. The Labor Party is still living in the Dark Ages.

The Queensland Government's home-ownership schemes are the envy of other States, as are its public housing wait-lists. The majority of other States' minimum waiting-time is approximately Queensland's maximum.

Mr Burns interjected.

Mr RANDELL: I ask motor mouth to listen.

Queensland can also boast the shortest waiting-list of any mainland State. It would appear that the Opposition has a very selective memory on the issue of its housing policy, which needs a bottomless pit of money to meet its pie-in-the-sky promises. Queensland's National Party Government has achieved realistic housing goals within an established budget and will continue to do so with the support of the people of Queensland.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

Disability Support Services

Hon. B. A. NELSON (Aspley—Minister for Family Services) (10.16 a.m.), by leave: I am pleased to take this opportunity to inform honourable members of certain enhancements in services to Queensland people with disabilities.

Following the receipt of the report of the Ministerial Task Force on Services for People with an Intellectual Handicap in Queensland, which I chaired in 1988-89, an internal restructuring ensured that the disability support services were both upgraded and more effectively integrated with the rest of the department.

During the past financial year, a total of 50 additional staff were allocated to the disability support program, which enabled the department to improve the calibre of service delivery in several key areas, including residential care, community liaison and development and professional support. In addition to this, a further 100 positions have been committed to the Department of Family Services in the next financial year. I wish to emphasise that, in the allocation of those positions right across my portfolio, I will be responding very positively to the needs of people with disabilities and their families.

On Thursday, 28 September 1989, the Ministerial Advisory Committee on People with Head Injuries held its inaugural meeting with representatives from several State Government departments, the Commonwealth Government and an organisation known as Headway. That initiative was taken to help address the critical situation of many families throughout our State in which an adult member has sustained serious brain damage through accident or illness. That situation, which may affect any family in our society at any time, places inevitable strain on spouses and older parents as well as on the individual who has sustained the injury.

It is evident from the correspondence that reaches my department that there is a need for a concerted approach to this tragic and complex issue involving a range of service-providers and consumers. This point was also strongly reinforced in the findings of the recent ministerial task force. Submissions to it emphasised that in the case of young children, there was a particular need for structured therapy programs to enable them to develop as fully as possible and to support their families. As such, further

appropriate strategies are being developed within the department to provide specific early-childhood services which will complement existing ones.

For families living in the more distant areas of the State, different approaches are obviously required. I am pleased to announce that a remote area service has recently been established in central Queensland with a co-ordinator based in Rockhampton and area co-ordinators in Emerald, Longreach and Gladstone. The need for a similar approach in the Wide Bay area is currently being assessed, and I am optimistic that a similar service should be set up there in the near future. New positions that have been created in Cairns and Mackay have also recognised a substantial need for services in those communities. An appointment has already been made in Cairns, and I anticipate an appointment being made in Mackay quite soon. Services at the Gold Coast and on the Sunshine Coast have increased through the establishment of community-based houses in those areas, and new service co-ordinator positions have been established in both areas to supervise the growth of those new services. A townhouse development at the Gold Coast will shortly be opened to provide additional accommodation of high quality for 15 people with an intellectual handicap.

The report of the ministerial task force has been analysed by my department and I have been very impressed with the excellent responses that have been received from several other departments—for example, the Education Department, the Transport Department, the Police Department and DEVET. Over the next few months a system of central and local advisory committees will be set up throughout the State along the lines that were recommended in the report to participate in the implementation of the recommendations.

I am pleased to announce that action has already been taken with respect to the recommendations dealing with respite care. As a new initiative in 1989-90, the department will fund non-Government organisations for the provision of two facilities that will provide respite care for persons with an intellectual disability. That will cost \$100,000 in 1989-90 and \$200,000 in a full year.

Honourable members would be well aware that Queensland has received worldwide acclaim for its program of relocating people with intellectual disabilities from institutional styles of living to community housing. However, it is very timely to evaluate what has been achieved and to consider the way in which that program should be implemented in the future. Accordingly, I have approved that Touche Ross conduct a review of that program in close liaison with officers of my department.

It is with very great pride that I announce that Queensland has been selected to host the 1992 World Congress of the International Association for the Scientific Study of Mental Deficiency, which will be held at the Gold Coast in August of that year. I believe that the selection of Queensland for that international event reflects very positively on the dedication and the professionalism of workers and volunteers who are associated with the field of intellectual disability.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr GYGAR (Stafford) (10.21 a.m.), by leave: On Tuesday of this week, 3 October, the *Sun* newspaper published a letter that had been written by a Mr Dan O'Donnell of Stafford Heights, in which he alleged that, in March 1988, Channel 9 broadcast a report stating that the Lewis diaries revealed that Sir Llew Edwards had interceded with Sir Terence Lewis to have charges against me dropped. Channel 9 did not broadcast any such report. The allegation is a total fabrication and is completely without foundation. This incident again demonstrates the depths of gutter politics to which the extreme Left of the Labor Party is prepared to descend in its increasingly desperate attempts to defeat me in Stafford.

The Lewis diaries record that I contacted the Police Commissioner to demand action to close down a brothel that had opened in my electorate and, on another occasion, to request an investigation into police behaviour during a raid on the home of one of

my constituents. Despite the fact that the constituent concerned was a prominent member of the local ALP branch, I vigorously pursued this matter and prevailed upon the then Deputy Premier, Dr Edwards, to approach the commissioner on behalf of my constituent to ensure that the police behaviour was properly investigated.

Mr O'Donnell's allegations are maliciously false. I have instructed my solicitors to immediately institute legal proceedings in the Supreme Court of Queensland against Mr O'Donnell and the *Sun* newspaper so that they are brought to account for their defamation.

QUESTION UPON NOTICE

Decline in Union Membership

Mr STEPHAN asked the Premier and Treasurer and Minister for State Development—

“With reference to figures coming from the ACTU conference which say that less than one third of the private sector workforce are members of a trade union, and that only 10 per cent of the 1.5m jobs created in Australia are held by people with union tickets—

Do these figures indicate the fall in support for union membership in this country and is he concerned with this trend?”

Mr COOPER: I am not concerned with the fall in union membership. I am certainly more interested in jobs, growth, development and the environment than whether or not people are members of unions. The demise of unionism in Australia will not impact on this nation's economy or industry.

What is concerning the ALP is that the death of unions will certainly threaten its funding machine. The ALP will have to find alternative funds to compensate for a revenue drop of perhaps 40 per cent by the year 2000.

The reason why people are not joining unions is the failure of Labor to maintain standards. Labor's policies threaten workers. They include high interest rates which threaten families, average weekly earnings which have not kept pace with inflation and a consumer price index which rises faster than wages.

Unions are a dying breed in Australia. They are certainly an endangered species. Labor's industrial relations policy is also extinct and suitable to another age.

Mr R. J. Gibbs: Have a look at your back bench. They are in an absolute frenzy of support. Even I am embarrassed.

Mr COOPER: The honourable member knows all about this.

Labor wants to abolish essential services legislation and the Electricity Authorities Industrial Causes Act—the legislation which keeps the lights on.

Despite the unions' failing numbers, they make up for it by the way in which they dominate the Labor Party. The Leader of the Opposition would not hold that position if it were not for Hodder, who is the AWU boss, and the Liquor Trades Union. That is why the Leader of the Opposition is called Hodder's little boy. We all know that. He is certainly under the union thumb—and, of course, that union boss just happens to be Errol.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

Supply of Ministerial Expense Details to Special Prosecutor; Standing-down of Ministers

Mr GOSS: In directing a question to the Premier and Treasurer, I refer to a television news bulletin last night which reported that four present or former Cabinet Ministers have been requested by Special Prosecutor Drummond to provide further information to explain certain ministerial expenses and to the reported confirmation of

this report from a Government source in a metropolitan newspaper this morning, and I ask: will he confirm this morning that he has been advised, officially or unofficially, to this effect? Secondly, will he apply in respect of this situation the same standards as his predecessor applied to Mr Hinze and Mr Lane, namely, to stand them down until the commissioner concerned can give an assurance that they will not be adversely named or further affected?

Mr COOPER: I am aware that a number of rumours have been sweeping this place. I am also aware that they have been fanned fiercely by members of the Opposition.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr COOPER: Like hell they haven't! I am fully aware of it.

I have also stated repeatedly that I will not comment on matters that are under investigation by an independent Special Prosecutor. The Leader of the Opposition should know that.

If and when a situation should arise that does require a comment from me, I will not hesitate to make it; but, until then, I believe that all members of this House should allow the proper process of any inquiry to proceed without politicisation, which seems to be the corner-stone of the policy and campaign of the Leader of the Opposition.

Quite obviously, that question was loaded and charged with the usual innuendo. There is no question about that. I do not believe that it should ever have been asked—certainly not at this point—particularly by someone who claims, obviously absolutely falsely, to be very diligent about the rights of accused persons and the presumption of innocence. Where is the presumption of innocence? Either it suits the Leader of the Opposition or it does not. As far as I am concerned, we on this side of the House believe in the presumption of innocence, as the Leader of the Opposition should. I should ask the Leader of the Opposition the question: does he believe in the presumption of innocence? Everyone else in this State enjoys that presumption, be it in this place or elsewhere. People can and should enjoy that presumption of innocence. That is where we on this side stand.

I have made my point clear. I will not comment while certain matters are under investigation.

Tabling of Details of Ministerial Cash Advances and Expenses

Mr GOSS: In directing a second question to the Premier and Treasurer, I refer to the statement of expenses of Ministers of the Crown tabled in this House today and I ask: why has he failed to include details of entertainment expenses for the relevant period? Secondly, why has he failed to provide details of entertainment expenses and cash advances in respect of this Government for the last three years? Will he agree this morning to table such information before Parliament rises?

Mr COOPER: Guide-lines have been issued. I cannot recall just how long ago that was done. Nevertheless, guide-lines have been issued in relation to ministerial expenses. They fully comply with everything that is required under the legislation. There is absolutely no need to respond any further to that question.

Detective Sergeant J. P. Reynolds

Mr STEPHAN: In directing a question to the Premier, I refer to a statement made in this House recently about Detective Sergeant J. P. Reynolds and I ask: has he received a letter from the solicitor Richard Carew with regard to the statement about Sergeant Reynolds? If so, will he table the letter in this House?

Mr COOPER: Yes, I did receive a letter from Mr Reynolds' solicitor. He seems to be under some misguided impression that to supply information in reply to questions of serious public interest is really not a proper thing. As far as the Government is

concerned, it has a right and a duty to put forward such information in this place. I can assure Mr Richard Carew that my comments in relation to Sergeant Reynolds were made after very careful consideration in order to give the facts that this House is entitled to. I certainly do not step back from that for one second. I seek leave to table this letter.

Mr Burns: And incorporate it?

Mr COOPER: And have it incorporated in *Hansard*.

Leave granted.

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

CAREW and COMPANY

Solicitors

PRINCIPAL:
Richard Carew L.L.B.
ASSOCIATE:
John J. Furlong L.L.B.

11th Floor, National Bank Building
420 George St. Brisbane
P.O. Box 328, North Quay Q. 4002
DX 40124 Brisbane Uptown
Telephone: 230 1528
Facsimile: 230 1628

date: 4/10/89
our ref: RC/KS
your ref:

The Premier of Queensland
The Hon. R. Cooper MLA
P.O. Box 185
NORTH QUAY Q. 4002
(Fax No.: 229 6275)

Dear Mr Cooper,

We are writing to you on the instructions of Detective Sgt J. P. Reynolds.

Sgt Reynolds has handed to us a copy of an article printed in the Courier Mail last Friday the 29th of September 1989.

Sgt Reynolds has instructed us to advise you that he regards your reported comments as being a cowardly attack upon his bona fides in relation to his investigations.

Further he instructs us that, as a former Police Minister, you would be aware that under the Police Act he is precluded from publicly answering your criticisms. He instructs us that his report of the 25th of July 1989 mentions four separate incidents. The matter involving Mr Gunn was given to Fitzgerald Enquiry staff in September 1987. The matters involving Sir Dormer Andrews were under investigation from November 1988. Both of these dates are well before the Enquiry into Mr Justice Vasta commenced.

In the abovementioned report there appears the following paragraph:

“Mr Cooper said yesterday the Memorandum was an obvious and pathetic attempt by Sgt Reynolds to hit out at those whom his friend, former Supreme Court Judge Mr Angelo Vasta, blamed for his dismissal”.

Our client instructs us that the innuendos flowing from this reported comment are both insulting and incorrect.

Further we are instructed to refer to your reported comments to the effect that our client's mention of Noel Kelly's involvement damages the credibility of his report. Our client is of the view that Kelly was involved in a matter that needs further scrutiny and that, ironically, it is the credibility of Mr Mullholland Q.C.'s advice that is damaged by the fact that Kelly's corroborator, George Nolan, is working with Mr Mullholland.

In the abovementioned article Mr Mullholland is reported to have stated, in effect, that nothing would be gained by investigating further any of the incidents referred to by our client. Yet, our client instructs us, Mr Hangar Q.C. on the 23rd of January 1989 had at least one of these matters listed as terms of reference (i) in the Judge's Enquiry.

Further our client instructs us to remind you that under Section 200 of the Criminal Code he is obliged to carry out his duty to investigate any breaches of the law. He is of the view that you have, under Parliamentary privilege, made an unjustified attack on him for carrying out his duty. He is concerned that this should not be the sort of treatment honest policemen

deserve in the post-Fitzgerald era especially with suggested reforms such as “whistle blower protection”.

Finally our client instructs us to request that you, for the sake of fairness and completeness, table this letter in the House.

We are instructed to forward a copy of this letter to the Opposition Leader Mr Goss, the Police Minister Mr Lester, the Opposition Police Spokesman Mr Mackenroth and Leader of the Liberal Party Mr Innes.

Yours faithfully
CAREW AND COMPANY
RICHARD W. T. CAREW

ALP Campaign Advertising

Mr STEPHAN: In directing a question to the Premier, I refer to the latest glossy Goss advertisement on television, in which the Labor Party and its leader are hanging on the shirt-tails of Queensland Rugby League, and I ask: does he believe that the use of the Queensland Rugby League team by the Leader of the Opposition can assist the Labor Party to achieve what its members cannot?

Mr Casey: Your game is polo.

Mr COOPER: I have never played it in my life. Quite frankly, though, I would not mind a game. That would be all right, because the game involves the use of a mallet. The member for Mackay's head would be a fantastic target.

Mr Burns: Pick up your notes. It is the only way you can perform, but you can't cancel the Parliament.

Mr COOPER: That is okay. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition has his notes, too. His only problem is that he cannot read, the poor little fellow.

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Burns: Make your Ministers answer.

Mr COOPER: The Deputy Leader of the Opposition is a poor little has-been.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I call the Honourable the Premier.

Mr COOPER: The Government is trying very hard to introduce an adult literacy course in this State.

Mr Burns: You can't handle this yourself.

Mr COOPER: If only members of the Opposition would assist, the Government might be able to establish the course and give them some help.

Mr Burns: Well, you can't handle it yourself.

Mr COOPER: Members of the Government will be thinking of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition when the course is brought in.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I call the Honourable the Premier.

Mr COOPER: The most intriguing factor——

Mr Burns: Pick up your notes and let everybody know that you are reading your answers.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable member for Lytton for the first time.

Mr COOPER: The Deputy Leader of the Opposition should watch for froth foaming around the mouth, because that will indicate when he has really gone mad.

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Mr COOPER: Very soon we will see him climbing telegraph-poles in the nude in his electorate.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I warn both the Premier and the honourable member for Lytton. The Honourable the Premier will now answer the question.

Mr Mackenroth: Kick him out, Mr Speaker. That is what he deserves.

Mr COOPER: Well, it would beat climbing telegraph-poles in the nude, wouldn't it?

The intriguing feature is that nowhere in the advertisement is the Labor Party mentioned. What are members of the Labor Party afraid of? Why do they not mention the Labor Party? Is it just Goss or glossy Government? Is that it? He has gossamer wings, and we can see clear through him. My God!

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I now warn the Honourable the Premier for the second time. I ask him to answer the question.

Mr Burns: Don't throw him out. Please don't throw him out. We need him here.

Mr COOPER: That is all right. I am quite happy to be here.

Mr Burns: We want you here.

Mr COOPER: That is all right, too.

It seems that, instead of using the Labor Party that Mr Goss is supposed to lead as the vehicle in order to promote himself in the advertisements, to gain any semblance of an idea of winning power in this State the Leader of the Opposition has to use people such as little Alan Langer. The Leader of the Opposition has to hop on Alan Langer's back so that he can carry the Opposition's Leader through.

Mr Gunn: Poor little Alan.

Mr COOPER: Poor little Alan, that is right.

Mr Goss: We'll use your photo in the ad, too.

Mr COOPER: I must admit that I should take a look at it. I can almost picture little Wayne in shorts and long socks jumping up and down on the sidelines as little Alan Langer goes in to score a try. It is the most pathetic and incongruous sight anyone could ever imagine.

I appreciate that the Labor Party is very desperate to win Government. The poor old Broncos are probably starting to feel worried already about their future chances of a premiership win, which is what the National Party would love to see, without being handicapped by people such as the members of the Opposition.

Anti-National Party Articles in Murdoch-owned Newspapers

Mr BURNS: In directing a question to the Premier, I refer to claims made in this House on Tuesday night by the member for Warrego, Mr Hobbs, that media outlets controlled by Mr Rupert Murdoch had been directed by Murdoch to publish anti-National Party stories, and I ask: does the Premier support the view expressed by Mr Hobbs that Mr Murdoch has personally intervened by his actions, or is he satisfied that Murdoch-owned newspapers are reporting the news factually and honestly?

Mr COOPER: I must admit that I derive great amusement from newspaper cartoons and I dare say that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition does also. I wish that some cartoons could be published depicting the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, because it would be really interesting. He is the sort of character who would give Government members a lift when they looked in the newspapers every morning at 6 o'clock.

I must admit that I did not hear the speech made by the member for Warrego, who is without doubt a very astute member. He represents his electorate with a great

deal of vigour and most certainly will be returned with an increased majority at the next election. I have no doubt about that at all. I can only say that I have not heard the comments he expressed in relation to the media. As I have not heard them, I am not in a position to comment.

Offer of Government Appointment to Member for Gregory

Mr BURNS: The Premier runs away from questions. One day he will have to answer a question.

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

Mr BURNS: In directing my second question to the Premier, I refer to reports circulating during the recent leadership coup that resulted in the removal of far-western Queensland's only Minister, Bill Glasson. The reports indicated that he was to be offered a special Government appointment in the west as a sweetener after his omission from the new Cabinet. I ask: what was the post offered to Mr Glasson? What were his reasons for refusing it? Who is filling that position, or was it only a public relations exercise to cool down Bill Glasson?

Mr COOPER: No position exists. No position was offered. Therefore it is very difficult——

Mr Burns: There's no Minister in the central west, either.

Mr COOPER: No position was offered. No position has been created. I guess that this is, as usual, just a figment of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition's imagination.

Study Carried Out by Evatt Research Centre

Mr HYND: I ask the Premier: has his attention been drawn to a study carried out by the Evatt Research Centre that attempts to denigrate Queensland's economy?

Mr COOPER: Like the Labor Lawyers movement, which is led by the whinging Leader of the Opposition, there are other fronts, such as Citizens for Democracy and the Evatt centre referred to by the honourable member. The study simply props up the Labor Party and gives it a better image in its attempts to destroy or denigrate the Queensland economy through what is without doubt a grossly misleading report. It is nothing but propaganda.

All the other economic indicators show that the Queensland economy is far better than that of any other State. It conveniently overlooks the information contained in the State Bank of Victoria publication *Econostate*, which analyses the nation's and States' economies. That document demonstrates that Queensland's economy is the best in the nation, that Queensland has the lowest public debt and that it is the lowest-tax State. Everyone knows that Labor's economic policies have ruined the economies of the other States. The evidence is there. Victoria is known as the State of insolvency, which is a tragedy for that State. The record shows that Western Australia has been racked by financial scandals. The Hawke Government has lost all semblance of economic rationality in its bid to buy votes.

Mr Burns: Pick up your notes.

Mr COOPER: Yes, I do have notes; but, unlike the honourable member, I can see them from here.

Mr Burns: This is supposed to be without notice. You are supposed to know this. You are not supposed to be reading notes.

Mr COOPER: My eyesight is not failing like the honourable member's eyesight. He is a poor, decrepit old fellow and has been here far too long. He is a has-been. Wait till the old froth comes from his mouth! We will have him climbing up telegraph-poles in the nude yet if he keeps it up!

Recently the Hawke Government gave the banks \$200m to help with interest rates. Those four banks had a collective profit of \$3.7 billion. In addition, the multinational company Kodak, which is in Mr Hawke's own electorate, has been given \$60m to save it from competition. The sum of \$100m went to Hawke's mates in the airlines to save them from the Australian Federation of Air Pilots. Another \$50,000 has gone to every pharmacist who does not want to practise. The Prime Minister is buying off all the time.

Mr Goss attaches himself to people such as Cain, former New South Wales Premier Wran, Dowding, Burke and all the other politicians who have wrecked their States' economies—and the people of Queensland have to suffer the dreadful thought that Mr Goss will do the same thing in Queensland. There is no way in the world that the people of Queensland will permit mamma's little boy to run this State.

Federal Government Attitude to Airline Pilots Dispute

Mr HYND: I ask the Premier: has he any information on the latest situation in the pilots dispute, and is it true that the attitude of the well-known proponent of consensus, Prime Minister Bob Hawke, is fanning the flames of this dispute and causing great suffering and hardship to the tourism and business industries throughout Australia?

Mr COOPER: Last night I was asked by a southern newspaper for a comment on the apparent break-through in the pilots dispute. This dispute has gone a long way towards crippling the tourist industry in this State, not to mention all the other industries and the people who have suffered as a result.

On the very first day of the dispute Prime Minister Hawke painted himself into a corner and now it is simply his ego that is preventing any resolution. This morning's newspaper headlines show that again Hawke's intervention has shattered any hopes of a break-through. The Australian tourist industry is bleeding and, on my figures, so far in this dispute a total of \$3.5 billion has been lost to the tourist industry throughout the nation. The Prime Minister's ego is in the way and he will not even condone negotiations that might go some way towards a resolution of this dispute.

It would be a far better idea if Mr Hawke left the country and allowed other people to get on with the job. I know that this dispute can be resolved by means of a sensible approach and debate. The blame can be sheeted home in one direction. On the first or second day of the dispute Mr Hawke said that he would not allow negotiations and would not back down. He said he was going to win, come hell or high water, thereby locking the entire Australian nation into this dispute from which it will be very difficult to recover.

Cape York Strategy

Mr INNES: In directing a question to the Minister for Land Management, I refer to his statement in recent days that last year the Government adopted a Cape York strategy, and I ask: when was the strategy adopted, to what Government departments has it been circulated, has it been publicly released or circulated in any way at all, and was the grant of a freehold lease of over 24 500 hectares at Silver Plains this year in accordance with that strategy?

Mr HARPER: I indicated that the Queensland Government is in the process of developing a strategy for the Cape York area which was instigated in about August of last year when consultants were given a brief. The questions would more properly be addressed to the Honourable the Premier, whose department is handling the results of that consultancy which is in the process of being completed at the present time.

Opposition to Take-over of Corporate Sector by Commonwealth of Australia

Mr INNES: In asking a question of the Minister for Justice, I refer to the opposition by many medium and small companies around the Australian States to the take-over of the corporate sector by the Commonwealth of Australia and to the contest in the

courts in which a number of the States have participated. I now ask: will he explain why the Queensland Government is reported as having abandoned that appeal and joined the position of the Labor Party in Victoria, which diverges from, and abandons, the position of New South Wales and the other Labor States, which are maintaining their opposition?

Mr HENDERSON: If the honourable member would put the question on notice, I will provide an answer. I cannot speak. Unfortunately, I have lost my voice.

Mr INNES: I do so accordingly.

Investigation by Special Prosecutor of Police Minister's Expenses

Mr WARBURTON: In asking a question of the Minister for Police and Minister for Employment, Training and Industrial Affairs, I refer to the investigation into his use of ministerial expenses, particularly cash advances, by the Special Prosecutor, Mr Drummond. I now ask—and just a simple answer will do—has he been officially advised by the office of the Special Prosecutor of the results of that investigation?

Mr LESTER: That matter has been answered this morning. I have had no communication whatever.

Investigation by Special Prosecutor of Police Minister's Expenses

Mr WARBURTON: In directing a question to the Premier, I refer to Mr Lester's answer. I think everybody in this place knows that the investigation has taken place. Obviously, no official information has been relayed to the Minister. Therefore, I refer to the Premier's appointment of Mr Lester to the very important and sensitive position of Police Minister in our State when he knew full well of the investigation by Mr Drummond. I now ask, very seriously: in the light of his knowledge of that fact—that the Drummond cloud in fact hangs over Mr Lester's head——

Mr LESTER: I rise to a point of order. I find that offensive. The honourable member opposite is assuming that that investigation is directed at me personally, and no-one else. That is wrong and I ask that it be withdrawn. I just want to say that I am as clean as a whistle.

Mr WARBURTON: Mr Speaker, can I change the wording?

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The member regards the comments as offensive. I ask the member for Sandgate to withdraw them.

Mr WARBURTON: I will withdraw that particular comment and rephrase the question.

In light of the Premier's knowledge of the fact that Mr Drummond is investigating the expenses of Mr Lester, I now ask: does the Premier understand fully what a devastating effect it would have on the appointment of the State's new Police Commissioner, whom we all wish the best of success, if in the future it is found that one of those who selected the commissioner, namely, Mr Lester, the very Police Minister who, under the terms of the Police Act Amendment Bill that is before the House, is responsible for giving written directions to the new Police Commissioner, is to be proceeded against by Mr Drummond for misuse of public funds? Does the Premier understand what a devastating effect that would have?

Mr COOPER: As I said in my response to what I think was the first question without notice, I will not be responding to any questions about the Special Prosecutor's investigation of this matter. Everyone in this place knows that all ministerial expenses were under investigation by Mr Drummond. That was something that the Government sought so that those matters could be clarified. Because of the politicisation and the legal impropriety of such questions, I will not be answering any further questions on that subject.

Economic Plight of Gulf and Peninsula Areas

Mr ELLIOTT: In asking a question of the Minister for Mines and Energy and Minister for Northern and Regional Development, I refer to current impositions on transport and economic development in the gulf and peninsula areas by the fuel tax, the proposed new gold tax and, of course, the Federal Government's mismanagement of the airline strike. I now ask: what initiatives has he overseen in an attempt to overcome these problems, particularly in the lower gulf region?

Mr KATTER: On a number of occasions the Government has tried—it is trying again now—to get the Federal Government to allow more international air services into Cairns. On a number of occasions that request has been rejected. The result is that 50 international flights come into north Queensland each week. However, the capital cities have 600 international flights each week.

Previously, as the tourists could be carried to north Queensland by the internal airlines, that did not matter very much. Now that those airlines are not operating, only a very, very limited number of international tourists can come to north Queensland. I am told that occupancy rates in a large number of accommodation houses are down to as low as 20 per cent.

One cannot help thinking about the airline strike and comparing it with the performance of this Government in the power strike. It took us just 11 days to get the lights of Queensland turned on, and turned on permanently, in such a way that they would never be turned off again. The airline dispute is now into its eighth week and the “world's greatest negotiator”, as one newspaper called him, has left us without aeroplane services for that time. The tourism operators are not only going broke, they are also going into debt—and that debt has to be serviced by the “world's greatest Treasurer”, who has imposed interest rates of 20 per cent.

That would be bad enough in itself, but the sugar industry is being affected by the Federal Government's allowing into this country for the first time ever subsidised EC sugar. It was the Labor Party that originally protected the sugar industry. That clearly evidences just how much that party has changed from being a party that genuinely served the interests of the northern community to one that has sold out and allowed subsidised EC sugar into Australia.

I must add to what I have already said about the imposition of a gold tax. One of the few things that the outback areas of north Queensland have going for them is the enormous growth in the gold-mining industry. As I have said on many occasions over the last five or six years in this House, earnings from gold exports have risen from approximately \$400m to almost \$4,000m a year. That growth took place only after Mr Hawke said that he would not impose a gold tax. The fact that he is reimposing a gold tax means that that growth will be stillborn and that a large number of Queensland's mines will be placed in grave jeopardy.

In the airlines dispute, we can compare the performance of a Labor Government with that of a National Party Government. We can, with great pride, say that it clearly indicates the relative performances of the two Governments.

Airline Pilots Dispute

Mr ELLIOTT: I ask the Minister for Tourism: in the light of the disastrous airline strike that Australia is experiencing at present, would he outline to this House and to the people of Queensland what assistance is being sought and what actions are being taken to resolve the dispute? How does it compare with the action that has been taken by the Federal Government?

Mr BORBIDGE: Most members of this House would be aware that last week Cabinet agreed to defer certain Government taxes and charges to the people in the tourism industry who are suffering hardship as a result of the ongoing pilots dispute.

I compare this Government's reaction to that of the Federal Government, which has refused to provide any assistance.

Mr Simpson: What about the \$100m to the airlines?

Mr BORBIDGE: That is apart from the \$100m that was provided to the airlines.

If the pilots went back to work tomorrow, Australia would have lost \$3.5 billion in export earnings. The cost to Queensland is currently running at \$320m, and industry across Australia is losing \$35m a day. International arrivals are down 30 per cent throughout Australia. Across the nation, 150 conventions have been cancelled.

The Queensland Government's position is quite clear. It intends to do everything possible to assist the tourism industry. Its position on State Government taxes and charges will be kept under review. It continues inquiries worldwide to try to locate suitable aircraft and aircrew to work in Queensland. Perhaps this time the Queensland Government might receive a degree of co-operation from the Federal Government. I have officers on standby to deal with that matter.

Mr Elliott: We live in hope.

Mr BORBIDGE: As my colleague said, we live in hope.

While the Federal Government is refusing to provide tax relief to the tourist industry and refusing to provide compensation to all the operators who, through no fault of their own, are on the verge of bankruptcy, we have the incredible spectacle of a \$60m grant to Kodak, which is based in the Prime Minister's electorate of Wills.

An article in the *Financial Review* of Friday, 22 September, states—

“Federal Cabinet approved last week an assistance package to prevent Kodak's corporate parent, Eastman Kodak, moving the profitable”—

I emphasise “profitable”—

“and efficient Coburg film-manufacturing operations offshore.

At the same time, Mr Alan Oxley, the former Australian Ambassador to GATT, told the National Press Club that under GATT rules it was illegal to subsidise the export of manufactured products.”

It is interesting that Kodak is based in the electorate of Wills, which is represented by the Prime Minister of Australia. The grant was for \$60m.

The article continues—

“There are 18 unions and 18 awards at the Coburg site, the Australian headquarters of Kodak.

Key unions include the Federated Miscellaneous Workers' Union, Amalgamated Metal Workers' Union, National Union of Workers, Building Workers' Industrial Union, and Electrical Trades Union.”

What a rort! The tax-payers of Australia are funding \$60m to prop up jobs in the Prime Minister's electorate and to help his mates in the trade union movement.

What is the Labor Party doing at present to assist the tourism industry and those innocent operators across Australia? Not a thing! It is a disgrace. It is a scandal. It is about time that the Labor Party in Queensland took a stand to protect the many people in the tourism industry who are on the verge of bankruptcy and economic disaster.

Mr De Lacy interjected.

Mr BORBIDGE: Recently, when the Tourism Estimates were debated in this Chamber, the member for Townsville had to stand up for the tourism operators in the electorate of the member who interjects—Mr De Lacy. It shows his lack of concern. It is an appalling indictment of the attitude of the Labor Party in this place.

I assure the Parliament that the Queensland Government will do everything possible to assist the tourism industry in this time of major crisis.

At 11 a.m.,

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Honourable members, today is a day allotted for Supply. As this is a very complicated procedure, I ask that members who wish to leave the Chamber do so quickly.

SUPPLY

Seventh Allotted Day—Reception of Resolutions

The Resolutions reported from Committee of Supply on Wednesday, 4 October, were presented and, on motion of Mr Cooper, received.

Adoption of Resolutions

Hon. T. R. COOPER (Roma—Premier and Treasurer and Minister for State Development) (11 a.m.): I move—

“That the Resolutions be now agreed to.”

Honourable members indicating a desire to discuss certain resolutions—

Resolution 1 agreed to.

Resolution 2—Mines and Energy and Northern and Regional Development—

Mr INNES (Sherwood—Leader of the Liberal Party) (11.01 a.m.): This resolution deals with matters of Supply relating to the Mines Department. I wish to deal briefly with a matter relevant to Mines and Energy. In the last year we have witnessed an extraordinary backflip by both the Government and the Opposition on a very significant financial transaction in this area.

The Wallumbilla-Gladstone pipeline has apparently cost some \$100m to \$120m, and there has been a major change of policy and attitude by both the Government and the Opposition on this very significant enterprise and this very significant issue. Some \$120m is potentially able to be returned to the coffers of the State for other purposes if that amount of money can be realised from the sale of the pipeline.

When one considers the allocation of very large amounts of money and the consequential effects that will have in subsequent financial years, one realises that it is very important that thought be given to the considerations that led to the decisions that were made on those significant events. Those decisions will translate directly into this financial year. That was an extraordinary backflip. One might say that it was a double backward somersault with a one and a half PICCAR by the Leader of the Opposition.

On 26 September 1989 the Leader of the Opposition—

Mr FitzGerald: Don't cry wolf.

Mr INNES: Perhaps I should say that the Government has changed its mind but that it has not done so with such spectacular flurries of—

An honourable member: Hypocrisy.

Mr INNES: Hypocrisy. That is exactly right.

In his reply to the Budget the Leader of the Opposition said—

“I turn now to the Gladstone-Wallumbilla gas pipeline. The present Government has sought to extend its coal rail freights regime to the gas industry by adopting, through legislation, the power of monopoly in relation to the construction, maintenance and ownership of gas pipelines.”

Indeed, there is some truth in that summary. Mr Goss went on to say—

“We have witnessed the extraordinary spectacle of this so-called free-enterprise Government pumping more than \$120m into what amounts to a State socialist

enterprise. Even Mikhail Gorbachev would have been embarrassed by the largess pumped into this pipeline by this so-called free-enterprise Government. Whatever happened to the private sector? The public relations directed State socialism involved in this project should be rejected as a wrong and inappropriate allocation of scarce public resources, and we so reject it."

What was the situation in April of the previous year? Earlier this year, when calling for an increased allocation for education, the shadow Education Minister talked about the sale of the Wallumbilla-Gladstone pipeline. It is fascinating to look back to when that project first received approval in this House. It could not have started without the approval of this House.

In April last year when amendments were moved to the Petroleum Act the Liberal Party stood alone against a piece of legislation and a specific delineation by the Mines Minister at that time of a broad policy intent that was designed to allow the State to own and acquire all gas pipelines in this State, and specifically to authorise a start to the Wallumbilla-Gladstone pipeline. At that time the Labor Party, through its Mines and Energy spokesman, Mr R. J. Gibbs—and I know that the Labor system involves the election of spokesmen but the allocation of shadow portfolios lies with the leader—said—

"I must say to members of the National Party that, after a period of 16 years, I am more than delighted to see the National Party, by way of this legislation, paying homage to the late Rex Connor. Rex Connor was the Federal Minister for Mines and Energy in the Whitlam Government between 1972 and 1975. The very party that castigated him and argued against the concept of buying back the farm has tonight, along with members of the Labor Party, supported legislation providing as follows . . ."

He went on to say that a corporation sole would be set up and authorised "to search for, recover, acquire and refine petroleum; to dispose of petroleum and petroleum products; to construct, own, maintain and operate pipelines and oil refineries", and so on. He continued—

"Let me say quite unashamedly on behalf of the Labor Party that I support that legislation. I have no hesitation in saying that I believe there is an absolute necessity for Government to be involved in the development and protection of the natural resources of this State and of this country.

I am delighted that this Government is passing legislation that really enshrines the argument that the Labor Party has advanced for years."

Last week Mr Goss castigated the Government for not being a private-enterprise Government, after he has duchessed private enterprise in the board rooms around this State and pretended that he is a closet private-enterprise individual. He also said in that debate on behalf of the Labor Party and his nominee for the position of Mines and Energy Minister that of course the rights to acquire or the rights to sell all Australian coal should reside with the Government as well.

During that debate a division was called by the Liberal Party. In his reply Mr Tenni said—

". . . this Bill, which stands to benefit so many people in the State of Queensland, particularly those in the Gladstone and Roma areas."

Honourable members should listen to these words because they were uttered immediately before Mr Goss took part in the division and voted in favour of the Bill. In referring to the Wallumbilla-Gladstone line, Mr Tenni continued—

"After this line goes in, we will probably see a web of pipelines being constructed throughout Queensland. That will happen because this Government has had the ability and the gumption to go ahead and spend some \$90m-odd of tax-payers' money with a view to creating an industry that will be great for the future of this

State . . . I am very pleased that members of the Labor Party support the proposal. I congratulate them for that and for their forward thinking.”

Mr Tenni castigated the attitude of the Liberal Party, which was that it was socialism, that it should not take place because, when the time was ripe, private enterprise would provide the money to construct the pipeline when both the consumer was available and the price was right for the transportation of the gas.

Mr Schuntner: A vote for the Labor Party is a vote for the Nationals?

Mr INNES: A vote for the Labor Party is a vote for the Nationals; it is a vote for the support of socialism.

The Labor Party cannot go round the board rooms of this State saying, “We are really private enterprise; we are not socialists.”, that its policy is compulsory unionism and preference for trade union members in all legislation, or that it will reduce the number of Ministers from 27 to 18, which is a lie, because it is not Ministers but departments. It is another lie pushed out to earn votes. The truth has no meaning. Consistency has no meaning. It might have been all right to say, “We have had a latter conversion and we have seen the light. Our decision was wrong last year”, similar to its decision on the Stamp Act when the honourable member for Cairns said, “We did not understand what we were doing.” That is a darned sight more honest than the posturing invective of the Leader of the Opposition in trying to hide the conversion that he would not admit had taken place.

If this State is to go ahead it will go ahead by consistent application and use of private-enterprise principles. The other two parties in this House have had to see that in the last year in their attitude towards this very expensive project, the Wallumbilla-Gladstone pipeline project. But, frankly, it should be taken further; there should be an amendment of the Act, because the Act should never have been changed to allow the Government to take over the ownership of the pipeline system.

Mount Isa Mines Ltd called the bluff of the Government. It called for expressions of interest for the provision of gas to the mines. That was completely contrary to the Act, but thank God that private-enterprise company decided to do its own thing and brought a reluctant Government into line by saying, “Perhaps we had better allow this because Mount Isa Mines is a big operation of vast benefit to the State.” The Labor Party, looking for votes, stands on its socialist head, without recanting its principles and, contrary to the vote it cast in this House, starts to castigate the Government in these deprecatory, florid and completely excessive and hypocritical terms.

The Liberal Party was right in the first place. It stands right today. The Government, at least we can say, changed its mind without all the invective. But, as a mark of hypocrisy, it was the Opposition that would not admit that it had supported this legislation, had supported this pipeline, and tries now to castigate the Government for a decision that the Opposition warmly and enthusiastically supported as an exercise and extension of its long-held socialist policies.

Resolution 2—Mines and Energy and Northern and Regional Development—agreed to.

WAYS AND MEANS

Opening of Committee

Hon. T. R. COOPER (Roma—Premier and Treasurer and Minister for State Development) (11.13 a.m.): I move—

- “(a) That, towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty, for the service of the year 1989-1990, a further sum not exceeding \$5,190,454,000 be granted from the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Queensland.

- (b) That, towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty, for the service of the year 1989-1990, a further sum not exceeding \$5,741,342,000 be granted from the Trust and Special Funds.
- (c) That, towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty, for the service of the year 1988-1989, the Statement of Unforeseen Expenditure to be Appropriated not exceeding \$3,212,433,000 be granted from the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Queensland.
- (d) That, towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty, for the service of the year 1988-1989, the Statement of Unforeseen Expenditure to be Appropriated not exceeding \$488,779,000 be granted from the Trust and Special Funds.
- (e) That, towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty, for the service of the year 1988-1989, the Statement of Unforeseen Expenditure to be Appropriated not exceeding \$19,582,000 be granted from the moneys standing to the credit of the Loan Fund.
- (f) That, towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty, on account, for the service of the year 1990-1991, a sum not exceeding \$1,420,000,000 be granted from the Consolidated Revenue Fund.
- (g) That, towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty, on account, for the service of the year 1990-1991, a sum not exceeding \$2,980,000,000 be granted from the Trust and Special Funds.
- (h) That, towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty, on account, for the service of the year 1990-1991, a sum not exceeding \$25,000,000 be granted from the moneys standing to the credit of the Loan Fund."

Motion agreed to.

Resolutions reported.

SUPPLY

Adoption of Resolutions

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The Chairman reports that the Committee has come to certain resolutions. Before I put the question that those resolutions be received, I formally put resolutions 3 to 19.

Resolutions 3 to 19 agreed to.

WAYS AND MEANS

Resolutions received and agreed to.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2)

First Reading

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

Second Reading

Hon. T. R. COOPER (Roma—Premier and Treasurer and Minister for State Development) (11.17 a.m.): I move—

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

This Bill is the second and final Appropriation Bill for the current financial year. It seeks parliamentary approval to cover expenditure included in the Budget Estimates

for this year, unforeseen expenditure incurred during 1988-89 and expenditure for the first two months of the financial year 1990-91 to maintain Government activities until further Supply can be granted.

An amount of \$19,661.4m is provided to cover anticipated expenditure for Supply services from the Consolidated Revenue Fund, the Trust and Special Funds and the Loan Fund. This amount represents the total of Parts (I), (II) and (III) of the schedule to this Bill. It also incorporates the amount of \$8,620m for Supply services previously appropriated in the Appropriation Act 1988-89 (No. 2) and the Appropriation Act 1989-90 (No. 1).

Unforeseen expenditure for 1988-89 totalling \$3,720.8m is also incorporated in the Bill. This amount has had Executive authority, but now requires parliamentary approval. Full details of this amount are set out in Parts (IV), (V) and (VI) of the schedule to this Bill and the document *Statement of Unforeseen Expenditure to be Appropriated*, which was recently tabled in the House.

The Bill allows for an amount of \$4,425m to provide Supply for the Consolidated Revenue Fund, the Trust and Special Funds and the Loan Fund for the first two months of the financial year 1990-91. Adequate provision has been made within this amount to cover cost escalations in the intervening period.

This Appropriation Bill is introduced against a background of sound economic achievement for Queensland again in 1988-89, with a continuation of good growth in 1989-90. Let me say very firmly that the Queensland National Party Government's economic record is one of sustained high performance and is to be envied by all other State Governments. The outstanding success of the Queensland economy has not been achieved overnight. The record of achievement spans most of the last two decades. It is a record which speaks for itself.

Queensland has consistently had—
economic growth above the national average;
export growth above the national average;
job growth above the national average; and
population growth above the national average.

Over the last 20 years, Queensland has become a more diverse and dynamic economy that is increasingly oriented to and competitive in the international market.

Much has been made of Queensland's rural base. The fact is that the diversity of our rural sector and its geographic and climatic spread provides us with an excellent buffer against volatility in production and prices of individual products. The State can now boast mining industries which are among the most competitive in the world. The mining sector generates significant export income for the State and for the nation. It is our export revenue growth which is helping to keep the Federal Labor Government's current account deficit from being in an even more disastrous position than it is in now. I sometimes wonder whether the Opposition is really aware that Queensland is the nation's third-largest manufacturer. To listen to the Leader of the Opposition, one might be forgiven for believing that we did not have a manufacturing sector at all.

The manufacturing sectors in New South Wales and Victoria depend for their very survival on the high levels of protection afforded by successive Commonwealth Governments over very many years. The Queensland manufacturing sector has expanded and diversified in recent years, taking advantage of competitive opportunities in both domestic and export markets, particularly the latter. It is a manufacturing sector that will survive on its own merit, not because it has been mollicoddled by Government. Real, long-term growth can be achieved only if Governments allow industry to do what it does best and not place undue regulation and other obstacles in the way.

Service industries have also expanded rapidly. The financial-services sector, business services and the building industry have all experienced strong growth. Of course, the spectacular growth in the tourism sector has been the highlight. Since 1983-84 domestic

visitor-nights have grown at an average annual rate of 11.3 per cent. During this period, international tourism has grown at an average annual rate of 27.3 per cent. As at March 1989, \$9.8 billion worth of tourist-related projects were under construction or firmly committed—over half of the Australian total.

For those honourable members who took time to read the Treasury Budget document on the Queensland economy, it will be no surprise to learn that the Queensland economy is estimated to have grown in real terms by 5.3 per cent in 1988-89, which is well above the estimated national average growth rate of 3.3 per cent. Growth of at least 3 per cent is forecast for 1989-90, which is again well above the expected national average.

Let me cite some relevant statistics. The State's export earnings in 1988-89 increased by over 11 per cent to almost \$9,000m, with the State accounting for over 21 per cent of Australia's total exports.

During 1988-89, over 90 000 new jobs were created in Queensland—more than one-quarter of all new jobs created in Australia. This represented an increase of 7.6 per cent over the year—the fastest rate of growth in any Australian State during 1988-89.

The State's labour-force also grew strongly by 5.9 per cent during 1988-89, almost double the national average of 3.2 per cent. Unemployment in the State declined to 6.5 per cent in June 1989, compared with a rate of 7.9 per cent 12 months earlier.

The point has been made before, but it worth repeating. Because of its higher population and labour-force growth due to interstate migration, Queensland has a much harder task than other States in reducing unemployment. In the 12 months to March 1989, the State's population increased by 3 per cent, almost double the national average increase of 1.6 per cent. Of the 3 per cent increase, 2.1 per cent was due to net migration gain from all sources, while 0.9 per cent was due to natural increase. Net interstate migration during the period increased by over 50 per cent to 38 837 persons.

Contrary to the popular view that most of these people are retired people, the 1986 census showed that only 7 per cent of interstate migrants were of retirement age, while 21 per cent were children and 72 per cent working-age people. I repeat: 72 per cent were working-age people. They come to Queensland because of the employment opportunities generated by economic growth and because Queensland is a more affordable and desirable place in which to live and raise a family.

People will continue to come to Queensland because the latest economic indicators show that the State is continuing to outperform the rest of Australia. These economic indicators include—

- residential and non-residential building activity;
- engineering construction;
- exports;
- retail turn-over; and
- new motor vehicle registrations.

Capital expenditure in Queensland increased by almost 29 per cent in 1987-88—more than double the national average increase. From this very high base of activity, private new capital expenditure in Queensland declined by 7.9 per cent in the nine months to March 1989, compared with the corresponding period in the previous year.

The easing in investment is hardly surprising given the crippling interest rates which have been inflicted upon industry by the Federal Labor Government. Having devastated industry, it is now setting about to destroy tourism by its inflexible attitude in the pilots dispute. If the Leader of the Opposition cared as much about Queensland as he claims, he would be doing all in his power to get his Federal friends back on the right track.

Increasingly, Australia's economic future is being determined by our performance in international markets. This applies especially to Queensland because of its greater export orientation. The State Government has recognised this and is encouraging and assisting Queensland business enterprises to become more outward-looking. Business

must take advantage of opportunities in offshore markets and this Government will be promoting this as much as possible.

As part of a broad strategy to further strengthen the economic base, the Government has also been working towards greater diversification of the State economy. Manufacturing has been a success story, and in the five years to 1987-88, Queensland's manufacturing turn-over grew at an average rate of 10 per cent per annum.

Most sectors of manufacturing have experienced strong growth; not just the largest sectors such as food, beverages and tobacco and basic metal products, but also the smaller sectors such as textiles, clothing and footwear, wood products and furniture and paper and printing.

Employment in the manufacturing sector in Queensland has also increased strongly. In the 12 months to May 1989, manufacturing employment in the State grew by 20 per cent to 171 400. The armchair critics who are all too willing to be critical of the manufacturing sector should look at the facts and not at the fiction in their minds.

One-third of the new jobs created in Queensland in the 12 months to May 1989 were in the manufacturing sector. In 1988-89 manufactured exports increased by 7.6 per cent to almost \$3.2 billion.

Sectors experiencing particularly strong growth in exports included photographic, professional and scientific equipment, appliances and electrical equipment and industrial machinery and equipment. The recent strong growth of manufactured exports illustrates the potential for Queensland manufacturers to succeed in increasingly competitive world markets.

There has been significant growth in downstream processing of our mineral resources and in other high value-added and high-technology industries, which is very encouraging for the long term. The number of manufacturing projects committed and now proceeding continues to grow.

It is not possible to list all these projects. However, I do want to point to some of the more important examples—

- Ampol's Lytton refinery catalytic reformer and feed hydrotreater to cost \$110m;
- ICI's \$80m chemical complex and Minproc's \$50m sodium cyanide plant at Gladstone;
- APM's \$28m extension to its Petrie paper-mill;
- CSR's \$15.5m wood panel plant at Ipswich;
- Fisher and Paykel's whitegoods-manufacturing plant at Cleveland; and
- Colgate Palmolive's \$15m detergent-manufacturing complex on the Gold Coast.

There is a significant number of projects, small and large, spanning all sectors of the economy and all areas of the State, which clearly indicates to me and any objective observer that manufacturing development in the State is well balanced on both a sectoral and regional basis. These are not phantom projects. They are projects which are on the go and which will yield significant benefits for Queensland and Australia in the years to come. There are many other major projects in the areas of manufacturing and mineral-processing which are also under very serious study.

The continued growth and diversification of the manufacturing sector will contribute to the creation of a more flexible, adaptable and productive State economy, with the potential for even higher rates of economic growth in the future.

Although I am absolutely positive about Queensland's economic future, the mismanagement of the national economy by the Federal Labor Government has placed a cloud over Australia's immediate economic outlook. It provides a stark reminder that we should never let the management of the Queensland economy fall into the hands of any Labor Party.

The present Queensland Government understands business and delivers the goods. In the next 12 months or so, my Government will be doing all that it can to ensure that the Queensland economy is not unduly adversely affected by the misguided and ill-conceived policies of the Labor Government in Canberra.

As I have already said, I am confident that the underlying resilience of our economy will mean that Queensland is still likely to achieve a rate of economic growth in 1989-90, which is better than the national average. Our future remains very promising. Our population will continue to grow strongly, well into the next century, as more and more people recognise that Queensland is the State of the future.

Our traditional strengths in the areas of agriculture, mining, mineral-processing and tourism provide the basis for sustained expansion of the economy. Further downstream processing of our resources, together with diversification into energy and technology-reliant manufacturing, will provide additional catalysts for growth and development.

The policies of the National Party Government have been key ingredients in Queensland's success. They are policies of—

- fewer and lower taxes;
- smaller government;
- a less regulatory business environment;
- more flexible labour market; and
- an emphasis on private enterprise and personal initiative.

The people of Queensland can be assured of this Government's commitment to the continuation of these economic policies. This Appropriation Bill provides the funds necessary for implementation of these policies. I commend it to the House.

Mr De LACY (Cairns) (11.31 a.m.): It is my pleasure to join in the debate on the Appropriation Bill. As I was on my way to the Chamber someone told me that the Opposition should oppose the Bill; that, because of the way in which the National Party has spent Government and tax-payers' funds throughout the past 10 years, as detailed in the Fitzgerald report for the whole of Australia to see, the Opposition should not be party to giving one single cent to the National Party Government.

Mr Elliott: How much would you give the Federal Government?

Mr De LACY: Let me say that, unlike the Queensland Government, there has been no Fitzgerald report on the Commonwealth Government that is an indictment of its administration.

I listened with interest to the Premier's comments on the performance of Queensland's economy and its future. I did not necessarily agree with everything he said. However, I believe that the Queensland Government this year lost a golden opportunity to capitalise on what has been a very good year. All State economies, in common with the national economy, have grown very rapidly during the last 12 months. The State Government reaped a windfall in revenue in the Budget. Stamp duty alone increased by approximately \$300m above previous estimates. If ever a Government obtained a windfall, this State Government did.

What has it done to fix up the years of neglect, underspending and underservicing for which it has been responsible? This National Party Government bought out the Expo Authority and built a pipeline from Wallumbilla to Gladstone, although the pipeline could have been built by the private sector. The National Party Government lost a golden opportunity and, unfortunately, golden opportunities do not last for ever.

Economic expansion in 1988-89 was caused by the tourism boom, by the building and construction boom and by the upturn in commodity prices. All honourable members would know that Queensland's economy is still very narrowly based and depends on commodities. A rapid upturn in commodity prices occurred during the last 12 months. Many informed experts believe that the upturn has peaked and that commodity prices

will now begin a downward trend. Because of the impact of monetary policy at the Federal level, tourism and building and construction activity that caused the upturn will be the two industries that are affected most when a downturn in national activity occurs.

Honourable members might recall that in 1982-83 the building industry collapsed. The Queensland economy also collapsed. That was the beginning of the end for the Bjelke-Petersen Government, because that collapse destroyed the myth that they were economic managers. The people of Queensland and people in other States of Australia very quickly realised that the Government was doing nothing at all; that it was simply riding along while things were good. The present Government has ridden along while things were good this year, but it has been completely unable to capitalise on the windfall and golden opportunity that have been presented to it. What a pity!

The Government's failure amplifies the fact that the National Party really has no strategy. Whatever happened to Quality Queensland? At this time last year, a lot of discussion took place on the subject of Quality Queensland. Eventually, that policy was jettisoned. I wonder what has taken its place apart from statistics that were selectively cited by the Premier today. I must say that one skill that has been developed by National Party members over the years is the technique of fiddling statistics. People can do as they please with statistics. For example, the Premier mentioned that exports increased by 11 per cent. That remark begs the question, because last year they decreased by 15 per cent, which means that Queensland is not even back to the level it reached two years ago. The Premier also mentioned that Queensland provided 21 per cent of Australian exports, which is true. Queensland is an export-oriented State, which is another way of saying that the State's economy is very narrowly based. Three years ago Queensland provided 25 per cent of Australia's exports. The statistics indicate that Queensland's share of Australia's exports has actually reduced over the last three or four years. That example illustrates the point I make. If a member has plenty of research officers and is prepared to fiddle the statistics, figures can show any trend at all.

I notice that the Government also cites statistics to indicate that Queensland has the lowest per capita State debt in Australia. However, the National Party Government has not compared State debt with the State's gross product. If Queensland's debt was computed as a percentage of gross State product or total production in this State, Queensland would be revealed as having the highest State debt in Australia. As I said earlier, everything depends on statistics and the manner in which they are used.

The entire Supply debate over the last fortnight has been characterised by Government members and members of the Liberal Party displaying obsessive panic over the prospect of a Labor Government. It has also been characterised by members' concentrating on the performance of the Federal Government and the Labor States. Those two factors are part of the panic syndrome. Both the National Party and the Liberal Party in Queensland are manning the panic stations. Virtually every speaker who participated in the Estimates debate prefaced his remarks by saying that if ever there was a Labor Government in Queensland, Heaven forbid this and Heaven forbid that. They could not erase from the rhetoric their fear of the prospect of a Labor Government. I know that that realisation is beginning to hurt, but it is a concept with which they will have to come to terms. The National Party is dead in the water. The last time I read the polls, they indicated the National Party's approval rating was 17 per cent Statewide. It had been reduced from the level of 39 per cent three years ago. The Nationals are on a downward trend at the rate of 1 per cent a week. Because of their performance over the past week, the downward trend may have accelerated. The approval rating in metropolitan Brisbane is down to single figures. Perhaps they ought to change to playing golf now that they have reached single figures. Paul Keating said that John Howard was a swinging carcass waiting to be cut down. The National Party is also a carcass waiting to be cut down.

When the four Ministers are charged with misusing public funds, as was suggested last night on a Channel 9 program, the National Party will be absolutely dead in the water. The only honourable thing for Mr Cooper to do would be to go to the Governor,

resign his commission to the Governor and let the Governor make the decision. I do not believe that the Queensland economy or the Queensland people can tolerate this lack of Government that the State has experienced in recent times. Queensland needs a stable Government; one that is prepared to make decisions; not a Government involved only in solving crises from day to day.

I return to the Supply debate and the comments made by the Premier in his second-reading speech. Government members continually gave gratuitous advice about how to solve the problems of the Federal economy. They referred to interest rates and gave advice on how the pilots dispute could be solved. Not once has the Premier of Queensland criticised the pilots, but he is always criticising the Prime Minister. The members of the National Party are new-found apostles of the principles of negotiation and conciliation, and maintain that the Federal Government ought to negotiate with the pilots. Negotiation has never been one of the National Party's strong points and it is strange to listen to Government members in this House all proposing negotiation and conciliation. They ought to put pressure on the pilots to go before the arbitration commission and have their claims arbitrated, because that is where the solution lies, if there is one.

Mr Stephan: Mr Hawke said six weeks ago he was going to fix it.

Mr De LACY: Mr Hawke has continually said that the dispute ought to go before the arbitration commission. The Australian commission is the independent arbitrator and that is where the dispute should be settled.

The reason why the pilots do not have support from the trade union movement is that the pilots are opposed to two fundamental tenets of trade unionism in this country: firstly, the national wage-fixing guide-lines, and secondly, the arbitration system. The pilots maintain that they want to negotiate, but they will not do it within the bounds of the national wage-fixing guide-lines or before the arbitration commission. The pilots are starting to back-track a little, and perhaps there is still some scope for settlement, but they must be prepared to go before the arbitrator, which is the Australian system of an independent umpire. The pilots can either be part of the Australian system or outside the system. The great tragedy is that, to a large extent, they have chosen not to be a part of the Australian system. In the first place, their claim was based on international wage rates and not Australian wage rates. Perhaps they do not regard themselves as part of the Australian system at all.

It has been suggested that the airlines have a separate agenda, which may well be right. The airlines probably want to reorganise their work practices, manning levels and a variety of other things, but I regret that the pilots have a separate agenda also. Basically they are conservatives and belong to a conservative union. They do not support Australia's centralised wage-fixing system and they are doing their very best to destroy it. It seems that the pilots' other agenda will not work, because neither the airlines nor the Federal Government have been prepared to bow down to them. It would hasten a resolution of this dispute if the conservative parties in this State—including the National Party—and Peacock and his other people in Canberra put pressure on the pilots. Then the conservative parties will understand what the pilots are trying to do to the economy instead of trying to score cheap political points against the Prime Minister and the Federal Labor Government.

Mr Vaughan: I have never heard one person on the side of the Government advocating that the pilots withdraw their resignations and return to work; not once.

Mr De LACY: Not once have they urged the pilots to return to work. In fact, the greatest advocates for the pilots federation has been the Queensland National Party Government.

Government members seem to want to talk about the national economy all the time, but I draw their attention to the fact that we live in Queensland and the Budget or appropriation debate ought to be about the Queensland economy. That was not the case, because Government members spoke about Canberra, Victoria, South Australia

and Western Australia. They could not say too much about South Australia because there were not too many points to be scored about that State.

If one looks at the national economy, one finds that in many ways Australia is performing well. However, there are major problems which have been canvassed by previous speakers. After the last Federal Budget was brought down the conservatives jumped in. However, they did not criticise the Budget as such; they criticised the Budget projections. Inflation was projected to remain high, current account deficit would continue to be high and the international debt would continue to grow. That is the easiest criticism of all because those facts were contained in the Budget. However, when it comes to solutions to the problems of Australia, there was an eerie silence, because no-one has the solutions; least of all Mr Peacock, Dr Hewson, Mr Stone and the other Stone Age people of the New Right. They do not have the solutions either. It is easy to sit back in the sanctuary of Opposition. I believe that Peacock and Howard and company will always be in Opposition and therefore will always enjoy that sanctuary. It is easy for them to say that inflation is too high, but when we in the Labor Party asked what to do about it, nobody knew. All they did was argue on the periphery; they did not talk about the fundamentals.

I will consider the performance of the Federal Labor Government. A national Government has three instruments open to it: fiscal policy, wages policy and monetary policy. Fiscal policy is a Government's budgetary strategy. In the time that it has been in power, the Hawke/Keating Government has turned a \$9.6 billion deficit into a \$9 billion surplus. That \$9.6 billion deficit was John Howard's legacy to Australia. So the Federal Government's fiscal policy has given the nation a surplus; it is saving on behalf of all Australians. What would the Tories do if they were there? Nothing!

I turn to wages policy. The fact is that in Australia wages are increasing at a much slower rate than the consumer price index. Real wages are falling. Do honourable members believe that Peacock and company could put together a wages policy that would perform better than that? Honourable members know they cannot; and I know they cannot.

That leaves monetary policy. Of course interest rates are too high. We all know that, but it is not that Governments like to have high interest rates. No doubt Keating does not like high interest rates; we do not like them; and home-owners do not like them. However, they are the only way to reduce demand. The fact is that last year consumption grew by 8 per cent and production by only 4 per cent. Unless those factors can be made to balance, the current account deficit can never be brought under control. As I said before, it is easy to criticise; the solutions are what count.

Perhaps another option for a Government is tax policy. Next week will see the big test for Mr Peacock. That is when he will present his new tax policy. I ask honourable members to think about the big one that he floated—that interest earned on savings accounts would be tax-free. I think that disappeared into history. When he presents his policy next week, will he or will he not introduce a consumption tax?

Last night I was very interested to listen to Mr Beanland talking about abolishing the capital gains tax. The Liberals are still on that anachronistic stuff of abolishing the capital gains tax. Do honourable members know how far it would set Australia back if the capital gains tax was abolished and all of those rorters out there were once again given the opportunity to fiddle their tax returns—to change their profits into capital gains—so they did not have to pay tax? Do honourable members know where the nation would be? It would be back into John Howard's \$9.6 billion deficit instead of a surplus.

Just as the rest of Australia is, I am waiting with bated breath for Mr Peacock's big test. Paul Keating simply cannot wait because he knows, just as I know and everybody else knows, that Peacock has neither the courage nor the intestinal fortitude to introduce anything worth while. What it will be is a little more opportunistic drivel, the kind of thing that has seen his approval-rating plummet in the same way as that of his predecessor plummeted. The most interesting thing of all is whether or not there will be another leadership challenge. Will Peacock continue to lead the Liberals?

Mr Vaughan: A challenge is on the cards. Howard is in the wings.

Mr De LACY: Yes, that is right.

Will Mr Peacock lead the Liberals to the next election? Will Mr Cooper lead the National Party to the next election? That is the continuing talk around the place. Another question is: will Mr Gunn be his deputy? Perhaps that is the biggest one of all.

Mr Vaughan: He'll be anybody's deputy—don't you worry about that.

Mr De LACY: Yes, that is so.

Last week I was lucky enough to get hold of the tax policy of the State Liberals—it is not the policy that Mr Peacock will deliver next week. It is very interesting to have a look at it. At least the State Liberals have produced it—I presume they have produced it; I did not see it in any of the media. Because there is not very much in it worth reporting, I might say that I am not surprised. This is supposed to be the great blueprint for the future, the *Liberal Policy for State Tax Reform and Economic Growth*. It is a blueprint for the future that is supposed to tell us what will happen in Queensland if the Liberals were to be in Government. We do not quite understand the logistics of that. They have two chances of getting into Government in their own right—theirs and Buckley's. That means that their only prospect is to enter, as a minority party, into a coalition with the National Party. That will put their principles to the test. Do they make these things a condition of coalition? Once they get the smell of that ministerial leather, there will not be many principles.

The overview at the beginning of this blueprint for the future of Queensland contains 19 paragraphs, four of which are on Liberal Party policy, seven are about the Federal Labor Party, six about the State Labor Party and two about the Victorian Labor Party. So out of 19 paragraphs, only four paragraphs address State Liberal policies; 15 of them attack the Labor Party, mostly at the Federal or interstate level, and some at the State level.

Mr Stephan: It would be fairly easy, though, wouldn't it?

Mr De LACY: Fairly easy to do what—to attack the Labor Party?

Mr Stephan: Yes.

Mr De LACY: With respect, if a political party is putting out a policy for Queensland, surely it should feel secure enough and have enough confidence in its own ability to state what the policy is. Is criticism of the Federal Labor Party a policy for Queensland? I leave that thought with the honourable member. No wonder members of the Liberal Party are treated as fools. No wonder nobody takes them seriously. No wonder nobody thinks that they can ever get into power. Yet Mr Innes is taking out full-page newspaper advertisements.

Mr Santoro: Why don't you go on and read it all?

Mr Vaughan: Listen to the new boy—little boy lost.

Mr De LACY: Who is that whom I can hear? Has he been in this Assembly before? I have not noticed him. What he ought to do is make his maiden speech so that other honourable members can have a go at him.

Mr Schuntner: Why don't you listen to what he says.

Mr De LACY: All right, I will.

I have gone through the first 19 paragraphs of the policy, of which 15 are about Labor Governments. After that the policy talks about appointing standing committees, commissions of audit, review bodies and task forces. The next four pages of that blueprint deal with the introduction of committees. The Liberal Party probably got that idea from Mike Ahern. The trouble with committees is that sooner or later they must make decisions.

I turn now to the part that deals with lower State taxes and charges. In Government, the Liberal Party will abolish land tax. It is the greatest con trick in the book to state that it will start abolishing taxes. It could have said that it will abolish another half a dozen taxes. I do not know why it picked on land tax. All taxes are unpopular. Why not abolish the lot? From the sanctuary of permanent opposition, it does not matter what the Liberal Party promises to abolish.

The oldest con trick in the book is to promise to abolish taxes but not outline the programs that will be cut to make up for them or the new taxes that will be introduced to recoup that money.

The Liberal Party will reduce coal freight charges. Those charges provide approximately \$1 billion for the State of Queensland.

Mr Vaughan: Out the window.

Mr De LACY: That \$1 billion will be out the window.

The Liberal Party will wipe out \$75m in land tax and \$600m in pay-roll tax. It has stated that pay-roll tax is anti-employment and anti-investment. So are most taxes, incidentally. It intends to reduce pay-roll tax. Why did it not abolish pay-roll tax? That would have been more effective.

Mr Vaughan: When Sir William Knox was Treasurer, he didn't do it; but he is willing to do it now.

Mr De LACY: That is right. It is easier to say that from opposition than it is to do it as Treasurer.

Mr Vaughan: From the bleachers.

Mr De LACY: That is right: from the bleachers.

That is the Liberal policy for State tax reform and economic growth; the blueprint for Queensland in the future. It is a nonsense. I pay credit to the media, because they recognised it for what it is. They gave it no publicity.

I will now comment on the other States of Australia. During this debate, members have concentrated their remarks on Victoria. Because of the equity investments and venture capital investments of the VEDC, Victoria has some problems. It also has problems with its State debt, as do New South Wales, Queensland, South Australia and Western Australia.

All the focus has been on the problems associated with the Victorian Economic Development Corporation. Most parties—the Labor Party included—have learnt a lesson from the problems associated with the VEDC.

Mr Santoro: What do you have to say about Workcare?

Mr De LACY: The Labor Party set up in Queensland a State Government Insurance Office that handled workers' compensation. Because Queensland has always had a State-owned Workers Compensation Board, it has never run into trouble. However, in Victoria and other States, where the scheme was in the hands of the private sector, problems were always associated with it. Labor Governments have attempted to rationalise the system to overcome the problems that exist. Of course problems exist, but they were created over the years by the honourable member's tory predecessors, who did nothing to control the scheme when it was controllable. The honourable member should not talk to me about that. Is he opposed to the State-owned Workers Compensation Board? Does he want it run by the private sector, thereby creating the problems that occurred in Victoria?

Mr Santoro: Socialism at its worst.

Mr De LACY: Before he interjects, the honourable member should know what he is talking about. He should make his maiden speech and we will hear what he has to say.

I acknowledge the problems with the VEDC and I have learnt from its experience. Any wise observer would have learnt something. The VEDC saw the need for the State to be involved in providing equity and loan funds for innovative companies to commence operations.

During the stock-market crash in 1987, many companies got into trouble, which left the VEDC and the State Bank of Victoria with some large debts. Again, we must analyse to what extent the State has a role in that kind of activity. It is fair to say that the Labor Party in Queensland is reappraising its approach to such activity. In future, it would be much more circumspect, as Governments would be in Victoria and Western Australia, about becoming involved in such activity.

The difference in Victoria is that its actions were taken with the best intentions to stimulate economic activity and business activity. It was not done on the basis of patronage or cronyism. It was not a corrupt exercise, as has been occurring in Queensland over the last 20 years, whether the Liberals were part of the show or not.

Although the VEDC has not gone well and is a big embarrassment to Victorians, its problems have not been of the same dimension as the problems that have occurred in Queensland. Honourable members should think about that point.

In Victoria, most areas of the economy are still performing well. Victorian Government departments have trail-blazed and led the way. Whenever the Queensland Government brings in an innovation, it pinches it from Victoria. In one breath it is bad-mouthing Victoria and in the next it is pinching ideas from Victoria.

Yesterday, it was announced that Queensland's new Police Commissioner will come from Victoria. That is good. It is acknowledged throughout Australia that the Victorian police force is probably the best. It certainly has the respect of the citizens of Victoria to a much greater extent, I regret to say, than the police force in Queensland has had the respect of the people of Queensland. I hope that by bringing in Mr Noel Newnham as the new Police Commissioner we can develop a police force in Queensland that has the respect of us all. That is an objective that I am certain members on all sides of the House would share.

If one examines the important indicators of the state of the Victorian economy such as output, employment, investment and export growth, one finds that for the last six years Victoria has consistently led Australia and consistently led Queensland.

Queensland has the advantage of being the sun-belt State. It is all very well for Mr Cooper to beat his breast and say, "Queensland has had huge population growth." Population growth is nothing; it is not a statistic that should ever be quoted. It is growth in employment and investment and an improvement in living standards that count. That is what we ought to be looking for. What does growth in population mean? Often all that an increase in population does is downgrade living standards.

North Queensland is not getting anything to compensate it for the rapid growth in population in that region. In fact, many people are starting to realise that their life-style is being downgraded as a consequence of the rapid increase in population. State Governments are unable to keep pace with the provision of services; consequently, crime increases; society becomes less orderly; and the environment and our life-style are being irreversibly and adversely affected. When the Minister stands up and talks about increases in population and beats his breast as though that is a statistic to be proud of, he shows that he does not know what providing good government is all about.

The Victorian Government has led the way in education reform, broadening the skills base and providing the wherewithal to bring about economic development. That takes me back to Queensland. The key to Queensland's success in moving from its traditional resource-based export industries to the higher value-added, more technologically

advanced manufacturing and service industries will depend on the extent to which we can reorient the needs of the work-force and bring about a fundamental change in the approach to training and skills formation.

Education and training probably represent the longest-term strategy of all. We can improve our education standards but we will not get an economic dividend for years down the track. However, that is where the investment ought to be made, and that is where this National Party Government and National/Liberal Party Governments over the years have let down the people of Queensland. That is why this State does not have the expansion that it should have in the manufacturing sector. That is why Queensland has such a narrow economic base.

I might say that Queensland will not perform better at that level by fiddling the statistics contained in the Budget. I am sorry that I have to keep mentioning this. However, the big thing out of the last Budget was the previous Premier—whichever Premier; it does not matter—telling everybody that education funding had been increased by 14 per cent. It does not matter how one reads the Budget papers; the best increase one can come up with is 9.9 per cent. It is there in black and white in the Budget papers.

When Mr Cooper replied to the debate on the Budget presented by Mr Ahern, he said, "What you are doing wrong is reading the Budget papers. You cannot take any notice of what is written in the Budget papers." If we cannot take any notice of what is written in the Budget papers, what do we do? Mr Cooper said that it is not proper to look at the expenditure for last year as itemised in the Budget. If it is not proper to do that, why is that column outlining expenditure for 1988-89 contained in the Budget?

I repeat that education funding in total increased by 9.9 per cent. If one takes into account the fact that inflation increased by 7.5 per cent and enrolments increased by 2 per cent—whichever statistics one wants to examine—real spending, as opposed to nominal spending, on education did not increase at all. It was just a confidence trick. The Government is not going to increase the skills base of the community and it is not going to increase the educational level of our young people so that they can take their place in a modern, competitive society simply by fiddling statistics. What the Government has to do is get out there and improve the education system, something which is sadly lacking in this State.

Another comment I want to make relates to a certain extent to what the Liberals have said in their policy. As I have said, their policy concentrated mostly on the Federal Government. The Federal Labor Government is accused of being the biggest taxing Government in Australia's history. Of course it is. Next year's Federal Labor Government will be the biggest taxing Government again, and the one after that will be the biggest taxing Government again, simply because the economic base——

Mr Harper: They need it to pay all those dole benefits, don't they?

Mr De LACY: I point out to the Minister that if there has been one trend in the statistics over the years it is that the number of dole beneficiaries has been reducing consistently. That trend has been consistent throughout the term of the Hawke Government, from the high of Malcolm Fraser's day. The Federal Government does need a lot of money. However, each year the tax-take increases because the economic base broadens and gets bigger.

Mr Elliott: Bracket creep.

Mr De LACY: Bracket creep is part of it.

The Federal Government has done away with a lot of the tax avoidance that was going on. That tax avoidance will be on again if this Government's policy of doing away with the capital gains tax is reintroduced.

Mr Yewdale: Mr Elliott doesn't pay tax.

Mr De LACY: That has been said before in this Chamber. It must be nice to have a property as well as an income.

I will say something about the biggest-taxing Government in history. The focus is always on the Commonwealth, but have we ever had a really good look at what is happening at the State level?

Mr Harper: Have a look at Victoria.

Mr De LACY: Let us have a look at Queensland.

Mr Harper: Have a look at Victoria.

Mr De LACY: I will have a look at Victoria, too. First of all, I will deal with Queensland. I can tell the Minister this: taxes in Queensland are increasing a lot more quickly than they are in Victoria. In 1986-87, according to the Budget papers, taxes, fees and fines, which include a whole range of State taxes, including book-makers' turn-over tax, land tax, pay-roll tax, stamp duty—

Mr Harper: No new taxes.

Mr De LACY: New taxes, old taxes; taxes are taxes. What a ridiculous statement.

In 1986-87, total taxation was \$1.027 billion, whereas in 1988-89 it was \$1.743 billion, an increase of 62 per cent. Can honourable members believe that? I ask the Premier and Treasurer to tune in to the Treasury office and see whether he can answer what I am saying. In two years, taxation increased by 62 per cent.

Mr Harper: You just told us: no new taxes. Of course taxation increases, because the economy is expanding.

Mr De LACY: The massive increase in State taxes results from an expansion of the economy but, when Federal taxes increase, it is because the Commonwealth Government is the biggest taxing Government in history. Does the Minister have two sets of standards?

Let me now deal with the total taxes, fees and fines, which include all of the regulatory fees such as rail freights. In 1986-87 the total was \$1.284 billion, and in 1988-89, it was \$2.093 billion, an increase of 63 per cent. In both areas of State taxation the increase has been more than 60 per cent, yet people claim day after day that the Hawke Government is the biggest taxing Government in history. I rest my case.

The final matter I raise today is a repetition of something I said in my speech in the Budget debate. I drew to the attention of the Premier and the other Ministers that the Budget papers contain some serious anomalies. I spelt them out. I put the best possible construction on them by saying it was conceivable that they were simply misprints or mistakes. I said that in good faith and I expected and hoped—maybe I was hoping for too much—that the Premier, in his reply, would have addressed those questions and told members why these apparent anomalies, involving millions of dollars in some cases, appear in the Budget papers.

I raise the matter again today in the hope that members will be given a satisfactory explanation. In the absence of one, we will have no alternative but to put our own construction on these anomalies, and our construction may not be as favourable as the proper explanation. I request that that matter be addressed by the Premier in his response to the debate today.

The Labor Party is optimistic about the future of Queensland. We believe that Queensland, as the sun-belt area of Australia, is the State with the greatest growth potential and the best potential for the realisation of the aspirations of all Australians. We believe that the State has been very poorly managed for the last three decades.

Mr Harper: That is why it is growing.

Mr De LACY: There goes the Minister again; growing, growing, growing. What is growing? If something is growing in the wrong way, what do we get out of it? Surely government is all about improving the living standards and life-styles of the citizens. That ought to be the objective.

Mr Harper: Do you remember the schools that the Labor Government left behind?

Mr De LACY: Thirty years ago? If the Minister wants to make comparisons about the school system—of course they have improved over the past 30 years.

Mr Harper: Do you remember what they were like then?

Mr De LACY: I assume that the Minister is one of the products, so I can understand why he would not be happy with them.

Providing services to the community is one of the factors in which a Government must involve itself. Government is not simply about growth and, least of all, about population growth. It is about improving the life-style and standard of living of the citizens.

Because the present Government has no concept of what government is all about, because there is no economic strategy, because there is no regionalisation of what the Government is doing and because the Government is involved in internecine, crisis management, is lurching from crisis to crisis, and is unable to make important decisions that affect and improve the wherewithal of the people of Queensland, things are not going anywhere near as well as they ought to be.

It is time for a change, a real change, and increasingly the people of Queensland are starting to recognise that change can come only from Wayne Goss and Labor.

Mr SANTORO (Merthyr) (12.13 p.m.): I believe that the honourable member for Cairns was severely astray in his comments and in his perceptions about what the people of Queensland want. He says that the Labor Party is confident about Queensland's future. I can assure him that, in a few weeks' time when the people vote in the election, they will not express a similar confidence in the Labor Party.

Mr De Lacy: Is this your maiden speech?

Mr SANTORO: During the last few days in this place, we have heard a lot of bleating from Opposition members about what the Liberal Party and even the National Party members have been saying about the abuse of union power. Opposition members have protested and said that we are trying to lead this Parliament on, that we are fabricating, that we are unfair, that we are biased and that we are unreasonable. All I can say is that even the reports commissioned by Labor Governments clearly condemn them and clearly point out that it is the Labor Party and the cronies they seek to protect, and not the conservative parties, that are unreasonable.

Right at the outset, I place on record my appreciation and that of my party for the good work performed by hundreds of thousands of good unionists throughout Australia. Anything I say from this point on should not be construed as being union-bashing or not recognising the fine efforts of people who have played a responsible role within the union movement.

It is terribly important that we seek to expose and to bring out into the open those practices which seem to be condoned by the ALP; which seem to be condoned in this House time after time; and which the Liberal Party feels deserve no such support. Let us discover what is fair comment and let us discover the results of the reports that have been presented to the Federal Labor Government about practices on the waterfront. Then let the ALP try to bleat and complain that the Liberal Party is misrepresenting the true situation within sections of the union movement.

Several years ago the Federal Government commissioned the Inter-State Commission's waterfront reform plan. Its report was delivered not so long ago. The commission pulled no punches in outlining the problems that confront the Australian waterfront and

described the evidence before it as “demonstrating the classic symptoms of an imperfect market”.

Some of those symptoms included poor work-force training and career arrangements; poor response to user needs; introspective industrial attitudes; poor information flows to users and between the links in the transport chain; and a lack of supply and demand balance, which is often reflected in congestion and queues or in the underutilisation of expensive facilities. I reiterate that the report was commissioned by the Federal Labor Government in Canberra and was received by it.

According to the commission, those symptoms have resulted in high costs, endemic unreliability, a high level of industrial disputation, inappropriate manning levels and work practices, poor discipline, poor motivation throughout the industry and a pervasive lack of competition. When one looks behind the scenes and tries to figure out what these words mean, exactly what practices occur on the waterfront and what the problems are, one discovers a system of rorts and abuse that should not be condoned by anybody, even members of the Labor Party.

For example, stevedoring charges to load scrap metal cost one Queensland exporter \$15 a tonne, compared with stevedoring charges of about \$3 a tonne in the United States and around 64c a tonne to do the very same job in England. Why do those cost discrepancies and differentials exist? Let me have a look at the specific practices.

Earlier this week in this House, Mr McLean said that no such abuse exists on Australian wharves. God help the State if he ever becomes the Minister for Maritime Services and is responsible for administering Queensland's wharves!

The gross overmanning of Australian wharves by unions that are protected in ways that they should not be protected has created the cost discrepancies and differentials that exist. For example, up to 15 men are employed to unload a vessel. An Australian stevedoring gang can consist—and does consist—of four employees on the wharf and a foreman; four employees on the ship and a foreman; one relief crane-driver who goes home when the shift starts but who gets paid for the full shift; one, possibly two, time-keepers; one delivery clerk; one time-keeper for pay-roll people; and one first-aid man.

I notice that Mr De Lacy has returned to the Chamber. Earlier he interjected and asked me if this was my maiden speech. A few weeks ago in this House I made my maiden speech, but Mr De Lacy must have been asleep. At that time I mentioned some of the more distinguished contributions that the ALP has made to this State, including the abolition of the Upper House and the introduction of the gerrymander. Either Mr De Lacy was asleep or he did not want to listen to my comments because they hurt.

The people of Queensland appreciate that one of the major reasons why accountability in this Parliament has been practically non-existent is the ALP's abuse of its role in this House when it had the numbers.

As I was saying, up to 15 employees are required to undertake the simple operation of unloading a ship. The Western Australian State Opposition's task force into restrictive work practices found that a similar situation exists in that State. The minimum crew required to berth a vessel and to handle cargo consists of five line-handling gangs, one gangway watchman, two labourers on the wharf, one signalman, three labourers on the ship, one crane-operator, one first-aid man and one stevedores' supervisor.

People in the community who are working their guts out trying to earn a decent living are earning far less than the \$50,000 to \$80,000 a year that wharfies receive for about 20 to 30 hours of work per week. I invite Mr McLean to try to convince decent, hard-working people that the work practices on our wharves are fair.

I turn now to the other practices in which those 15 people who unload a ship indulge. The practice of drawing straws has been adopted. Men on night shift frequently will work for a short time and then draw straws to determine which one of them will remain to the end of the shift and will clock off everyone else including himself so that all of them are paid for a full shift's work even if that work has not been performed.

As to double headers—do members of the Opposition really know what they are? I will explain it to them. A double header means working two shifts straight. For example, if two more hours of work are needed at the end of a shift to complete the loading of a ship, the men will refuse a call for overtime but will accept a second shift. They then work the required two hours and go home, but are paid penalty rates for the whole of the second shift. Hence a man may be employed for seven hours of the first shift, work two extra hours of the second shift and be paid for 14 hours, seven of which are at penalty rates. With treble time for an untaken meal break, that amounts to 24 hours' pay for nine hours' work.

I invite Mr De Lacy and Mr McLean—when he bothers to come into this House and to listen to something that should be of concern to him—to explain to those people who are earning a decent living for a decent effort that these are good practices and that they are in the best interests of Queenslanders and Australians.

Mr Lee: They are crippling our State.

Mr SANTORO: I am getting to that.

Mr Sherrin: Have a look at the pilots dispute.

Mr SANTORO: I will get to that, too.

As to the cumulative effect of those gross abuses—I invite honourable members to look not at the research of the Liberal or National Parties or anybody else but to look at the research that has been conducted by the organs of the Federal Labor Government.

Let me refer to the results of the IAC research and the results of the research that has been conducted by other groups, including the Business Council Transport Task Force, and outline what they reveal. The IAC results state—

“A recent study that was conducted by staff of the Industries Assistance Commission found that a 20 per cent improvement in labour productivity in the water transport industry combined with faster turn around time of ships in port would produce an initial cost saving of \$860 million in 1986/87 dollars. This would lead in the long run to an increase of \$1.1 billion in GDP. Reform would boost exports, create more jobs and lead to higher wages and investment.”

It would lead to higher wages for the people whom Mr De Lacy and other Opposition members claim to support.

The findings of the Business Council Transport Task Force in March 1988 corroborated the IAC's findings. Those findings indicated that Australian ports were half as productive as European ports, and only 40 per cent as productive as Asian ports.

Mr Prest: You're a oncer.

Mr SANTORO: I invite the honourable member to come into my electorate and take the bashing that Wayne Goss and the ALP received in the by-election. Prior to that by-election the ALP spent \$1m propping up Wayne Goss and trying to improve the ALP's corporate image. In that by-election, when the swing should have been towards the Opposition, the ALP's vote decreased by 1 per cent. People rejected the Labor Party's candidate. They rejected its union-dominated and based strategy. They rejected Wayne Goss. In approximately eight weeks' time they will reject the ALP. I invite the honourable member who called me a oncer to come into my electorate during the lead-up to the next election and tell my constituents, for whom I work hard, that I am a oncer. The honourable member will be laughed out of Merthyr, as he will be laughed out of any electorate in the State, including possibly his own.

I would like the honourable member to justify the imposition on exporters and importers of the extra \$200 for the loading and unloading of ships that has had to be imposed by stevedoring companies, which are sick and tired of, and financially devastated and disadvantaged by, the go-slow practices of waterfront workers. I have not heard Mr De Lacy or any other Opposition member speak about the news item that was broadcast

this morning and that appeared in an article in today's *Sydney Morning Herald*. I ask Opposition members to listen to this and then they can say something. That article states—

“The companies announced the surcharge yesterday as ships face an average delay of two days because of congestion, with no improvement”—

listen to this—

“expected for at least another three years.”

An Inter-State Commission report recommended quick and prompt action. Yet the Federal Labor Government sits on its hands while companies, which have had to increase their charges, are going broke. That has a flow-on effect. Companies go broke, unemployment increases, and the young kids about whom the Prime Minister and members opposite pretend they are so concerned are left languishing in the unemployment queues.

What is the Opposition's response to an importer or exporter who has levied on him a \$200 impost to cover Labor Party ineptitude, roting and inefficient work practices, which increase by 25 per cent the cost of bringing in or sending out a container thus forcing the closure of stevedoring companies and importing and exporting businesses? What is the Opposition's response to that? It does not have a response. All that the Opposition wants to see is the union movement feather-bedded and protected by a Labor Party that feels obligated, intimidated and restrained by the bludgeoning power of the ACTU and the unions that comprise it. Let members of the ALP and members of the Opposition advocate the reform that the Inter-State Commission recommended.

About two months ago the Labor Party's lack of commitment to the process of reform took a funny twist. Who suggested that structural reform was in fact necessary? None other than the economic guru, clown and buffoon, Paul Keating. An article in the *Australian Financial Review* of 21 or 22 August quoted Mr Keating as saying that the policy focus of the Federal Government should now shift to structural reform, including reform of the waterfront. If honourable members opposite care, they can refer to that article.

I must be honest and say that when I read that statement I congratulated the Federal Treasurer. Like all of my colleagues, I believe in giving credit where credit is due. A few days later the National Farmers Federation and the Grain Council of Australia sought to hurry along the reforms that were recommended by the Inter-State Commission's report. I am sure that members opposite will recall that these associations attempted to load a ship in Brisbane using contract labour rather than Waterside Workers Federation members. They tried to speed up the reforms recommended by the Inter-State Commission. The people in Sydney and Melbourne held fears. I reiterate those fears, because they see no improvement in waterfront practices for at least three years. They have resigned themselves to languishing for at least another three years in economic decay that has been brought on by waterfront practices.

The Grain Council of Australia and the National Farmers Federation sought to break the circuit and bring on reform. What happened? Did Mr Keating, Hawke or members of the Opposition in this House come out and say, “Let's support industry. Let's support the people with whom we claim these days to have a rapport.”? They did not. They condemned and they remained silent when it suited them. The Federal Treasurer's bleating about a coming emphasis on structural reform was in fact just that.

Earlier by way of interjection the member for Mansfield referred to the airline pilots strike. It is indeed interesting to examine the inconsistent approach adopted by the Federal Government. I am very pleased that Mr Sherrin mentioned the matter because I intend to include some comments on it during my speech. The Federal ALP adopts an inconsistent attitude to union matters. Honourable members should reflect on what the Federal Labor Government has done during the airline pilots strike. It has brought in the army and scab labour, and is seeking to break the strike. Why does it not take a similar attitude to the waterfront?

Mr Sherrin: Because it is two-faced.

Mr SANTORO: I would suggest to the member for Mansfield that the reason is that members of the Hawke Labor Government are obliged, restrained and restricted by the brutal power of the ACTU. They depend on funds that are confiscated from unwilling workers to support election campaigns. They are dependent on the ACTU for political clout and also for everything that is not good in the union movement. These are the reasons why the inconsistent attitude is adopted. Well may members of the Opposition in this Parliament remain silent.

I did not hear the member for Cairns cite figures released recently by the tourism consultants Howarth and Howarth indicating that operators are losing \$1m a day because of the airline pilots strike. In August, occupancy rates in motels and hotels in Queensland were 54 per cent, which, when compared with 1988 figures, indicates a decline of 27 per cent. He did not say anything about businesses at all.

Recently I visited the Cairns electorate and met business people to tell them the Liberal Party story. The figures shown in the consultants' report were confirmed to me in person. Tourism operators told me that loss of revenue from accommodation amounted to \$50m a month. The enlightened approach promised by the Prime Minister in 1983 is what is required to settle this dispute. The Prime Minister spoke about consultation and about getting together with people to arrive at amicable solutions. However, in view of his inconsistent approach to the waterfront vis-a-vis the airline pilots strike, businesses are collapsing and economic devastation is being wrought on the whole economic fibre of regions, towns, firms and families. It rests very much in the hands of the Federal Labor Government to take positive action to resolve the dispute, but instead its members are sitting on their hands.

I say to the honourable member for Cairns that, because unionism in Australia is in decay, people are voting with their feet. If the ALP believes that the work practices I have described are supported——

Mr De LACY: I rise to a point of order. I am offended that the honourable member keeps referring to me yet will not take an interjection at all. I insist that, if he is going to talk about me, he should have the courage to take an interjection.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Row): Order! There is no point of order. Interjections do not have to be acknowledged by the member on his feet.

Mr SANTORO: Obviously I am cutting close to the bone. I can see why members of the Opposition are upset. I reiterate that unionism in Australia is in decay. Common, decent people are realising that, through its trade-union links, the ALP does not have anything good to offer. Well may the ACTU president, Mr Crean, state in an article published in the *Courier-Mail* on 26 September 1989 that the union movement has become irrelevant for most of Australia's workers. The article states that only 42 per cent of workers are now members of the trade-union movement. Mr Bill Kelty warned 600 delegates at a conference, "We don't have a God-given right to survive." I wish to cite the words stated by the ACTU's Federal secretary—

"We'd be less than truthful to say of ourselves that we were an adequate trade union movement. We are not and we must simply face up to that fact."

Mr Crean said that unions had failed to perform and had not kept pace with the change they had generated during the 1980s. One can actually read into that statement a glimmer of common sense because it seems to indicate the realisation that the union movement must become responsible and take into consideration urgent economic and social needs of Australians, both inside and outside the work-force. Members on the Opposition side of the Chamber are concerned about the welfare of people who are employed, rather than with the well-being of people who find themselves in unemployment queues mainly as a result of bad economic policies and bad trade-union practices.

The member for Cairns referred to Victoria as an enlightening illustration of what Labor can do. Although I have a stack of material that I would like to outline in my speech, I will confine myself to outlining a few relevant statistics that give the lie to the

claim that the ALP experience interstate is good. The increase in Victoria's net debt that was admitted by the ALP was \$12.3 billion from June 1982 to June 1989. In other words, in 1981-82 the debt was \$11.4 billion, but in 1988-89 it rose to \$23.6 billion. Workcare's accumulated deficit as at 30 June 1989 was \$5 billion. Third party insurance recorded an accumulated deficit of \$1.2m. Unfunded liabilities of the Victorian Government's superannuation scheme as at 30 June 1988 amounted to \$4 billion. The State Government in Victoria sold \$600m of rolling-stock and then leased it back over five years, which resulted in a cost of \$600m. I could go on providing statistics that indicate the Labor experience in Victoria.

The member for Cairns referred to State taxation but refrained from mentioning that in 1981-82, when the Liberal Party was in Government in Queensland, State taxation raised \$2 billion. In 1988-89, State taxes amounted to \$5 billion. In contrast to that, per head of population Victorians now pay more than double the Queensland rate. In 1987-88, Victorians paid \$1,081 per capita in State taxes compared to \$525 per head in Queensland.

Reference has been made to the Liberal Party's pledge to introduce a commission of audit similar to that set up in New South Wales. Nick Greiner's commission of audit found out many things. For instance, it found that in only five years the previous Labor Government had doubled State borrowings to \$24.7 billion, doubled the State debt to \$1.4 billion and produced total liabilities of \$46.2 billion. Commissions of audit have a very important role to play in the financial administration of any State, including Queensland, and this has been demonstrated by Nick Greiner's commission of audit which was implemented after the Liberal Party took office in New South Wales last year.

We are constantly told that Labor in Queensland will be different. In the remainder of my remarks I will question how Labor would in fact be different. In its State tax policy released a few days ago, the Liberal Party makes firm commitments about land tax, rail freights and a commission of audit. The business community has no faith in the Labor Party, irrespective of what the Leader of the Opposition and other economic spokesmen for the Opposition say. The business community realises that behind Wayne Goss stands a pack of union hacks and failed leaders who are not prepared to give guarantees and explain their unwritten agenda. The ALP in this House stands for increased trade union power. The union movement in Australia is rapidly losing favour and members, and they are the words of the ALP's Federal president and secretary.

The Labor Party does not say that it will entrench compulsory unionism or that it will abolish voluntary employment agreements, thereby causing economic mayhem. It does not say that it will repeal the essential services legislation and once again plunge Queensland into darkness. It does not say that it will stack all the quangos with trade union bosses or that it will create a dozen new industrial relations quangos, including an industrial relations advisory council, an employment planning authority, an occupational health and safety commission, a science and technology council, local employment committees, an employment planning authority, a tripartite committee to review the industrial Acts, an industrial democracy unit, an industrial democracy advisory service, a parliamentary consultative council, an apprenticeship review committee and workers' health centres. I will circulate that list of quangos to all the business people in my electorate and challenge them to contact the ALP and ask the Leader of the Opposition what is meant by that list, what functions those quangos will perform and explain how they will restrict the efforts of good business.

Mr Hayward interjected.

Mr SANTORO: I have been talking for some time, but the honourable member has not been in the Chamber to listen. He can comment during his own speech.

I turn now to look at the Labor Party's attitude towards new technology. A great deal has been said in this place about new technology. The Labor Party believes that new technology can cause serious economic and social problems. The ALP maintains

that a Goss Government will closely monitor and control the introduction and implementation of new technology in the State at regional, local, industry and workplace level. Perhaps the members of the Labor Party would like to tell managers that they will have to consult with their workers before introducing new technology in any industry, irrespective of the demonstrated benefits of that new technology.

The socialist Labor vision for Queensland will be rejected in eight or nine weeks' time, or whenever the election is held, and the Liberal Party looks forward with great confidence to reaping the benefits of the decline in ALP support.

Mr SHERRIN (Mansfield) (12.43 p.m.): I wish to make a few comments about this Appropriation Bill (No. 2) that is associated with the Budget introduced by the previous Premier. As Mr Ahern stated in his speech, it is a Budget that focuses on quality-of-life issues, particularly the importance given to education and the restructuring of the teachers' award.

I have spoken about this matter in another place and it is long overdue. I understand that the ACTU has now taken up that award as a model for other Australian States and that Tasmania is looking closely at being the next State to implement a similar award. I strongly endorse that point of view, because for a number of years I have been somewhat concerned about the attitude that the quality of education provided in schools can be improved by simply throwing more teachers into the system. Whilst there is some sentiment for that, I do not believe that that necessarily improves the quality of education that children receive. As a result of the time I spent teaching and from research, I have always held the view that the single greatest factor affecting the quality of education received by a child is the teacher in the class room. It has no great association with a whole host of other variables, even though they are important, such as parental support and physical resources in schools. The single most significant input into the quality of education is the teacher who is out in front of the class.

Recently the Board of Teacher Education expressed concern at the quality of incoming teachers. I know that members on both sides of the House have expressed concern at the falling TE scores that are required to gain entrance to teacher-training institutions.

Mr Scott: Is this your second maiden speech as a back-bencher?

Mr SHERRIN: No, this is the fourth time; one has to get into it.

Mr Scott: It has improved your speaking style a little bit.

Mr SHERRIN: I am pleased that the honourable member likes my laid-back style. That is one of the impediments of being a Minister; one cannot do that over on the other benches.

I shall return to what I was saying before I was interrupted by my colleague. The key issue is the quality of teachers in the system. If we were to compete in the market-place, attract graduates of high calibre and retain them in the education system, the remuneration offered to teachers and their award needed close examination. In my own discipline of science, I know that, because of the remuneration offered, particularly in the technology and science fields outside, it is almost impossible to attract high-calibre science graduates to teaching. Many of the best graduates were leaving. One does not need to be Einstein to realise what will happen to the overall standard of science education in our schools if we fail to attract the best quality science teachers. If we put the poorer quality teachers in class rooms, they will produce students with poor-quality training and the whole cycle will repeat itself generation after generation. I am very supportive of the Budget thrust that supports the improvement in the quality of education, particularly by addressing the quality of teachers in class rooms. I believe that that thrust attracts support from both sides of the House.

I wish to dwell for some time on the Family Services initiatives that have been undertaken and provide some background as to why there has been a change of focus

in the delivery of those services. There is no doubt that the quality of the community in which we live is very much dependent on the quality of our family life. Many serious concerns face the Australian and Queensland communities, concerns that many members have expressed over the years. One concern is the increasing incidence of child abuse. Last year there were more than 10 500 notifications of child abuse, much of it sexual abuse. I believe that that is just the tip of the iceberg. As the awareness campaigns of the State and Commonwealth Governments start to bite out there on the consciousness of the community, in the years to come the number of notifications will increase significantly.

In a community such as ours that espouses Christian values—I think all parties stand for very high ideals—to let that happen is just not on. That issue must be addressed in a real and meaningful way and, I believe, in a co-operative fashion. Certainly when I held the Family Services portfolio and when Peter McKechnie was there, we worked in a very co-operative way with Commonwealth and local government authorities.

Another issue in the community that is real and tangible, and that has a dreadful down side, is that of domestic violence.

Mr Scott: Those values you were talking about before—you can't just restrict them to Christians, can you?

Mr SHERRIN: I did not say that.

Mr Scott: You should spread them across the human race.

Mr SHERRIN: I did not say that. The honourable member will not draw me on that. I am simply saying that there are Christian values and other values and high ideals to which all political parties aspire.

Mr Scott: People value—would you give it as high as that?

Mr SHERRIN: I ask the honourable member not to provoke me. I am in full stride.

Mr Scott: I'm not getting you to praise the devil. I would be worried about the congregation that you belong to.

Mr SHERRIN: I am being watchful. I do not want to be hit by a lightning bolt.

Domestic violence is a serious issue. A very large proportion of the population will experience domestic violence; many children will witness it in the home and, unfortunately, a large number of women and a few men will be the victims of domestic violence, and very serious violence it is, too. It is a violence that remains hidden and can have phenomenal effects on the families in which it is present.

The issue of homeless youth has been highlighted by the Burdekin report, which was released earlier this year and which estimated that something like 50 000 to 70 000 young people are out on the streets in our nation. That we can let that happen in a nation as affluent as Australia is an absolute indictment of our country. When touring the refuges where young people stay, I find it interesting to ask them, "Why do you leave home?" The most common, significant reason given by them is that they have been in a situation where mum or dad break up and either the mum or the dad forms a new relationship with a new partner and, either covertly or overtly, the young person gets the very clear signal that his relationship with mum or dad is now taking second place to the relationship that mum or dad has formed with the new partner. Unfortunately, sometimes that is very, very overt. The children are basically told to leave home because there is no room for them in the new relationship. Sometimes all the covert signals are there and the young person realises that he has very much taken a back seat in the relationship and so leaves home.

I will continue with that theme. One of the things I am getting at is the increasing level of juvenile crime, which has been well documented. The annual report of the Police

Department, which was tabled today, highlights once again that juveniles are offending against the law and that in many cases that has resulted from marriage break-ups.

I have documented all of those issues because they are very serious matters facing the community. In the past the response of Governments at all levels has tended to be a reactive or bandaid response. In other words, they have waited for the child to be abused, for the woman in a domestic situation to be beaten, for the young person to hit the street, for the young fellow or young girl to offend against the law, or for the marriage to break up before the resources of Government and/or community groups are marshalled to try to put all the pieces back together again.

The fact that many Governments and many community groups are able to achieve some success speaks volumes for the commitment and dedication of many of those people out there working in the field. After talking with many of our workers, I know that very few people would do the job for the money paid. It is as simple as that. Many people just would not do it. The stress levels are high; the workload is phenomenal, and it is escalating. A person has to be committed and dedicated. From talking to these people I know that they could get twice that amount doing almost anything else. They are fantastic people. The fact that they do have successes speaks volumes for the type of people who are committed to that service.

The problem is that what was a minor problem two generations ago became a major problem in the 1960s and 1970s and is now a problem of crisis proportions with our generation. What we are seeing is the incidence of modelling; that is, young people grow up in families that suffer domestic violence and carry that on in their later life to their own families. As we know, time and time again, with the poor modelling that they have received from things like violence, child abuse, homelessness, broken families and so on, that modelling is growing in a snowball fashion from generation to generation to generation. That cannot be disputed. It is out there; it is real.

If Governments and community agencies continue their response in a reactive way with a bandaid approach, they are not dealing with the root cause of the problem. Money will be appropriated in the Family Services budget to attempt to change the focus from that reactive response, which as a caring community we must continue to maintain for the people who are out there hurting, to a much more preventive response. We should identify the families that have problems, where there is real stress and tension and a lack of extended family support, so that we can help them overcome the stress, get over the problems and go on and function in normal family relationships.

In the past, that has tended not to be the response of Governments and communities. The Family Services budget contains a real thrust that will be pro-active and preventive; in other words, when the stress comes to bear on them, it will marshal the resources of the community and Government agencies to help those families get over that stress and continue to function as normal, healthy families should.

Three areas have been highlighted for the appropriation of money. The Government is extending the system of parent aides in hospitals. Two systems of parent aides are operating: one at the Mater Hospital and one at the Royal Brisbane Hospital. I recommend a tour of inspection. It is a system of volunteers operated by a co-ordinator at both the main maternity hospitals in Brisbane. They can identify young women who do not have the appropriate modelling and mothering skills to raise their babies. Believe it or not, many young women who have babies basically do not know how to care for them or nurture them.

A sad case that came to my attention about four months ago concerned a young woman who was reported to the Department of Family Services for the neglect of her three-month-old baby. Upon investigation, we found that the baby had spent the first three months of its life flat on its back in a cot with almost no interaction from its mother. The only interaction that it received from the mother was when the mother reached over at regular intervals and put a bottle in its mouth.

We all know about the psychology of bonding between a young baby and its parents and how important that is. When we asked the young mother why the baby had not received any warmth, cuddling or nurturing, she said quite honestly that she could not nurse it because she would break all its little bones. She had a total ignorance of the nurturing and care of a young infant.

Parent aides are very successful mothers in the community who go home with young mothers and show them how to care for the baby and provide the caring skills that, unfortunately, a large number of young people nowadays do not know. In the past, the young mother's own mother would have come or the mother-in-law would have come and stayed and provided that tuition. There would have been an opportunity in the young mother's own family, if there were older children, to pick up all those skills. However, that does not occur today.

The Government has provided additional funds to institute more parent-aide schemes in Queensland's hospitals. It would be my aspiration to have parent aides operating in every hospital in the State that has a maternity facility in the not-too-distant future.

In a similar fashion, funds are provided for an additional 16 part-time home-makers across the State. They are very experienced and successful mothers and wives who can go to families that are having problems. The single greatest cause of marriage break-up and family break-up in the community today is brought about by stress resulting from financial mismanagement. A classic situation that came to my notice recently was a family that had, after the rent was paid, \$150 to last it for a fortnight. The parents went out and paid \$120 for a doll for one of the children, which left the family with \$30. Of course, in a couple of days, they presented themselves to one of the local community groups for emergency relief. I do not condemn that family for that. I am saying that they had no idea on how to prioritise and work out their budget. They needed help.

Home-makers, the very warm and supportive women who work in the Department of Family Services, can go alongside those people and their families, identify where the stress is and provide help and advice. They can say, "Look, that happened to us 10 years ago and we did this to get over it", or, "Give me your budget. I will work out a budget for your family to get through the fortnight and I will show you how to stick to it." Those home-makers provide very real, tangible support that 20 years ago was provided over the fence by neighbours or community groups. Because we are so mobile and tend to be very insulated in our interactions with the local community nowadays, those people do not receive that sort of support.

A great need exists for extended community involvement. As part of its family policy, the Government will be establishing across the State community networks that will provide a forum for Government agencies providing support in local communities, the church and other community groups to come together and identify what are the key issues and pressures in the local community. The pressures in Townsville are totally different from the pressures in Toowoomba. They will identify how we, as community and church agencies, should work together to meet those pressures and stresses on families; how we should harness the resources in a better way than we are doing; and how we should have input into Government so that we can get the resources that our local community needs.

As part of that process, we are looking at the early detection of families with problems. Provision is made for an additional six social workers so that the social worker scheme can extend the trial that has been operating in our high schools for the past few months. That will provide early detection of problems. Young people bring those problems from their dynamic family situations into the school environment. The fact that principals, teachers and administration staff are able to provide support speaks volumes for the work that they are doing. In addition to the educational requirements and needs in the schools, professionals are needed to provide support. We hope to extend that and make it a Statewide scheme.

In the areas of marriage enrichment and pre-marriage counselling, Australia is one of the world's worst places for young people contemplating a life together. They cannot obtain professional advice on the demands that will be made on them and their time. They are not told that a successful marriage requires give and take. That is one of the reasons why for a period last year more marriages in this country were breaking up than were being formed.

It gives me great pleasure to support the Appropriation Bill (No. 2).

Sitting suspended from 1 to 2.30 p.m.

Mr D'ARCY (Woodridge) (2.30 p.m.): I want to talk about the problem of toxic waste in the Kingston area. The Government has set aside a certain amount of money to have that problem examined. Over the past two and a half years I have been highly critical of the way in which the previous Premier, Mr Ahern, handled this problem. So I was very interested to hear Mr Cooper, in the first few paragraphs of his first speech after his election to the Premiership, identify the problem of toxic waste as one of the problems facing Queenslanders.

I can remember quite clearly taking to the Health Department a sample from the sludge pit at Kingston and having it examined and then having a meeting with Mr Ahern at which he gave a moral commitment, on behalf of the National Party Government of Queensland, to do something to overcome the problem. He accepted that the Government has a moral responsibility to do something to overcome the problem.

In the two and a half years since that time, until he lost the Premiership, Mr Ahern did not have one shovelful of toxic waste removed from the Kingston area. As I have said, I was very pleased to hear the Cooper commitment to the removal of toxic waste. However, in the last 10 days or so, some things have occurred that highlight the fact that nothing has changed in Queensland.

Mr Cooper has made no commitment at all to remove toxic waste; his Government has made no commitment to remove toxic waste. Mr Cooper has not mentioned the subject of toxic waste since his election as Premier. I have written letters to Mr Cooper and Mr Borbidge, who is the Minister responsible for that matter. Mr Borbidge responded with a lot of waffle that was just a rehash of everything Ahern had said when he was Premier.

When the Opposition questioned the Government about the task force that it established, which was going to virtually walk away from the problem, it was found that Dr Sally Leivesley, the head of that task force, would be overseas till the end of the month. After that great commitment, the Opposition expected some action from the Government on the toxic waste problem. The Logan City Council, which has pressured the Government all along to do something about it, had virtually despaired of Mr Ahern and wrote to Mr Cooper asking him to receive a deputation. Mr Cooper has not even answered that letter. I believe that a deputation of members of that council was received by Mr Borbidge. According to my information, that was a waste of time.

The major problem is that the toxic waste in the sludge pit is not contained; in other words, it is bubbling out of the ground. Everybody who has been associated with the problems in Kingston identifies that as the major problem and realises that it must be shifted. Up to now all that has occurred is that some houses around the area of the sludge pit have been purchased. Surely if this Government, under Mr Cooper's leadership, is fair dinkum, it will shift that toxic waste out of the sludge pit. The Government claims that it does not have a site on which to shift that waste. It is not game to announce a possible site until after the election for fear of losing votes in some other area.

Surely after two and a half years the Government should be at the stage at which it can solve the most identifiable problem. In fact, the problem is much greater than is generally realised. Everybody is aware that the sludge pit must be shifted. That sludge pit is still there and it is still contaminating people.

Nothing at all has been done. Everyone expected some action from Mr Cooper, but what do we find? The head of his task force is overseas till the end of the month. He will not receive any deputations. Nothing has been done. Surely he could have mooted some legislation regarding the disposal of toxic waste in this State. We have not even seen that. Not a murmur has been heard from Mr Cooper since that first crushing statement on his election to the Premiership.

One really becomes disturbed when one realises that the problem is not new. As I have said, it has been around for two and a half years. The sludge pit, which has been identified as the major problem, should be removed. I have not referred to the material contained in the open-cut mine. The Labor Party has always believed that that material should also be removed.

The people of Kingston have three main concerns. One is their health. The health surveys that have been carried out to date by the Government have not given them much comfort. Those surveys have not been detailed enough or of sufficient scope to enable the problems that have arisen in the area to be identified.

There is a high incidence of cancer in the Kingston community. The number of cases of leukaemia in that area that are reported to my office is horrific. Despite what the Government's task force says, that incidence is not normal. The Opposition was highly critical of the way in which that health survey was carried out. That survey team never went back over the years and carried out a proper random check of people who have lived in the area. They did not conduct a random survey and find out who used to live at, say, 8 Diamond Street or 10 Amethyst Street and go through their health records for that period. That was the only way in which that task force could have obtained a core sample. However, it was not done.

Scientific information was supplied by Sinclair Knight to the council, in the first instance, and then to the Government. Sinclair Knight is a company that has come in for tremendous criticism for its activities throughout Queensland and Australia while working for Governments. Admittedly, this is a difficult field. However, the fact is that the first reports brought down by Sinclair Knight were totally and utterly inadequate. Those reports were prepared in such a way that they did not give a clear indication of the parameters of the problem.

When I referred to the open-cut mine, I was actually referring to the open-cut mine on top of Kingston hill into which people used to dump virtually anything. It is known that people dumped drums of PCBs there. That is now starting to show up in water samples. It is known that people from interstate—particularly from New South Wales and Victoria—dropped waste there at night. It is known that many companies were involved in dumping waste material there because it was a virtually unsupervised pit at a time when management of the environment and conservation were not as well understood as they are today.

Let me explain what the task force did. It drilled bore holes around the open-cut area and took samples from those holes. It is saying that, although PCBs are showing up in two bore holes and the watercourse beneath the ground, the problem is contained, and it intends to leave the toxic waste there. At this time I am asking for the sludge pit and not the open cut to be shifted. It should be done by the Government. The current situation is that the sludge pit is not contained and the open-cut, the Government says according to the Sinclair Knight report, is contained.

The Sinclair Knight report was attacked not by me but in a report commissioned by the Logan City Council and the Griffith University. The task force was led by John Weir and had the services of people such as Greg Miller, who is a well recognised scientist. It attacked the modus operandi used by Sinclair Knight to determine the parameters of the problem, to decide what was in the pit, and the effect it was having on the people of Kingston.

In the first instance, the commission was dealing with the scientific information. But both the scientific and the health information have been criticised by experts. I do

not claim to be an expert but I do know that the Government has done nothing for the people of Kingston. The money is sitting in the Treasury, there has been a task force and there have been plenty of reports. I blamed the previous Premier, Mike Ahern, for the way he bungled this matter. I am now laying it fairly at the feet of the new Premier, Russell Cooper, because this matter did come under his jurisdiction for a short time. He employed Dr Sally Leivesley to head the task force. Still nothing has been done. The procrastination is continuing. Cooper is no different from Ahern. It appears that the people of Kingston will get no more satisfaction from Cooper than they got from Ahern.

Leivesley is overseas until the end of the month, so she will not even see the council, which is the major body responsible for the cleaning up of the area. No determination has been made on where the material is to go. There has been no legislation. Since the first utterances, nothing has been said. The people of Queensland, and the people of Kingston in particular, expected that, after making this grandiose announcement on his election to the Premiership, something would be done by the Premier. They expect a Cooper commitment. The people of Kingston and the people of Queensland expect something to be done about this environmental problem of toxic waste. It is a tragedy that this has occurred.

Information is still coming from various areas throughout the State and from overseas. One of the consultants investigating the Love Canal disaster in the United States, which was admittedly more identifiable than the Kingston problem, is in Australia. He is Dr Paul Guppy. He will be in Kingston on Monday. He has looked at the problem. I have spoken to him. He is an American health expert with a large number of professional qualifications. His previous experience includes research, development and the writing of medical standards and the drafting of legislation for the practice of health-care services and guide-lines for conducting medical procedures in toxic waste.

The programs researched, developed and implemented include the first competency-based training program in ophthalmology. It is now in use in Canada, the United States of America, West Germany and Israel. In conjunction with Dr Carruthers and Dr Ross, the paramedics involved in research, development and making recommendations for offshore, remote and urban areas researched and developed a counselling and redeployment program for personnel returning from stress situations caused by toxic waste. He is obviously a gentleman who should be interviewed by the press in relation to this problem. Because of his experience overseas, he has some very definite things to say about the health programming that is necessary to clean up this problem in Queensland.

I again demand that the Government, under its new Premier, make a commitment and honour it. The National Party probably does not have much longer in Government. The Labor Party has made a firm commitment on what it will do about this problem. There has been no commitment from this Government. All we have had is talk. I expected a commitment from Cooper. I am afraid that all we got was verbalising. He will not see the council. The task force leader is overseas. There has been no statement since the original statement. There has been no mooting or moving of legislation. There has been no announcement on a site that may be used to store toxic waste.

Since the Griffith University report, an American geologist, Mr Bill McClenney, made a statement on the Mount Taylor toxic hazard site. In referring to the situation in America at present, he said—

“All landfill sites used for the disposal of ‘fixed’ chemical wastes in America have ‘leaked’ in varying degrees, even through triplelayer claywalls.”

He is saying that no matter what is done, the open cut will leak. He continued—

“Sanitary landfill is no longer an acceptable method of disposal of hazardous wastes in America.

The standard methods of soil and water sampling were found to be inadequate when testing for chemicals outside the ‘normal’ range.”

I must again refer to the limited range of the tests in the air and soil in the Kingston area. They would have given a clean bill of health to almost any dump in Queensland, so I am asking for further testing. He continued—

“High temperature destruction of hazardous wastes is now the more favoured method of disposal of hazardous waste.”

Several methods have been proposed in Australia and even in Queensland. There are people in Queensland who have the technology that can be used and it would be a world first. In the Budget debate, I referred to the fact that the Government had not been inventive enough to get involved with the technical advances in this State and country.

Queensland does not have a significant manufacturing base. It has 16 per cent of the national population but only 11 per cent of the national manufacturing base. Queensland gives away its ideas, such as those on solar power. Queensland has access to high technology for the destruction of toxic wastes through high temperatures, but the Government has done nothing about it. It is not inventive enough to consider funding any of those projects.

The Queensland Government is too worried about whether Ministers are going to be charged over their ministerial expenses and whether the Australian Taxation Office will get them. I am sure that the press and the people of Queensland realise that, during the past six months, Queensland has been in a state of limbo; it has not had a Government. Ministers have been too worried about their portfolio changes and their taxation problems to govern this State and to develop the necessary innovative ideas. I look forward to a change of Government in December.

Mr HINTON (Broadsound) (2.46 p.m.): I am pleased to join in this debate. The honourable member for Woodridge is correct when he says that many of the good ideas in this country are going overseas, but he is asking the Government to fund new technology.

Queensland has a free-enterprise Government but the good ideas are not being taken up. Interest rates of 20.75 per cent affect business in Australia and prevent private enterprise from producing new technology. Because Japan's interest rates are set at 5 per cent and those in the United States are set at 7 per cent to 8 per cent, it is obvious why new technology and industries are going to those countries. It is a great shame and yet another example of the criminal negligence of the Federal Labor Government.

The honourable member for Woodridge was quite correct in saying that Australia is exporting its industries, particularly new technology, and its jobs. The root cause is the high interest rates. It is pleasing to note that Queensland is the bright spot in the very black world of the Australian economy. Queensland has a balanced Budget and a growing economy. Employment in Queensland has increased by 6.8 per cent, or 82 000 people, compared with the national average of 5.1 per cent.

Every month approximately 1 700 people come to Queensland because they require services such as hospitals, schools, nursing homes and Housing Commission homes. Queensland has a brilliant record of providing all of those services while maintaining a balanced Budget, a growing economy and rising employment.

Mr Davis: You made the same speech last week.

Mr HINTON: The honourable member is quite right, and I intend to continue to make this speech because I am trying to drum into his thick skull that he is backing the wrong lot. Other members and I will continue to drum home the point that the policies of the Federal Labor Government are taking Australia towards bankruptcy.

This morning during a ministerial statement, Mr Randell also drummed home that point. I was pleased to see members of the Opposition squirming when Mr Randell pointed out the facts about the Federal Labor Government.

I noted with some interest that Mr Peacock has been speculating——

Mr Davis: Who?

Mr HINTON: Mr Peacock has been speculating—and some of the members of the Federal Labor Government have not been denying it—that, towards the end of this year, a Federal election could be called on an opportunistic basis. That will provide an opportunity for the people to bring about the death of that Government. It would suit the Queensland Government to go to the polls at the same time as the Federal Government, because it would be able to point out the true facts about the ALP Government's economic record—the debt-ridden chaos and the collapsed standard of living.

Mr Davis interjected.

Mr HINTON: The honourable member is all right on his parliamentary salary.

I ask honourable members to consider the plight of the average man who earns \$400 a week, has two children at high school and whose wife does not work. I wonder how he feeds and clothes his family and provides for the schooling of his children. He must find it impossible to run a car and meet his rent or mortgage payments.

At schools that I have visited headmasters have told me that children in classes are listless because they are not being properly fed. The last thing that a family is prepared to forgo is its motor car and the house. As a result, savings must be made on other items. The Opposition's friends in Canberra have created that situation and they should hang their heads in shame.

Mr Davis interjected.

Mr HINTON: The honourable member should not swivel around like a corkscrew; he should hang his head in shame because his friends in Canberra have created that situation.

If the Labor Party were to gain Government in this State next year——

Mr Randell: Very unlikely.

Mr HINTON: The Labor Party has high hopes. I have never seen members of the Labor Party looking so cocky. However, I am sure that Mr Randell would agree that they have looked a little less cocky during the past week or two. This morning when the Premier was speaking in this House, I looked at Mr Goss' face and, quite frankly, he was as white as a sheet. Mr Goss knows that the tide has turned and that the next public-opinion polls will show a completely different picture.

Ms Warner interjected.

Mr HINTON: I cannot read that paper from this distance.

Mr Randell: Five per cent of the poll.

Mr HINTON: I thank the Minister. I cannot hear what Ms Warner is saying, but I am sure that it is correct. I would not doubt for one moment that what she says is true.

A renaissance of the National Party has occurred in my electorate and the National Party will sweep back into power. It is just as well that Mr Davis is retiring before the next election; otherwise he would still be sitting in the very same seat and would be turning himself inside out to argue with back-benchers.

Mr Davis: The ALP candidate up there will be the new ALP member.

Mr HINTON: The honourable member tried this the other day because he wants me to mention that candidate's name. The ALP has some hopeless candidates, but Mr Davis knows damned well that that man would be the most hopeless candidate in this State.

Recently I pointed out that a few months ago all the Labor front-benchers came to my electorate. Every two months Mr Hamill arrives to denounce the fact that the railway line from Rockhampton to Yeppoon will close. That is denied every two months. Then up comes Mr Comben, who tries to wreck our harbour. Then up comes somebody else. One after another they pile in. At present Mr McElligott is trying to cause some trouble in the Livingstone Shire Council. Opposition members will do anything to cause a bit of disruption, a bit of mayhem and the loss of economic progress.

Mr Randell interjected.

Mr HINTON: Yes, he did. Mr Randell was recently Minister for Local Government. Mr McElligott has been up to my electorate trying to stir the pot of disruption and unhappiness.

Mr Randell: Is it right that they are paying his fare to bring him up there?

Mr HINTON: I would pay his fare any time to bring him into the area. Every time Opposition members come to my electorate they give me all sorts of ammunition to use. I assure them that I enjoy that immensely.

Mr Davis: Mr Hinton——

Mr HINTON: The honourable member is about to say that I am making the same speech twice.

Recently I said that Opposition front-benchers have stopped coming up to my electorate because they now recognise that, even though I hold the seat with a majority of 1 per cent, the Labor Party has no hope of winning my seat and it is concentrating on other areas. The Labor Party has conceded the seat of Broadsound. I think it is a compliment to me. I am certainly very happy about that.

Mr Davis: The only reason they haven't come up is that they have got to be here in Parliament.

Mr HINTON: No. The Labor Party has conceded the seat of Broadsound to me. In any case, if the honourable member decided to come up there, he would not make it as he does not know his way north of Nambour. Let us face facts: he would even get lost on the new electric train service.

I am very proud of the Queensland Government. Despite the fact that an enormous number of people are coming into Queensland, the Government has retained the lowest tax rates of any of the States. Queenslanders pay \$593 per head in State taxes. That is some \$300 less than the average that is paid by residents in the Labor States. That is a lot of money.

The great taxer has just walked into the House. I refer to the Leader of the Opposition. As soon as the Labor Party gets into power—if it gets into power—this State's tax rates will rise to the same levels as those in the other States.

Recently the Leader of the Opposition came to my electorate and promised the locals a northern road link out of Yeppoon, through Byfield across to Glen Geddes. That road would cater for the tourist trade.

Mr Goss: At least I didn't put somebody else's signature on the promise.

Mr HINTON: The honourable member has been up there and he has promised it. But he did not cost it, did he? The Main Roads Department has costed it for me. Without taking into account that 40 kilometres of the road is through heavy, deep-flood country, it will cost \$35m. Taking that into account, I estimate that the road would cost about \$50m. If that sum were taken out of the central division's road budget, not one cent would be left for new road construction anywhere else in central Queensland. That is how stupid the Leader of the Opposition's commitment is. Quite frankly, he should not come back, because he has been laughed out of town over that issue.

I have made it very clear in my area that my main road priority, after the commitments that I have already made, is the provision of four-lane highway between Rockhampton and Yeppoon. That road is used by people who live on the coast and travel to and from Rockhampton. If Mr Goss were on that road at 5 o'clock in the afternoon he would find that the traffic was bumper to bumper. That is the road that people want, not some mythical, non-existent, impossible pipe-dream on my coast that he has dreamt up. He is the joke of the coast. I am very grateful to him for coming up there and putting the Labor policies in such an absurd light. Maybe in 30 or 40 years a road such as the one he proposes will be able to be built. It would be an asset; there is no doubt about that. But in the context of the funds that are available at present, unless he trebles State taxes—and that is not inconceivable—it is just not on.

I strongly advise the Leader of the Opposition to research his facts before he comes into my electorate. By coming in with that sort of rubbish, he has done himself and his image immeasurable harm.

I want to refer to some of the chaos that the Federal Government wants to inflict on Queensland. This State has a strong economy and a Budget surplus. But look at the problems at the national level. I know they have been mentioned before, but it is worth repeating them. In 1983 when Hawke came to power, Australia had an external debt of \$23 billion. The Federal Government is now adding to that debt at the rate of \$2.58 billion a month.

I am glad that "Mr Keating junior" has come into the House. If that sum is multiplied by 12, it amounts to \$30 billion a year, which is more than the total debt that Australia had before Labor came to power. That is happening in one year. What an incredible legacy. Some 63c of every export dollar goes towards meeting that debt. This country is going down faster and faster.

But what is the Labor Government doing to correct this problem? It has whacked up interest rates. What does that do? It kills business. What does business do? It provides the exports.

Mr Randell: Every hour we are \$2m more in debt to overseas countries. Every hour we are down the drain.

Mr HINTON: That is right; every hour. Every hour the Opposition's friends are taking this country down the drain at that rate. That is absolutely horrendous. That will not be solved by the introduction of some bandaid, knock-em-down, kick the worker in the teeth measure that results in an increase in interest rates, which will put the worker out of his home, out of his job and out of his industry. That will not solve the problem. It will be solved by cutting the cloth to fit. Imports have to be reduced to a level that can be sustained to redress the foreign debt.

When the Federal Government is prepared to bite the bullet and address the problem, it will retain some credibility. Until that is done, Mr Keating will retain the image that he has, namely, the undertaker of Australia. Those problems will take the Opposition down. The best thing that could happen is for a Federal election to be held at the same time as the State election, as has been hypothesised. I personally do not think it will happen. However, if it did, the State Government would be laughing all the way to the Treasury benches.

Mr Davis: I want to know why you have got such a big following. There are two National Party members in the Chamber.

Mr HINTON: My colleagues trust me. They know that while I am speaking in the Chamber, the Government is well represented. They are in their offices working for their electorates. I wonder how often ALP members do that.

Let me refer to Labor members working for their electorates. In Rockhampton where I live, there are two electorates, Rockhampton and Rockhampton North. Rockhampton North is represented by Mr Yewdale who is known as "Mr Invisible". During divisions, he goes to sleep in his room in the Parliamentary Annexe and does not come

down to the Chamber when the bells ring. In three years, the one chance that the Labor Party had of embarrassing the Government was lost because the member for Rockhampton North was sound asleep in his bed. I can tell the honourable member for Brisbane Central that the member for Rockhampton North has been sound asleep in his electorate for the last six years.

The National Party has a good candidate by the name of Lee Nevison for Rockhampton North. He stands a good chance of becoming a member of this Government. The Labor Party has, as its candidate, a very abrasive member of the Queensland Teachers Union. As a member of the Rockhampton City Council, he has managed to annoy practically the whole area. He is famous for one issue, and one issue only, namely, "Let's have another strike." I can tell him that middle Rockhampton is sick to death of people calling for more strikes, but that is what the ALP's candidate in Rockhampton North is doing.

Mr Randell: What happened to the water-slide in Rockhampton? What did that cost?

Mr HINTON: I cannot answer that question.

Mr Randell: It fell over.

Mr HINTON: I sympathise with the Rockhampton City Council, because the project set up by Mr Tom Wyatt in the gardens that have been established is a great credit to the town. An engineering disaster occurred and it now stands as a monument in the town. Every tourist who visits the area looks at it. Everyone has his problems, so I suppose the Rockhampton City Council is allowed to have its problems and the odd embarrassing moment, too. It is certainly time, however, that the embarrassment surrounding the project was fixed up.

The electorate of Rockhampton is represented by Mr Braddy, who would be the laziest member in this Parliament as far as looking after his electorate is concerned. Headmasters and members of p. and c. associations in his electorate phone me and ask me to come and look at their schools and their problems. They ask me to make representations for schools in Rockhampton because the Labor members are not doing their job. That is a very poor show.

Mr De Lacy: Tell us about Santa Claus again. That is the best story you have told in this House.

Mr HINTON: I can tell the honourable member about Santa Claus. I refer to the ALP's campaign director who had committed 168 offences and was charged with 14 offences by the Police Complaints Tribunal before he was superannuated out of the force for health reasons. He is the type of person that the ALP has working for it. I can tell the member for Cairns that in my electorate I have had an absolute picnic over those issues. Approximately two weeks ago the Labor Party had a meeting. The members told each other where to get off, went home and nobody agreed to do anything. On the Capricorn Coast, that is the state of the ALP, particularly since recent incidents involving the campaign director occurred.

Mr Prest interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Booth): Order!

Mr DAVIS: I rise to a point of order. It is my duty to draw to your attention the state of the House.

Mr HINTON: Mr Deputy Speaker, let me just——

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! My attention has been drawn to the state of the House.

Quorum formed.

Mr HINTON: I thank the member for Brisbane Central for his assistance and support in summoning an audience for me.

Mr Davis: That's all right.

Mr HINTON: I am sure it was his pleasure.

I wish to refer to the structural damage caused by Labor to this State. The instances are well worth considering. The Federal Labor Government has progressively cut road-funding. I am pleased that the member for Bowen is present in the Chamber. He has been very quiet today and I did not notice him previously. In 1985-86, funding was frozen at the 1984-85 levels. In 1986-87, funding was cut by \$24m. In 1987-88 funding suffered a further cut of \$180m. In 1988-89, funding was cut by \$50m. For 1989-90, funding was cut by \$25.7m. Queensland has suffered a 40 per cent reduction in real terms in Federal road-funding since 1983.

The State Government has to make up the shortfall by imposing higher vehicle registration costs. The Queensland Government has played its part in maintaining a real level of spending. This year the Government has increased spending by 14 per cent.

Mr Hayward: I am curious to know how you can predict 1990, because we have not even reached that stage yet.

Mr HINTON: I think the honourable member's ears have deceived him. I said, "1988-89". This financial year the State Government has increased spending by 14 per cent to make up the reduced level of Federal Government funds. The Queensland Government is trying to ensure that an adequate road program is maintained in this State.

I was fascinated to see Mr Goss and Mr Burns on television lifting up a piece of broken bitumen on the national highway in north Queensland. That road is supposed to be funded by the Federal Government.

Mr Hayward: Oh, come on!

Mr HINTON: That is right.

Mr Milliner: Not on the national highway.

Mr HINTON: It was the national highway; at least, that is what was stated on television. That stunt shows their hypocrisy, but stunts of that kind do not wash with the people of central and northern Queensland. They know where the real problems lie when it comes to road-funding.

General-purpose grants to local governments were cut by \$20m in 1988-89, and a further \$17.9m will be cut in 1989-90. That was announced in the tax package on 12 April 1989. One thing that this State Government has done for local government—it is being taken up by the local councils in my electorate—is provide \$40m in matching grants for council roads. The Minister is nodding his head. I have alerted the councils in my electorate to those grants and they are submitting applications. I will be ensuring that those applications are successful. This is a very good program and one that is designed to assist local authorities, particularly with roads such as grain or tourist roads that are of economic importance and which rate-payers are unable to finance. My electorate has several roads of that type and the councils will be looking for a share of that \$40m. This is a great effort on the part of the State Government and a direct contradiction of the action taken by the Federal Government.

In 1988-89 export incentive programs were cut by \$77.7m, and yet a few moments ago the member for Woodridge complained about the fact that new technology and programs were not getting off the ground in Queensland and were being exported overseas. That is largely due to the fact that there are interest rates of 20.75 per cent in this country, 5 per cent in Japan and 7 per cent or 8 per cent in the United States and other countries. Australia has a deficit of \$2.58 billion a month and the Federal Government has cut export incentive programs by \$77.7m. What an outrageous situation!

Mr Hobbs: They are just knockers.

Mr HINTON: Yes, they are knockers.

Mr Hayward: Can you name the programs that have been cut?

Mr HINTON: No, I cannot name all the programs; there are too many—a multitude. I will research the matter for the honourable member.

Mr Hayward interjected.

Mr HINTON: Yes, and in the Matters of Public Interest debate during the next week of sitting I will detail every program in which incentives have been cut. The honourable member does not deny that there have been cuts in those programs or that the Federal Government is discouraging exports from this country. The Federal Government only encourages imports, and a good example is the pineapple industry.

Mr Hayward: One thing I know for sure is that Jim Pearce knows what programs they are.

Mr HINTON: Jim Pearce is lucky to be able to find his way out of Dysart. I first met little Jimmy Pearce in Dysart when I became the member for Broadsound and heard about the underground coal-mine strike, which was called the Harrow Creek sit-in.

Mr Randell interjected.

Mr HINTON: Mr Randell knows all about it; I inherited that area from him.

BHP-Utah wanted to close the colliery down because it was uneconomic and the quality of the coal from the trial colliery was not satisfactory for blending. I decided to visit those blokes underground and talk to them. For 10 days they had been claiming that they were a kilometre underground and suffering all sorts of deprivations; freezing in the cold and living by the light of a hurricane lamp. I decided to do the right thing and find out if a compromise could be reached. BHP-Utah fitted me out with a hard hat with a light, gave me a map showing me where to go and wished me the best of British luck. I went to the colliery, but I did not have to go underground. The underground sit-in miners, who were led by Mr Pearce, were all on the surface and were knee-deep in beer bottles and cigarette butts. They were deceiving their own mates. I did not even need to switch on the light on my hard hat because they were out in the bright sunlight. That was the first time I met little Jimmy. I have never let him or the people of Dysart forget that. He deceived the people of Dysart that time, and if, by some miracle, he were to get into this place, he would deceive them here. I assure honourable members that that will not happen, but that is his claim to fame; he led an underground sit-in by sitting on the surface. Needless to say, after a frank and full discussion on the virtues of sitting on the surface for an underground sit-in, I went to the television stations, revealed the fact that he was there and the strike collapsed the next morning. At 10 o'clock the next morning the miners went back to work because they were laughed out of town. That is the record of my ALP opponent in industrial matters.

Mr Milliner: He's never been called to court for forgery, has he?

Mr Hayward: Why don't you tell us about forging electoral papers?

Mr HINTON: One of these days I will tell honourable members the story surrounding that incident. It was an ALP set-up.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr HINTON: You people know it.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! There is far too much noise in the Chamber. The honourable member will address the Chair.

Mr GOSS: I rise to a point of order. I find the reference to an ALP set-up not only inaccurate but also offensive, and I ask that it be withdrawn. The Opposition's allegation is supported by the fact that the honourable member pleaded guilty and did not appeal in respect of his conviction.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I do not accept that point of order.

Mr HINTON: I will pass on to more productive matters. In 1988-89, the tourism industry assistance program was cut by 67.5 per cent, or \$7.2m, at a stage when tourism had become Australia's second-biggest earner. At a time when the Australian tourism industry should be encouraged to capitalise on the beneficial impact of activities, including World Expo and the Bicentenary, the Federal Government cut back the programs to assist tourism. However, that is nothing to what it is doing to tourism at the present time, with Mr Hawke fooling around with this airline dispute. How many weeks has that dispute been going? Is it seven or eight weeks?

This morning I was very interested to hear in a ministerial statement that the Queensland Government settled the power strike in this State in about a week. It turned on the lights in Queensland, and they have remained on ever since.

Mr Smyth interjected.

Mr HINTON: The member for Bowen has been squirming ever since.

Mr Hawke knocked back the assistance that Queensland offered. In every way he impeded any progress that Queensland tried to make to get planes flying in this State to assist the tourist industry, particularly in north Queensland. There was no hope there, only blocking and a complete lack of assistance. Now the strike is in its eighth week and it is bringing our industry to its knees. As if that is not enough, the Federal Budget cut back assistance to the tourist industry.

Mr Randell: Hawke brought the troops in on this strike.

Mr HINTON: I was not going to go into that. I will leave that to the Left Wingers, such as the member for Bowen. They can worry about scab labour and the bringing in of the troops to break the strike. They are the ones who should be upset about that and they are the ones who should be concerned.

All we know is that the Federal Labor Government has brought this country to its knees. If the motley crowd led by "Whinging Wayne" was to get into power in Queensland, it would bring this State to its knees. However, I can assure the House that that certainly will not happen.

Ms WARNER (South Brisbane) (3.17 p.m.): I rise in this debate to speak about some serious problems in the State of Queensland. It distresses me somewhat to have to follow the previous speaker, who confined his comments to electioneering gimmicks. His major contribution to this House is to be known as the most successful forger to enter Parliament.

I enter this debate to inform the House of the problems that have emerged——

Mr Randell: That was very unkind.

Ms WARNER: Let us get down to the real purpose of Parliament, of government and of administration. Let us try to keep ourselves away from this election that is looming. As far as I am concerned, that election should be called as quickly as possible so that we do not have to put up with the sort of meaningless speech just delivered by the forger from Broadsound.

What we really should be addressing in this Parliament are the real concerns of government, matters that affect the quality of the lives of my constituents and the lives of the constituents of every member in this House.

Mr Milliner: Do you really think he was a successful forger? He did get caught.

Ms WARNER: It seems that it was a very successful forgery.

Mr Prest: It was forgery. He pleaded guilty to the charge.

Ms WARNER: Yes. Obviously he had no element of shame about it at all—certainly not high levels of shame. As appears from a lot of the standards displayed opposite, on a number of different levels there is actually a failure to be able to tell right from wrong. It is not just in a case of forgery; it is in a number of other areas, such as ministerial expenses and the division between private and public domains.

I want to turn specifically to a public domain, a matter of fairly boring and tedious but, nevertheless, important administration in this State. Members may or may not be aware that the Brisbane City Council has recently conducted an extensive study, which is called the Brisbane traffic study, into traffic flow within the city. As I have said before, this is a fairly tedious matter to go into in detail; nevertheless, it is something that affects each and every one of us as individuals and it also affects society as a whole, economic development, aspects of regional planning, town-planning, housing, industry, small business and so on. So more notice should be taken by members of this House of the whole question of that Brisbane traffic study. Indeed, if the State Government was paying attention, there should be some State Government response, some State Government contribution, to what is a very important study.

Mr Gately: Are you going to tell us how much money Mr Hawke is not giving this State for its road maintenance and construction?

Ms WARNER: As Mr Gately so rightly points out, it is a question of funding, but it is also a question of money in quite a number of other ways.

The costs of the proposals in the present Brisbane traffic study are quite staggering. If the State Government is to accept the proposals as they are, it would be very negligent. The changes that have been flagged in the study are astronomically expensive, but the problem with the study is that the solutions offered leave us with the same sorts of dilemmas as are currently faced in respect of traffic flow in and out of the city.

I will summarise briefly the main proposals of the Brisbane traffic study. They are: new road crossings of the Brisbane River, from Toowong to West End, from the University of Queensland to Dutton Park and from Hawthorne to Teneriffe; the establishment of an inner ring road; the completion of an outer ring road; a new northern arterial road; improvement of the western corridor; commencement of another highway to the Gold Coast; and, in the city heart, parking restrictions in new developments, levies on owners of off-street parking facilities, and more bus priority routes.

The problem with the proposals from the study is that they are essentially conservative in nature. They do not address alternative and preferred ways of life that people of Brisbane could look forward to. It is salutary to note that, because the level of ecological disaster that has occurred is so great, cities such as Los Angeles are considering traffic bans.

Mr Randell: There is no fire in this.

Ms WARNER: No, there is no fire in this speech. It is a basic, ordinary speech about Government administration. In the volatility, hype and activity of the last few weeks of this National Party Government we are having very little basic, ordinary, good government. It is about time that the people of Queensland were allowed to go to the polls so that they can get back onto an even keel and start looking forward to a better future.

As I said, the Brisbane traffic study has been conservative in its approach. It has not looked at the human and economic costs of the motor car to our way of life. It has not looked at the cost of the motor car to the environment as a whole and at the major problems that we as a community face at that macro level of planning. It has come up with a very conservative document that says, "All right, we have got so many cars that we have to get into the city centre or around the city. How are we going to do that?"

We are going to build more roads." It has not examined why we need so many cars or whether there are any alternatives to the use of the car as a major form of transport in and out of cities. That fixation with the motor car is what has caused the problems in North America—similar problems that Brisbane will face if more innovative measures are not put forward to deal with them.

The Brisbane traffic study revealed that in 20 years Brisbane will have a population of more than one million, with a forecast of a 40 per cent increase in the patronage of public transport. Yet the study does not look at how public transport will be enhanced. The other reason why the study is somewhat hamstrung is that it does not have the capacity to look at other forms of transport such as rail alternatives, which are the province of the State Government. What is immediately called for is an integrated transit authority response looking across a range of different public transport mechanisms, not merely at buses and cars, which is basically what that study looks at.

Over a period in Brisbane, stopgap and ad hoc measures have resulted in a traffic and transport system that is very haphazard, frustrating and, in some places, even dangerous. Expert opinion is that reorganisation and rejuvenation should begin in the central business district and radiate from there.

One of the major rationales behind the proposals of the Brisbane transport study relates to population and settlement patterns, particularly for the city of Brisbane and also the Brisbane statistical division, which includes the cities of Ipswich, Logan and Redcliffe, the Shire of Redlands and parts of the Shires of Caboolture, Pine Rivers, Moreton, Albert and Beaudesert.

The major issue of the study is that in 1976 the city of Brisbane represented 73 per cent of the population of the Brisbane statistical division, but by 1986 it fell to 62 per cent. The fastest rates of growth are in Logan City and the Shires of Redlands and Pine Rivers. In the period 1981-86, the net migration from the city of Brisbane was almost matched by natural increase. The number of households in the city of Brisbane has increased, although the population has remained static. Therefore, density is actually reducing.

On current trends, the population of Brisbane city will remain static or decline, although the number of households will increase, which means that the density will reduce even further. Overall, there will be even more people on the outskirts of Brisbane trying to get in, which raises questions about town-planning, regional development, decentralisation and all those issues that are not addressed by the Brisbane traffic study.

The issue needs a more holistic approach. If we look at small sections, we will make life very uncomfortable for a few people living in the inner city, which simply becomes an area of transit for the people who live outside the city. That seems to be one of the propensities for the development of my electorate of South Brisbane and for the northern inner-city suburbs. It comes about because of the concentration on the belief that the only way to travel is by motor car. That Neanderthal view of transportation will be our undoing. In extreme examples, it will result in the sorts of problems that have emerged in Los Angeles.

We have the opportunity to look at those issues with the benefit of the experiences of overseas cities and southern cities and to try to avoid the problems. We do not have to go headlong into the problems and deliver to the people of Brisbane the same sort of urban sprawl with the motor car as the principal form of transportation, which has been the undoing of North America and has cost vast amounts of money, lots of wastage and health problems. The destruction of cities in North America has resulted from such poor planning. But we have a better opportunity than they had; we are at the beginning of the process, not at the end of it. We have a chance to arrest that process. However, we cannot do that if we consistently are presented with studies with the lack of vision of the Brisbane traffic study.

One way that the Brisbane traffic study talks about trying to reduce the number of cars is by a strategy of demand management. The strategy is to reduce or to manage

the desire to travel by private car by reducing or managing its attractiveness. That process is referred to as demand management. To date, demand management has been limited mainly to the central business district of Brisbane and it has had very little impact on planning decisions elsewhere. The principal mechanism that has been used is a levy on parking spaces in the inner city. It is interesting to know that the central business district has 27 000 car-parking bays compared with Sydney, with a much greater population, which has only 35 000, and Melbourne, which has 40 000. Brisbane is actually overcatered for in the central business district in terms of parking.

There are other ways to manage the use of the private car such as traffic management, the relocation of road space to give priority to public transport and high-occupancy vehicles and the development of a public transport system—and I believe that this is the key and must be looked at long and hard—that will attract commuters and encourage them to leave their cars at home. Unless we can do that, we are going to consistently face this problem in, say, 10-year cycles, of having to build more roads.

Major social dislocations occur when new roads and new bridges are built. It actually results in the destruction of existing communities and sensitive and valued parts of the city. It destroys heritage and character and it alienates people from their preferred environment. That is what will happen if all the proposals of the Brisbane traffic study are adopted.

In my area people are very concerned about the two bridges that have been suggested, one from the university to Dutton Park and one from Sylvan Road at Toowong to Victoria Street at West End. The bridge from the university is proposed because the university is recognised as a very large generator of traffic. It is suggested that therefore another bridge is needed to get traffic in and out of that area. I have a couple of comments about that. One is the fact that the university currently has more cars than it knows what to do with. Oval space is continuously being used as car-parking space, and the distance from the car park to the place of study is becoming further and further, which causes a lot of inconvenience. There is actually a fee for car-parking on the university campus at the moment.

The situation is already out of hand. What does the Brisbane traffic study say? It says, "The university generates a lot of traffic. What we will do is build another bridge." That will result in more cars being introduced into a very confined space. It really is absurd. A progressive and alternative idea would be to stop the university from being a major generator of traffic by simply building a rail link from the northern railway line across a bridge or building an under-river crossing to Dutton Park. That is a form of demand management using public transport which would mean that people would not have to take their cars to university. If that was done, the amount of congestion on Milton Road and Coronation Drive would immediately be reduced.

That, of course, brings to mind the other bridge over the river from Sylvan Road to Victoria Street. That bridge has been suggested because there are large amounts of traffic wanting to get to the CBD daily from the far-western suburbs down Milton Road and Coronation Drive. The West End side of the river is relatively traffic-free. It is a very pleasant suburb. The other day someone described West End to me as having the flavour of a country town in terms of its level of community identity and community spirit.

So what happens? It looks a bit unfair to the traffic-planners that West End is free of traffic and the northern suburbs have clogged arterial roads such as Coronation Drive and Milton Road. The simple answer in the traffic-planner's mind is to put a bridge across the river and funnel traffic into an area that was previously blissfully free from that problem and allowed for the sort of community development that I have just described.

West End is a suburb in which people want to live, in which there is a high level of communication and in which there is a great feeling of character. One can go onto the street and meet people. It is a very pleasant and humane part of Brisbane in which to live. However, the traffic-planners want to let traffic run through the area so that all

the people who live in the western suburbs can Volvo in over the West End bridge and destroy that suburb. West End would simply become a transit route. The interests of the residents of West End would be thrown away in favour of the interests of people from the western suburbs who have more economic clout. It is grossly unfair. Not only is it grossly unfair because of what it will do to West End but also because it is economically unsound to commit the same planning mistakes year in, year out simply because one cannot see beyond that great god, the motor car.

It seems to me that we really have to start thinking about alternative ways of moving people around to overcome traffic congestion. There is a need not only for alternative ways of moving people around but also for alternative ways of planning the outer suburbs: the satellite cities, if you like, around Brisbane. One of the gravest forms of social dislocation has been this tendency to urban sprawl in which people are isolated in non-communities. There are no facilities and there is no recognised centre. They have to rely on the television for entertainment and on the motor car to get backwards and forwards from the city to carry out their daily business. That is no way in which to live. That is an anti-people recipe for the development of a city. I think we can do better than that.

If this Government had its mind firmly trained on the provision of services and facilities for the people of Brisbane instead of worrying so much about how it is going to get itself elected, it might actually have a better chance. However, this Government is, of course, completely distracted by its own internal problems. It is completely distracted and has ignored those kinds of ideas. This Government has not considered progressive ideas in terms of alternative people-based strategies for planning and development. It has looked at the fast buck. It has looked at what is good for so-called big business and it has continued with the tired old methods of the past that have led to the sorts of problems that we now face.

If either of these bridges is to go ahead, it would both have to be built because the Brisbane traffic study estimates that the bridge from West End to Toowong would carry approximately 31 000 vehicles a day, but that would only occur if the university bridge which it is estimated will carry 29 000 vehicles a day, was built. One can imagine the effect of that volume of traffic on a residential area. It will be quite devastating, with people not only using the bridges but also rat-running throughout the suburbs. There needs to be some long-term, serious planning rather than simply looking at the solutions of the past and coming up with some new, people-based decisions after consultation with people.

The Labor Party is having a meeting on Sunday. It will probably be a very large meeting. We will discuss in some detail the recommendations outlined in the study and talk about how they will affect us in our daily lives. We will also talk about the effects that that kind of development will have for the whole of the city of Brisbane and for the welfare of everybody in this State. We will be doing that. We will be doing our job in making sure that we discuss the matters of importance to people in their daily lives whereas, it seems to me, there is very little of that kind of discussion occurring on the other side of the House.

The people who are most singularly conservative and narrow-minded in matters of long-term planning are the Liberals. At the Brisbane City Council level, all that party has been able to come up with is the frivolous Lord Mayor who really does not look at any levels of substance, but gets by on some pretty pictures in polka-dot dresses, fancies herself as Polyanna and is absolutely terrified that she might turn into Lady Macbeth if she actually did something about the appalling leadership of Angus Innes.

Mr Prest: Have you noticed that, although this appropriation debate will last for about four hours, it is almost three hours since a Liberal was in the Chamber?

Ms WARNER: That says it all in terms of the substance that the Liberal Party can offer the people of Brisbane.

Not only has the Liberal City Council consistently shortchanged the people of Brisbane on a whole range of issues while it big-notes itself with all sorts of glossy images and advertisements, but also it has done nothing to address the real issues that face people in their daily lives. We have to do that. Responsible government requires that. Never mind about how pretty Sallyanne is. Never mind about how well she can dress. Never mind about how many bridges she can climb. I am more worried about how many bridges she builds because they will destroy our lives.

Mr Davis: Angus Innes does not like that woman.

Ms WARNER: I should imagine that the reason why we are being inflicted with those bridges is that an effort is being made to keep them out of Angus' area because they would cause some significant ructions on the Liberal side of politics.

Mr Borbidge: Who would be better?

Ms WARNER: That would be hard to say. It is six of one and half a dozen of the other. Frankly, I do not care which one it is because either would provide the same sort of irrelevant leadership.

An honourable member interjected.

Ms WARNER: In different sorts of ways. One is more bubble and the other is more froth.

Mr Davis interjected.

Ms WARNER: There is a huge amount of inconsistency in that party. Actually, I feel very sorry for Angus in many ways because he is really in a totally contradictory position.

Mr McElligott: Oh, don't say that.

Ms WARNER: I am sorry, but I have a soft heart. When a person is as completely caught on the horns of a dilemma as he is, one's heart goes out to him. There are no solutions to his problems. There are no solutions to Liberal Party inconsistencies. There is no solution for the uncomfortable position in which he finds himself in having to say, "We are conservatives, but we are better than the conservatives on the Government benches, and you have to vote for them a bit, but not a lot and maybe, if you vote for us and you vote just in the right numbers for the National Party, we will be the major partner in coalition", and then realises that he cannot really say that because it is mathematically inadequate. Then he comes back and belts us again. Then, of course, he gets a bit uncomfortable when he sees the National Party vote going down and down, so he might not get any preferences. Then he does some nice things for the Government such as supporting it in a motion of confidence in the House. He is totally confused.

Then there is the spectacle of the Wolffdene dam. On one hand he says, "Over my dead body will the Wolffdene dam be built and I will make it a condition of the coalition." Then he suddenly takes a different point of view and gets locked into the conservative side of politics and he has to stick with the Government and vote for the dam. Then, a week later, Angus realises that that is an unpopular position and he has to flip back to the other position. I am exhausted even having to describe the mental gymnastics that poor Mr Innes has to engage in on a daily basis. It would be very difficult for him to sleep straight in his bed at night.

Mr Prest: You still have compassion for him?

Ms WARNER: I have a heap of compassion for him, but the people for whom I have most compassion are the people who live in my electorate and will have their lives disrupted, their houses reduced in value and their sleep disturbed because of the noise from the dense traffic trundling past their doors as a result of the inept planning decisions and planning strategies of the Brisbane City Council. After all, we have seen the impossibility and the inconsistency of the political positions that the Liberal Party has

had to take up in this State. That applies not only to the Brisbane City Council. The people of Brisbane will be the sorrier for having had a Liberal Brisbane City Council. In many ways it applies at the State level but, fortunately, at the State level there is no way that the Liberal Party could inflict any level of control over the people of Queensland because the people of Queensland are more sensible than that. They recognise that there is really one choice at this point in time and that is an ALP Government because it is the Government that will provide the sensitivity, the understanding and the alternative proposals. We will be able to look ecological disaster fairly and squarely in the eye and not shy away from the difficult decisions. In consultation, in a properly democratic system, we will implement ways in which we can go forward to a better society which will not include the mistakes and the ravages of the past.

Mr WARBURTON (Sandgate) (3.44 p.m.): The debate on this Appropriation Bill gives me an opportunity to talk about the alleged misappropriation and misuse of public funds by some National Party Ministers. I want to be constructive in my comments. I will not cast any aspersions upon any people. I want to deal solely in facts. I want to bring some important points to the notice of this Parliament.

In common with many other people, I watch the news from hour to hour. Last night, a television program referred to recent action that has been taken by the Special Prosecutor. Although I am not saying that that television program was absolutely correct, an article that appeared in today's *Sun* titled "MPs asked for more info on expenses" stated—

"One State Cabinet Minister and three former ministers have been asked by Special Prosecutor Doug Drummond, to provide extra details on ministerial expenses."

Mr De Lacy: That came as a big surprise to us.

Mr WARBURTON: It may have come as a big surprise to the honourable member for Cairns but it certainly came as no surprise to me.

Nothing in this Chamber or in the great corridors of power of this Parliament House has changed. Despite all of the apparent efforts by individuals, particularly the Premier and some Ministers, to hide the massive problems that obviously confront them because of the Drummond investigations, the media have knowledge of matters about which some parliamentarians have none. Soon I will mention the information that is currently in the hands of the Premier of this State.

As to the inquiries that have been conducted—it has always surprised me how the Leader of the Government has had access to information that is unavailable to members of this Parliament. One would think that the allegedly independent and non-political groups of people who are investigating corruption within the system and the misuse and misappropriation of funds would be just that, namely, independent and non-political. I cannot see why the Premier is any different from me, the Leader of the Opposition, any of my Opposition colleagues or members of the Government in respect to the flow of information. Why should the Premier or any other member of the Government be privy to information to which I am not? It is pretty obvious that that information is filtering through. That Mr Ahern was aware of some of the matters that were raised during a number of inquiries is of major concern to me and I will elaborate on that issue in a moment.

The corridors of power are humming with stories. The media obviously has got hold of information about which most members of this House were unaware but of which they now have some inkling. When a member asks a question about those very important issues he hears the same old story—the old Petersen line that I had to face when I was the Leader of the Opposition. It then became the Ahern line and it is now the Cooper line. Members of the Government are hiding behind and hanging onto the coat-tails of the people who are in charge of those commissions.

I have complete respect for people such as Mr Fitzgerald, Mr Drummond and the people who serve with the Special Prosecutor. However, somehow information is filtering

out and, repeatedly, the Premier has prior knowledge of it. Last Monday the Premier knew about what was going to happen to the correspondence that went to some Ministers and former Ministers of the National Party.

Mr Borbidge: It was in the Sunday papers.

Mr WARBURTON: I am saying that the Premier knew about that situation last Monday.

I am unaware of whether honourable members believe that the Premier should be privy to such information. I believe that if the Premier knows about something, so should I. If the National Party and the Premier are privy to information to which I am not, that gives them the opportunity to cover up, to fill in the holes and to prepare for the sorts of questions that the Opposition asks them in this House. In that way it ensures that Ministers provide the non-answers to which the Opposition has become accustomed.

Today in this House a one-page document was tabled. Quite frankly, that document disgusts me because it is an insult to the intelligence of each and every member of this Parliament. I refer to the statement of expenses of Ministers of the Crown in respect of travel costs, charter costs and so on. If that document is meant to appease the Opposition and to give to the people of Queensland some indication that, at long last, there will be an open and accountable Government, as I said, it is an insult to the intelligence of every member of this House and the public.

Honourable members are aware that \$968,342 was spent on expenses. The Opposition wants, needs and demands to know on what the Ministers are spending the expenses that have been the subject of Mr Drummond's inquiry. No doubt members of the Government will say that the departmental accounts of the Auditor-General's report contain the total amounts expended by Ministers.

I am not suggesting for one moment that each and every Minister has rorted the system. I am saying clearly that Ministers have rorted the system. One former Minister went into the witness-box at the Fitzgerald inquiry and admitted that he rorted the system. In doing so, he made allegations about other people. I do not want to pursue that issue here today.

All of these issues are pertinent and, as members of Parliament, it is our right to try to pursue them in this House with the Ministers. I am becoming sick and tired, as I know most members are, of Premiers and other Ministers in this place grasping hold of the coat-tails of the people who are heading inquiries in this State and refusing to answer questions.

I will now return to the matter that I raised this morning by way of questions. The Premier of this State, Mr Cooper, was responsible for the appointment of Mr Vince Lester to the very, very important post of Police Minister. As I said this morning, he did that—and I find this inexcusable—knowing full well that allegations that had been made in respect of the ministerial expenses and cash advances of Mr Lester were being investigated by Special Prosecutor Doug Drummond. I was not harsh this morning; I was simply trying to point out to people just how stupidly the new Premier of this State has acted.

At least when Mr Ahern became Premier—whether for proper reasons or not does not matter to me—he did the right thing and stood aside certain people who were the subject of investigation. In my opinion, that is reasonable. However, the new Premier, knowing full well that Mr Lester was under investigation, appointed him as Police Minister. Whether or not Mr Lester is eventually found guilty is irrelevant to my discussion at the moment. The fact is that he is under investigation, and he could be charged or found guilty in the future. However, irrespective of that knowledge, the Premier chose to place Mr Lester in one of the most important portfolios in the Government.

Mr Harper: He isn't charged with anything. Be fair. You are a fair sort of fellow.

Mr WARBURTON: Although a large number of Ministers and former Ministers are subject to Mr Drummond's investigation—and I think that might include Mr Harper—I believe that most people——

Mr HARPER: I find the suggestion offensive that I am or, for that matter, any other of my ministerial colleagues is under investigation.

Mr Warburton: I did not say anything about criminal investigation.

Mr HARPER: I think the honourable member referred to criminal investigation. I find those words very offensive and I ask that they be withdrawn.

Mr Warburton: I did not say "criminal investigation".

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Booth): Order! The Honourable the Minister stated that he is not under investigation and he asks that the words be withdrawn.

Mr WARBURTON: If I said the word "criminal", I will withdraw it. I am sure I did not.

Yesterday, Mr Noel Newnham was appointed as Queensland's new Police Commissioner. In common with the Leader of the Opposition, I make the point that we in the Opposition welcome that appointment and accept the fact that Mr Newnham has a huge job ahead of him. He deserves a fair go. He deserves to be able to come into this new job and do it without any clouds hanging over his head. I believe that everybody with any sense of fairness wants to see him succeed. I think that is a reasonable comment to make in this place.

I am not making any accusations about Mr Lester today. However, I simply make the point that the Police Commissioner should not be faced with the possibility of the Police Minister's having proceedings taken against him as a result of Drummond investigations. By virtue of his becoming Police Minister, Mr Lester not only had the responsibility of helping select the gentleman who became the new Police Commissioner but also, under the provisions of the proposed changes to the Police Act, has a major responsibility to work with the Commissioner. In respect of the relationship between the Minister and the Commissioner, the relevant section of the Bill states——

"The Minister may, after obtaining and considering the advice of the Commissioner, give written directions to the Commissioner with respect to the general policy and priorities to be pursued in relation to the performance of the functions of the Police Force.

The Commissioner shall comply with all written directions given under this section."

The legislation provides for the establishment of a very close working relationship between the Minister of Police and the new Police Commissioner. As I said, the new Police Commissioner should not have to be faced with a possibility of his Police Minister—this person who helped select him—becoming a victim of Mr Drummond's investigations.

As I said, I am not making any accusations; but the possibility remains. If a Minister is under investigation, as those named in the television program last night are, because of the serious nature of the investigations, there is every risk that some charges will be laid against some of them.

Mr Harper: You shouldn't prejudge them.

Mr WARBURTON: I am not prejudging. I am simply saying——

Mr Harper: You are.

Mr WARBURTON: I am not prejudging at all. I am simply saying that I have never seen such a stupid act by a Premier in all my life—taking that risk. In doing what he has done, he has taken the risk. I am simply pointing out that in taking the risk on

this occasion he has also risked the position of our new, important Police Commissioner. As far as I am concerned, that is stupidity.

Mr Gilmore: Rubbish!

Mr WARBURTON: It is stupidity.

Let me suggest without doubt that there is a great possibility, I would think—certainly in the minds of the people opposite—that Mr Lester is clean. Certainly, he says he is clean. Nevertheless, the cloud is there. That is the point I make. That cannot be denied.

Mr Harper interjected.

Mr WARBURTON: By way of interjection, the Leader of the House has forced me into the position of talking about Mr Lester. I did not want to do it. As I said earlier, not only has Mr Lester been involved in the selection process but also he has to have a very close relationship with the Commissioner of Police.

Mr Borbidge: You are trying to justify a smear job. You are trying to justify a sleazy smear. It does you no credit.

Mr WARBURTON: It is not the best environment in which to work, especially for a new Commissioner of Police who is coming to Queensland to clean up corruption.

Mr Borbidge: We thought you were an honourable man. You are a sleazy smear merchant.

Mr WARBURTON: I simply say that I have decided not to talk about Mr Lester. It is interesting to note the comments made by Mr Borbidge. My memory of Mr Borbidge goes back to the days of the Arts Department scandal. I believe that letters that have been received by Ministers and former Ministers in recent times would be couched in terms similar to those contained in the letter from the Auditor-General to Mr Callaghan. People have asked me what I think is in the letters. I have said, "I have no idea." I know, however, that the Auditor-General put to Mr Callaghan a number of questions, having carried out an extensive investigation, and said that he wanted responses to those matters within a specified and reasonable time. History shows that Mr Callaghan did not respond. His resignation was accepted post-haste before he got the opportunity to do that.

Mr De Lacy: Mr Borbidge was supporting him.

Mr WARBURTON: Mr Borbidge is silent at the moment, but he knows full well that during a great part of that scandal, when Mr Callaghan and others were ripping off the system under the very noses of the Premier and the Minister responsible at that time, he happened to be a member of the Films Board of Review. I notice that, although Mr Borbidge is not responding now, a short time ago he was most vociferous.

Mr Borbidge: For a short period.

Mr WARBURTON: But Mr Borbidge was a member during the time that the rip-offs occurred.

Mr Borbidge: No, you are wrong.

Mr WARBURTON: I am not wrong. Mr Borbidge was a member during the time that money was being ripped off by Callaghan. I say that he was a member at that time. If he wants to object to what I have said, bad luck. He was a member and he was there, and so were a number of other people at that level who were never brought to book for mismanagement. I am not saying that they were dishonest. The fact is, however, that maladministration and incompetence existed, the like of which had never existed before.

I believe that, knowing the facts about the investigation into Mr Lester's use of public funds, the Premier of this State should never have appointed Mr Lester as Minister

for Police. I believe that the Premier's actions are an absolute contrast with the actions carried out by his predecessor, Mr Ahern. At least Mr Ahern saw fit to stand down Don Lane and Russ Hinze when they were placed under a cloud of suspicion. At that stage, the Ministers who are presently in the Chamber did not argue. I find that very peculiar because at that time I did not hear Mr Harper or Mr Borbidge say, "Don't stand Hinze and Lane aside. They have not been found guilty of any charge." Those two Ministers knew quite well that Lane and Hinze were under investigation and supported the concept of their being stood down because it was honourable—or at least that was what they said at the time.

Knowing full well that Mr Lester's actions would be investigated, the honourable action for the Premier to take was to decide not to take the risk; to say that Mr Lester would not be the Minister for Police and, most certainly, would not have any involvement in the selection process leading to the appointment of the new Commissioner of Police.

As I said earlier, last night a television station named Ministers who are alleged to be under scrutiny by Mr Drummond. As I expected, Mr Cooper today hid behind the Special Prosecutor. The corridors of this Parliament are buzzing with the information, of which Ministers are well aware. If the media know about this investigation, why should not the members of this Parliament know about it? There is something wrong with the system when that sort of thing occurs.

Mr Borbidge: It was in the Sunday papers.

Mr WARBURTON: For the benefit of new-comers to this Parliament, I inform the House that Premier Cooper has known about Mr Drummond's approaches to Ministers and former Ministers since last Monday. Honourable members would realise that I am not often wrong about such matters.

Mr Borbidge: It was in the Sunday paper.

Mr WARBURTON: If the Minister wants to protect the secrecy surrounding this matter, he may do so. However, I am saying to him that it is wrong and improper not to inform the members of this Parliament. If the Premier knows, why should not the public know? After all, public funds are involved—not Mr Cooper's funds or Mr Borbidge's funds. If important information is available from Mr Drummond's office or from the Fitzgerald inquiry, it should be made public. Why has the Premier remained silent all week on this issue?

Irrespective of whether stories circulate as a result of rumour-mongering, speculation or fact—and all members would know that stories spread as a result of any combination—I believe that the Premier of this State has very distinct responsibilities that centre on him, the members of his party and Mr Vince Lester. Mr Cooper should be telling the tax-payers of this State what he intends to do about Ministers who may face charges as a result of Mr Drummond's investigations. He should also answer questions in relation to his own expenses and ministerial cash advances.

Mr Harper: He has done that.

Mr WARBURTON: So far he has failed to answer those questions. I always get a bite when this matter is raised in this Parliament.

I am speaking my mind. I am saying what countless thousands of people in Queensland are also saying. The Premier is dodging the question. He dodged questions when he was a Minister and he continues, as Premier of this State, to dodge questions.

The fact is that over a number of years the National Party, together with the Liberals, deliberately amended the Treasurer's Instructions to avoid public exposure of their expenses. This morning I heard a remarkable explanation of the history of ministerial expenses from the Premier. The undeniable fact is that some years ago a restricted version of ministerial expenses was tabled regularly in this House. The Opposition exposed the fact that expenses for Brisbane were not included and, believe it or not, they were finally included by Bjelke-Petersen, the Premier at that time. From that time

onwards—and initially when the coalition was in office—there was a reduction in the amount of advice that this Parliament received about ministerial expenses. It is more than a coincidence that, when that began to happen—that is, from the very time that the full information of ministerial expenses ceased to be tabled in this place and ceased to be subject to public scrutiny—the rot set in. That is when the accusations and allegations started about the misuse of public funds, cash advances and credit cards. Coincidentally, it all began when this Government, with the co-operation of the Liberals who were in coalition at the time, decided to keep this information away from the Opposition and the public. It occurred slowly, but surely.

Unfortunately, the members of the Liberal Party are not presently in the Chamber to answer these criticisms, but they were the biggest spenders of all time. Members now on the Government side of the House were bad enough, but some of our Liberal friends, especially those who are no longer members of this House, such as Mr Sam Doumany, were even better. Mr Sam Doumany was a whopper! In Brisbane alone he spent over \$20,000 in one year on booze and entertainment, which is not bad. Is it any wonder that there were strong and successful moves to keep this information away from the table of the House, so that the Opposition and the public could not have access to it?

I believe it is proper to talk about misappropriation when debating this Appropriation Bill. The Government appropriates money that is supposed to be used in the best interests of the people of this State, but it knows full well that very little has changed. This brings to mind a question I asked the previous Premier, Mr Ahern, in this House in November 1988. I said—

“In directing a question to the Premier, I want to go further than the honourable the Leader of the Liberal Party has gone in respect of ministerial expenditure. On a number of occasions the Premier has been asked what his Ministers are allowed to spend public funds on. Really that is the answer we want today.”

I asked that question on 10 November 1988 and it is still the question that the Opposition wants the Government to answer. My question continued—

“In other words, it relates to ministerial expenses for incidentals, for special purposes, etc. Today I ask the Premier to tell the House if there is an authorised list, forgetting about the guide-lines in the Financial Administration and Audit Act or the Treasurer’s Instructions, that allows Ministers to spend public moneys on such things as fees for membership of various clubs, haircuts and suits at Freedmans? I am asking: is there a list? That is the first question. Is there a list?

The second question is: is it the case that Ministers have an unfettered discretion in relation to ministerial expenses? Will the Premier finally give details of what amounts not to legitimate ministerial expenses, as we now find out, but to what we now know to be ministerial extortion?”

That question was asked in the wake of Mr Lane’s admissions and allegations before the Fitzgerald inquiry. In typical National Party style, in response to the question, Mr Ahern said—

“An outrageous imputation has been made.”

Honourable members must consider his answer in the light of what they know to be the current position as a result of the Fitzgerald and Drummond inquiries. This is only part of Mr Ahern’s answer, but it is the relevant part. He continued—

“As far as Minister’s expenses are concerned, there is a code of conduct. The Financial Administration and Audit Act lays down very strict provisions. To say that there is now some possibility for extortion, as is proposed in your letter, is a gross reflection on the Auditor-General’s office of this State.”

I ask honourable members to take Mr Ahern’s comments on board in the light of what they know to be the factual position today. The fact of the matter is that it was a loose arrangement, and, as Mr Fitzgerald and Mr Drummond have now found out, it was so loose that people were able to—and did—misuse those public funds. Mr Lane described

the system as—and I cannot remember his exact words—something along the lines of, “Go for your life.” He did not use those words, but that is what he meant.

I conclude by saying that, even in the face of the Fitzgerald inquiry and Mr Drummond’s investigations, this Government is intent on trying to keep the lid on the roting of public funds. That is pathetic. I reiterate what I said earlier—and I will not retreat from it one bit. I believe that Mr Cooper played stupid politics; he made a grossly incorrect decision when he allowed Mr Lester to become involved in the selection of Queensland’s present Police Commissioner. I cast no aspersions and make no allegations, but simply say that, when there is any cloud at all hanging over the head of a Minister in this place—whether it be justified in the minds of some people or not—then he should be excluded from such a responsibility.

Mr ELLIOTT (Cunningham) (4.15 p.m.): I am delighted to be able to take part in this Estimates debate—no, it is not the Estimates debate; I have got it wrong.

Mr Hayward: Have they taken your notes away?

Mr ELLIOTT: I do not have any notes. It is terrible to start off without any notes.

As I did not have an opportunity to speak in the Budget debate, this afternoon I wish to speak in the debate on the Appropriation Bill (No. 2). Although many of us know full well that there is a net migration to Queensland, this morning I was interested to learn that it is escalating at some pace. I have been going round citing statistics showing a net migration to Queensland of something like 30 000. This morning I learned that it is now 37 000-odd. In percentage terms, that is a significant increase that creates minor problems, such as trying to find jobs for all of those people in addition to our existing population. It also has an enhancing factor to the economy of this State, because many of those people buy or build homes and consume goods and services, which helps our economy to some degree.

Although many people try to make out that the great majority of the people migrating to this State have one foot in the grave and the other on a slippery banana skin, that is neither charitable nor fair. The statistics show that only 7 per cent of interstate migrants come here to retire. I admit that some of that net migration really commenced when this State first decided to do away with death duties. Of course, that brought many retirees to the Gold Coast; no-one can argue that that did not happen.

Because of the policies of, in particular, Victoria and, to a lesser extent, New South Wales and, to a fair degree, South Australia, 72 per cent of those who migrate to this State are of an age to be in the work-force and 7 per cent are children. That has to be good news for this State because it means that it is gaining people with initiative. If they have the gumption to come here, they must have initiative. It is not easy for a person to decide to suddenly up sticks, sell the family home, walk away from friends of perhaps 20 or 30 years’ standing and move from an area in which he has lived for perhaps all of his life to another State. Nobody does that lightly. For that reason, I believe that their migration to this State certainly augurs well for its economy and says much about their opinion of the husbandry of the Queensland economy. By contrast, it also indicates the living conditions in the States from which they come.

It is not surprising that many people wish to depart from Victoria, the State of insolvency. I have spoken to a number of these people, not just those who have come to my electorate. Many of them have located in my electorate around the edges of Toowoomba, in particular, and have started small businesses. During by-election campaigns when I have been door-knocking, I have spoken to a number of them.

Mr Veivers interjected.

Mr ELLIOTT: When we gained that excellent little fellow down the back whom we never hear and who never says a cross word to anyone——

Mr Eaton: I just heard him cough.

Mr ELLIOTT: Yes, he is there. He is called "Farmer".

I certainly found it quite interesting to talk to those people. I asked them where they came from. I found that the occupants of every second home came originally from Victoria. I asked them what would make them leave their homes, their families and their friends to come up here and they said that, in Victoria, it has got to the stage that a person could not contemplate bringing up his children if the attitude and other things down there continue in the same direction. The Government down there has made such a mess of——

Mr Vaughan: Why do you have to be like this?

Mr ELLIOTT: Well, unfortunately——

Mr Vaughan: Why be so negative?

Mr ELLIOTT: I am trying to show the honourable member a positive side. These people are positive in their outlook.

Mr Vaughan: This is entirely un-Australian.

Mr ELLIOTT: No. It is regrettable. No-one would be happier than I if that were not true, if everyone in Australia lived in similar conditions. I would be even happier if we could get rid of all of these socialist Governments down south.

Mr Vaughan: It's amazing that those people come and talk to you. I do not strike them.

Mr ELLIOTT: No, but the honourable member does not go and knock on doors to see them.

Mr Vaughan: I am seeing people every day and I don't strike those people who are so denigrating of fellow Australians like you are.

Mr ELLIOTT: They are not denigratory.

Mr Vaughan: You are a bit of a traitor.

Mr ELLIOTT: That is not true at all. Unfortunately, the honourable member is finding the truth fairly unpalatable.

Mr De Lacy: Are you suggesting that they all come here for the reasons you suggest?

Mr ELLIOTT: No, I am not.

Mr De Lacy: The migration we are getting is because of the climate—I'll admit that.

Mr ELLIOTT: If the honourable member listens for a minute, I will tell him why that is not true. If he considers the time just prior to when Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen ceased being Premier of this State——

Mr De Lacy interjected.

Mr ELLIOTT: Does the honourable member intend to listen? He interjected on me and challenged me on a point. Now he does not want to concentrate on the answer. He should either go outside and talk or be fair and listen. I am just about to explain it to him.

Mr Vaughan: Mr De Lacy, be Australian. Don't knock him.

Mr ELLIOTT: That is right. I am glad to hear that.

If the honourable member looked back to that time, he would find that net migration had dropped to approximately 12 000. Is he saying that at that time the climate had become so lousy that no-one wanted to come here? If he is saying that people are coming

here for the climate, there should be some correlation in the figures. In America there is an argument that people move to California for the climate. The rate of migration to that State continues to climb.

For a time, because people became concerned that things in Queensland were not as good as they had been, migration to this State decreased. People were concerned at the rise in unemployment. When Mike Ahern became Premier, unemployment decreased.

Mr Vaughan: In Bjelke-Petersen's day it was high.

Mr ELLIOTT: I would be less than honest if I said that it was not high at that time. However, the Government has concentrated keenly on attempting to broaden the base of Queensland's economy. I am not an economist and can offer no reason for it, but the employment position in Queensland has improved.

Mr Vaughan: And around Australia.

Mr ELLIOTT: If it is occurring in the other States, why are people still voting with their feet by coming to Queensland? It is because they know that more jobs are being created in Queensland than anywhere else in Australia.

Mr Vaughan: Rubbish!

Mr ELLIOTT: It is not rubbish. The statistics back it up. Impartial public statistics support my comments.

People are leaving their homes and friends and coming to Queensland to ensure that their children have a future. The honourable member might say that I am being patriotic; however, if he says that they are not coming to Queensland for that reason, he is being unpatriotic. Opposition members knock Queensland.

Mr Vaughan: I don't.

Mr ELLIOTT: I admit that I have not heard the honourable member knock Queensland.

Mr Vaughan: I don't believe in knocking the rest of Australia. You never let up on knocking anybody south of the border. You are the most un-Australian group I have ever come across in my life.

Mr ELLIOTT: That is not correct.

Mr Vaughan: You should be ashamed of yourself.

Mr ELLIOTT: Has the honourable member heard me knocking Western Australia? There is migration into Western Australia.

Mr Vaughan: You knock everybody south of the border.

Mr ELLIOTT: That is not correct. I would be the first to criticise some of the policies of the Western Australian Government, but I would not be foolish enough to say that some of its initiatives are not working. That would not be true. If the Western Australian Government was doing everything wrong, it would not be getting more people going there than it is losing. The honourable member cannot argue against the statistics. He should admit that that is a fact of life.

I am delighted to see an increased appropriation in the Budget for education to provide a career structure for teachers. Many people in my electorate are concerned with the standard of education of their children. Many business people have expressed to me concern about the standard of education of prospective employees. The poor standard is quite alarming. As a former educator of note, Mr Speaker, I am sure that you would be concerned at the number of people who have problems with the basic skills in written and spoken English and mathematics. Employers are worried about that aspect.

I am delighted to see an emphasis being placed on education. I pay tribute to the former Premier and to the Government for seeing a need for that emphasis. It certainly

was not before time. Most fair-minded Queenslanders would accept that initiative as being very important.

The Government has made a \$1m commitment to land care and the environment. That initiative will be far more successful than any previous programs or subsidies that have been available. Previous initiatives were provided for farmers. Most of the work on land care will take place on farms, but it will not be carried out by farmers. The them-versus-us syndrome will not apply in this instance, because many people in the community are becoming involved in the land-care committees and are working with the land-owners.

Mr Yewdale interjected.

Mr ELLIOTT: That is fair comment. I will not criticise what the Federal Government has done in the land-care area. I am only concerned that it did not do it 10 years ago. If the honourable member examines my speeches in this place, he will find that I have been advocating that for years.

I pay full tribute to any Government that is prepared to provide money for land care. If it is not done, we will end up with no land. Any nation that does not look after its land will have no future. Land contributes greatly to the economies of countries throughout the world. African countries such as Ethiopia have flogged out their country, stripped the timber from the land and created the potential for wind erosion. Australia has the potential for three disasters: wind erosion, erosion through storm rain and, as an end product, salination of the land. Quite frankly, anyone who cannot see that must be thick.

Mr Vaughan: What did you look around at Mick Veivers for?

Mr ELLIOTT: I thought I might line one up off Mick, but he is not in the Chamber. Here he comes now. Mick is a land-care man from way back. He is a great tree-planter.

I am also pleased to see the additional funds being made available for the Rural Fires Board. I am sure that that will be very much appreciated. The work that it does is very important to the bush communities. Much of the work is voluntary. Many of the bush fire brigades need additional equipment or upgraded equipment. That appropriation is a very welcome part of the Budget.

I am sure other honourable members wish to take part in this debate. I do not want to take up too much time. However, I want to thank the Minister for Works and Housing and the Minister for Education for the facilities that are going to be provided at the Oakey and Pittsworth State High Schools. I think that that will be very well received by the local community and much appreciated.

I urge the Government to reconsider its policy and remove some roads from the control of the Main Roads Department. There are a number of roads in my area that are causing problems, particularly in the Rosalie Shire. The Brymaroo road, which was reclassified, leads up to the Bunya Mountains, which are very much a tourist destination. As such, one would hope that assistance will be provided in upgrading such roads. If those roads cannot be reclassified, hopefully additional assistance will be given in maintaining them because more and more people are using them.

The road from Kingsthorpe through to Goombungee and Hayden is another road that carries quite a heavy volume of traffic. It is of concern not only to the people who live in that area but also to a large number of travellers and tourists that that road is starting to become an access route from the north down to the Newell Highway. Of course, the Newell Highway runs basically up through the back of Millmerran. People no longer use Cunninghams Gap because the Newell Highway is a much better road and involves a lot less gear-changing. I urge continued input from the Main Roads Department. It is great to see the work that has been done on that road. It has certainly been upgraded. However, because of the number of trucks that use it, it certainly needs to be continually maintained so that it is kept up to scratch.

I have much pleasure in supporting Appropriation Bill (No. 2).

Mr EATON (Mourilyan) (4.33 p.m.): It is with pleasure that I join this debate. The funds allocated in this Appropriation Bill will be used to manage this State for the next 12 months. I certainly hope that that money is put to good use because the Opposition believes that in many areas the Government has not achieved the best result from the expenditure of money.

That brings me to the shortage of residential blocks in Queensland. The annual report of the Lands Department for 1988-89 reveals that it received an income of \$42,020,000 from converting leasehold land to freehold.

It has been the argument of the Opposition for a long time that to help people establish their own homes in the various communities throughout the State, the State Government should make land available on a leasehold basis for residential development. If the Government were to do that, it would reduce the cost to the average home-owner who wishes to build his own home on his own block. I point that out for the benefit of the new Minister, because it was a long time before the former Minister said that he could understand what the Opposition was trying to say. However, in the end, he did get the message. He said that he would look into it, but nothing was done.

If some of the Crown land that the Government has already sold for freeholding purposes to the fast-buck merchants and entrepreneurs had been developed by the local authority and sold on a leasehold basis for the cost of development, the first year's rent in advance plus the survey fee, many people would have been able to purchase blocks in the vicinity of \$14,000 to \$15,000 instead of having to pay \$30,000 or \$40,000, as they have in the last 12 months.

Thirty-two blocks were sold at Kurrimine Beach, just south of Innisfail. I believe that the average price was about \$42,000. Those blocks were just residential blocks. The multiple-use blocks which were suitable for the building of units and duplexes were sold for \$67,000 and \$73,000.

The needs of the community are not being met by the Government. If the Government would only take heed of what the Opposition has been advocating for a long time, it would be a great opportunity for it to help thousands of people in Queensland. Much is heard about helping our young people. However, there are a lot of middle-aged people who have been saving for years who would like to own their own home.

When the price of land increases in the way that it has over the last few years, there is a compensatory increase in rentals. People are finding that they cannot save. They have to pay such high rent to live in a decent home in which to raise their family that they cannot afford to save. The Government, through the goodness of its heart, is saying, "We will give you good conditions. We will give you low interest rates. You can pay it off in 5, 10 or 15 years at 10, 12 or 13 per cent." However, these days the husband and wife are both working and they are paying for baby-sitters or they have latch-ley kids, who are causing problems because they have no parental control. I am sure that the Welfare Minister would be only too pleased to elaborate on that.

The Government has to look at the overall picture. It has to look further down the track. It has to try to plan and make decisions that will cater not only for present-day needs but also for the needs in the years to come. That is the policy that a Labor Government will introduce. In the country areas, the multinational companies and other private companies have aggregated large areas of grazing land and grain-growing land. Under this Government, those areas have been freeholded and that has increased the price of land. Today, some graziers are well off but they cannot afford to buy properties for their sons. If a grazier has two sons, one of them has to leave home while the other one stays home waiting for the old fellow to retire or for something else to happen so that he can take over the property. They cannot afford the high interest rates to buy land.

In the good old days prior to 1957 many people, some of them from interstate, would take part in ballots. On the expiration of a grazing lease that had six or seven

living areas, the Government would resume two or three of the living areas and put them up for ballot. Some members of Parliament or their fathers got a start on the land through the ballot system. The Leader of the House is acknowledging that. I was successful in a land ballot. Literally thousands of people applied. The last ballot in Queensland was for the two Glen Idol blocks. There were over 2 500 applications and about 1 800 of them were allowed to go in for the ballot. One of the conditions for participating in the ballot was that an applicant had to have access to \$500,000 to cover the cost of improvements and working capital. Not many people in Queensland today have access to that sort of money, but there were 1 800 in those days. That indicates how great is the need for more land to be made available.

The Labor Party has been attacked for saying that it will create incentives and provide opportunities to enable people to leave the cities and go to the country. Many people would like to do that but, because of the change in the rural scene, many are being forced into the cities. A beef station now employs only a few ringers for a couple of weeks to do a muster using helicopters. After that, the station has only a manager and an offsider to attend to maintenance and keep an eye on things until the next muster. I have seen those changes come about.

I worked in the old days without these modern facilities. Queensland has to change with the times. Legislation has to be amended to suit the needs of the day. The Government would have to admit that there have been only two ballots in the last 20 years. The ballots for the brigalow blocks were the beginning of the end. They were put up for auction. Again the Government was catering for the rich and greedy, not the poor and needy.

In those days, once a person qualified to go in for a ballot, the money was available through the Agricultural Bank. That was the case when I won a block. Once a person proved he had the collateral to pay for the improvements, the rest of the money was made available through the Agricultural Bank. The person who was successful in the ballot could borrow the rest of the capital to make the property a working proposition.

Mr FitzGerald: You weren't paying 17 per cent.

Mr EATON: No, we were paying about 2½ per cent and the last money was lent at about 4 per cent or 5 per cent.

Mr FitzGerald: How can anybody pay 20 per cent?

Mr EATON: People cannot. I could not agree more with the Minister. The Government has a responsibility to the people. I pointed out how the Government failed in allowing leasehold land to be converted to freehold, but, because of it, \$42m was paid into the Government coffers. In his reply, I would like the Premier and Treasurer to explain why that money cannot be put back into the development of blocks throughout Queensland. There are not many towns that do not need more residential blocks.

The reserve prices on the blocks at Kurramine ranged from \$22,500 to \$23,000 and the average sale price for all of them was \$42,000. At Cardwell in the Hinchinbrook electorate, 48 blocks were offered. I had a look at them. They were well developed and the Government cannot be criticised for the preparation of those blocks. It can be criticised, though, because they were sold as freehold and not leasehold. Today, many of those blocks are for sale. Even though there was a restriction that a person could buy only one block, some people got round it. We have all heard about dummies and we know the old saying that there is more than one way to skin a rabbit.

Other areas that have been brought to my attention are on the Gold Coast and Bribie Island. The Government developed blocks there and put them up for sale. Fewer than half of them were sold. The Government had a sign 200 yards down the road from these blocks saying that Lands Department residential blocks were for sale. Grass and weeds are growing around the sign and nobody takes any notice of it.

Then a real estate man comes along and says, "You have 20 blocks there for which you want \$30,000 each. I will take the lot and give you \$25,000 each." The Government

agrees because it thinks it is getting a good deal. A week later the real estate agent has them for sale again at \$50,000 and people buy them from him because he is a salesman. He advertises them and people know where to go to buy them.

The Lands Department and the Government are making no effort to sell them. They simply put up a sign which becomes faded and weather worn. No real effort is made. They put a small notice in the paper every now and then to the effect that land is for sale somewhere in Queensland. They should pay the agents commission to sell that land. People are paying more to the real estate agents who have bought blocks than they would have paid if they had bought them directly from the Government. A real estate salesman has the gift of the gab and he gets out and works hard to sell the land on his books. In addition, he offers it in a presentable condition.

The Government must make leasehold blocks available. If a person needs only \$15,000 to purchase a leasehold block and he receives title to it, he can use that land as collateral for a home loan. Later on when his children are off his hands, he and his wife can apply to freehold the land at market value.

Leasehold land in Queensland is being sold off for freehold purposes. In the future when the Government is receiving no income from its assets because they have all been sold off, it will have to increase taxes and charges. A progressive Government must consider the community's needs and provide funds to service them.

Large areas of land are being freeholded and are turning people into overnight millionaires. People such as Mr Bond and Mr Skase started off as real estate developers. Approximately 80 per cent of millionaires in Australia and overseas went from being paupers to being millionaires by buying a bit of land and cutting it up.

The land is our heritage. Soldiers fought and died for this land. The Government of the day is the custodian of the assets of the people. However, because of the way in which this Government administers the land needs of the people of Queensland, it is a very bad custodian.

I agree whole-heartedly with what the member for Cunningham said about land degradation, which, despite what the greenies might say, is one of the major conservation issues in this country. Because I have lived on the land all my life, I am very sensitive to its destruction. Sometimes land degradation occurs through natural causes, but most of it is caused by man through overgrazing or lack of initiatives to prevent erosion and salinity. Unfortunately, people wait until a matter gets out of hand and then they say, "We have a big problem. We have got to do something about it."

State and Federal Governments are starting to make progress. Peter Cook and John Kerin—the two Federal Ministers who are concerned about land degradation in Australia—would love to make more funds available to control erosion. The State and Federal Governments must get together.

Mr Newton: More money has to be made available.

Mr EATON: I agree that more money must be made available, but it cannot be plucked out of the air. Planning is necessary.

A few weeks ago I was part of the shadow Minister's tour of north Queensland, which investigated several problem areas. One project outside Charters Towers involves the CSIRO, the Department of Primary Industries and local graziers. I compliment each and every one of the people who are involved in that project. Because they are practical people who wanted to do their own thing, they accepted no assistance from either the State or Federal Government. Quite often, if the Government attaches strings to funding it attracts comment from academic twits who have learnt everything from books and have not been out into the real world to find out what it is like.

Mr Newton: Tax relief would help.

Mr EATON: Tax relief would help, but funding should be provided to those people without any strings attached.

A great deal of time and effort has been put into experimental work in that project and it has achieved results. Various types of legumes and grasses in paddocks are being left untreated to compare them with treated ones. In the long term perhaps the graziers will be the beneficiaries. Because they want to see progress, they are prepared to spend their own money. They do not want to see the degradation that is occurring in the back country.

Queensland is a very diversified State. Because of the vastness of its western regions, which do not receive very much rain, Queensland is known as a dry State. Many areas that do not have much black soil have suffered from erosion. For many years erosion has occurred on the Darling Downs, which has black soil.

During the shadow Minister's tour we visited the Darling Downs Institute of Advanced Education and spoke to Mr Hector Todd. It was great to see at first hand the work that that institute is doing and the results that it is achieving.

The Government provides insufficient health and welfare services in country areas. For example, Innisfail does not have a Government dentist. I cannot see why people who qualify for treatment by the Government dentist cannot be referred to a local private dentist. That would be one way of servicing the needs of the community. The same situation applies to optometrists.

Many professionals use postings in country centres as stepping-stones to the jobs that they want in other centres. There is always a transitional period between when one person leaves and the new one takes over. I ask the Government to consider the needs of those communities that are situated away from the big cities.

Good health and welfare services are provided in the major centres such as Cairns and Townsville. I can understand that the smaller towns cannot be provided with the best equipment. However, those areas could be serviced more regularly. Perhaps full-time urologists and other specialists could be provided. At present, specialists from Brisbane visit those areas for one or two days a week or sometimes for two or three days a month. On other occasions, the Government spends a lot of money on flying people to Brisbane. In the case in which a husband or a wife has to come to Brisbane for treatment, the other partner will travel with the patient. In the case of a child, the mother or father will travel with it. Under the isolated patients scheme, the Government has to pay those costs.

During my travels in north Queensland, not just in my electorate, I meet people who have to undertake that sort of travel to Brisbane. When the costs of the return airfares and the accommodation that have to be paid by the Government are taken into consideration, I think it would be far better if some specialists were stationed in north Queensland or facilities were made available so that specialists could visit those areas from Brisbane. Another solution would be to make use of the private specialists already in the area. Under the health system, people can attend either the private specialist or the Government specialist. A closer working relationship needs to exist between the two. I am a great stickler for the Government medical system. I always use the free hospital system myself. I have been lucky in that I have never had to use it.

Mr Mackenroth: You always use it but you have never had to use it?

Mr EATON: That is right. All my children were born in a public hospital. Every now and again, when I knock a bit of skin off, I go to a public hospital to have a tetanus needle. I am pleased that I have never had to use the system for anything more serious. It is like being in the RACQ. If a person does not have to use it, it is still a cheap investment. The less that one uses the system, the better an investment it is.

That specialist service is needed, particularly in country areas. Having lived in the country all my life, when I speak to people, I am fairly sensitive to their needs. I could cite instances of families at Mount Garnet, which a doctor visits once a fortnight. If his visiting day happens to be a public holiday, such as Anzac Day, he will not visit the

town until a fortnight later. Those families might go a month without receiving a visit from a doctor.

No regular buses or transport services are provided for those people who have to visit specialists. Either members of their family or their neighbours have to drive them to Atherton, in some cases, where there is a specialist such as an optometrist. If they are diabetics or they suffer from a heart condition which requires a regular check-up, they have to go all the way to Cairns and back again.

This Government claims to be a country Government. There are many ways in which those sorts of services can be improved. I know that Queensland is a big State. I have seen the amount of money that is mentioned in this Appropriation Bill. The Government has many plans for the way in which it will spend the money. However, it should try to spread that money out, and I know that it is not easy to do that. The Government has to consider its priorities. Funding could be improved in many areas.

There is now a Department of Northern Development, but not much money is spent on it. It is more or less an advisory or referral centre. If that department cannot help someone, it refers him to another department. There is also the Cape York-North Queensland Enterprise Zone. I believe they are two important Government initiatives. Because of this Government's lack of provision of finance over the years, some departments are acting only in an advisory capacity. When a person rings a department, he is referred to another department. Because the Government has created jobs for a few extra people, it should give them some money to work with.

Development is taking place in north Queensland now. All Government members would be well aware of the development that is taking place not only in Cairns but also elsewhere. The big developments can be seen in Cairns and Port Douglas and also in some smaller places. But development is not taking place in Ingham, where the population is increasing and has been increasing for years.

I am a supporter of the space base to be built on Cape York. I think it is great. Before I became a member of Parliament, every year I used to go on holidays to the gulf or the cape. It is great to get away from civilisation, where there are no telephones and only the crocodiles to look at. I know what the crocodiles will do. I believe that sometimes it is safer to be up there with the crocodiles than down here in Parliament House, because down here a person does not know who is going to stab him in the back. But up north a person knows what the crocodiles will do. If the right precautions are taken, one is safer there than he is here at Parliament House. One has only to use a bit of common sense and a bit of bushcraft.

I want to see development not only on Cape York but also all over north Queensland. I think development can be balanced so that the environment can be maintained. There are different conservation groups everywhere. Some worry only about the mangroves; some worry only about the trees; some worry only about the hairy-nose wombat or the one-legged flea. Some of them want to preserve the one-legged flea. No matter where one goes, one finds that there are always conservationists who do not want people to do anything.

I think a balance has to be struck between needs and desires. That has always been my attitude. Human beings should come first. It is a waste of time exterminating human beings and saving all the rare wildlife. In fact, care has to be taken because today more protection is given to weeds, trees, vermin and dingos than to human beings. Some conservationists want to do away with jobs. I have had arguments with conservationists. They say, "Why should jobs be preserved for the elite? They should be shot out onto the dole the same as others. I have been on the dole for 10 years; why can't they go on the dole?" That is the wrong attitude.

Many conservationists are well educated and have common sense. Unfortunately, there are radicals on both sides. Those who are good and sensible are being tagged as radicals. Those who are not radicals should be able to sit down and work out a common-sense approach that is beneficial to all concerned. When we leave this world we want

to be able to say that we have left something behind for the young people of Australia. I certainly hope that that can be done. It can be done only by negotiation. If anyone, whether he be a greenie or anti-greenie, gets his own way, the country will be ruined for everybody. There is room in the middle. There is room for a balance. I hope that common sense prevails.

Hon. T. R. COOPER (Roma—Premier and Treasurer and Minister for State Development) (5 p.m.), in reply: I thank honourable members for their contributions to the Bill. It is disappointing, however, that neither the Leader of the Opposition nor the Leader of the Liberal Party saw fit to make a contribution. I can only assume that the good news on the Queensland economy outlined in my speech overwhelmed them and they saw no reason to challenge the facts presented.

I note the comments by the honourable member for Cairns that in his view we can do what we like with statistics. I can only assume that this is the approach that he has taken in seeking to find some bad news. For example, although he finally acknowledged that Queensland has the lowest net debt per capita of all the States, he claimed that as a percentage of gross State product, Queensland's debt is the highest. However, the actual position is that on the basis of ABS estimates of net debt, Queensland still has the lowest debt level as a percentage of gross State product of any of the States, and almost half the level of that for Victoria. The Opposition claim that Queensland has the highest debt as a percentage of GSP may be based on a spurious comparison using gross-debt numbers. This is misleading as it does not allow for offsetting financial assets. Even so, on ABS estimates, Queensland has the second-lowest gross debt as a percentage of GSP of all the States.

The Opposition also acknowledged the poor financial performance of the Victorian Government but says that is okay, as it had the best of intentions. That will be little comfort for the people of Victoria who are now burdened with massive debt and high taxes. There is no reason to expect any different performance from the Queensland Labor Party if it ever wins Government.

Again the claim was made by the Opposition that the level of spending on education in the Budget was not a real increase. The honourable member for Cairns stated that the best he can do is estimate an increase of 9.9 per cent which he says is not a real increase after allowing for inflation of 7½ per cent and enrolment growth of 2 per cent. In fact, enrolment growth is expected to be around 0.8 per cent. Even on the honourable member's best estimate, there is clearly a real growth in addition to enrolment growth in education-funding. Given that the honourable member has recognised his lack of expertise in understanding the Budget papers, for his benefit I will remind him again that on a comparable basis the increase is some 14 per cent. The Budget papers clearly outline the new deal for education and it would not go beyond the meagre expertise of the Opposition to simply read this and give credit where it is due.

The honourable member also enlightened the House with his rationalisation of high Commonwealth taxation levels as being a reflection of a growing economy. He seems to support the concept that Commonwealth taxes should continue to be at record-breaking levels. What he is saying is that, given the chance, a similar high-taxing Labor philosophy would apply in Queensland.

The strong growth in State taxes mentioned by the honourable member reflects higher stamp duty collections in particular, which have, of course, occurred as a result of strong growth in the Queensland economy over recent years. It also reflects the need to introduce a tobacco tax to counter the minimal increase in Commonwealth grants over this period. This has occurred despite the record growth in tax receipts at the Commonwealth level.

The honourable member for Cairns also raised the matter of errors in the Budget document, the *State Budget for 1989-90 in Program Format*. For his information, I point out that corrigendums have been prepared. If the honourable member does not already have a copy of them, I will certainly ensure that one is provided to him.

In conclusion, I wish to again say that this is a very good Budget for the people of Queensland. Its initiatives, particularly for education, are forward thinking and provide a solid foundation upon which the National Party Government will build in the future.

I further commend this Bill to the House.

Motion agreed to.

Committee

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

Bill reported, without amendment.

Third Reading

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

FIRE SERVICE BILL

Hon. A. A. FITZGERALD (Lockyer—Minister for Community Services and Minister for Emergency Services and Administrative Services) (5.05 p.m.), by leave, without notice: I move—

“That leave be granted to bring in a Bill to provide for a Commissioner of Fire Service, The Queensland Fire Service Commission and to provide for and in respect of the prevention of and response to fires and certain other incidents whereby any person or property or the environment is endangered and for related purposes.”

Motion agreed to.

First Reading

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

Second Reading

Hon. A. A. FITZGERALD (Lockyer—Minister for Community Services and Minister for Emergency Services and Administrative Services) (5.06 p.m.): I move—

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

In November last year the State Government commissioned Dr Sally Leivesley to conduct a review of fire services in Queensland. The commission of review reported early this year and its recommendations were distributed as a Green Paper to gain public comment before any action was taken to implement legislation for the improvement of the fire service. Considerable consultation took place during the review itself and there was further comment as a result of the Green Paper. A number of meetings were held with interested parties, including the Queensland Fire Services Association—the representative body of urban fire brigade boards—the Rural Fires Board and unions of employees representing fire-fighters. These meetings, held in Brisbane and elsewhere, produced a high level of discussion and led to the preparation of a Bill to replace both the Fire Brigades Act and the Rural Fires Act. This Bill is a major step forward for the Queensland fire service. It will lead to a unified Queensland fire service, while retaining those vital elements of local involvement through urban fire brigade boards and the Rural Fires Board, which are essential in a State as diverse as Queensland.

A major element of the Leivesley report was the need for improved co-ordination of the fire service. The new Bill provides for the appointment of a Commissioner for Fire Services who will be a professional fire officer. He will be the chief executive of the fire service. To guide the commissioner in the management of the fire service Statewide, there will be a Queensland Fire Service Commission. The commissioner will be a member of the commission along with two representatives of urban fire brigade boards, one of

whom shall represent fire brigade boards employing auxiliaries, a representative of the Rural Fires Board and a representative of fire officers.

The commission will be the sole employer of permanent, full-time staff. This is of particular importance, as it provides a career structure for all permanent staff in the fire service. Furthermore, through the commission, more cost-effective financial management will be achieved, and with the implementation of risk-mapping, resources will be better allocated throughout the State.

The new legislation retains both the urban fire boards and the Rural Fires Board, which have served the State so well for so many years. Fires bridge boards will provide advice to the commission, promote fire safety and fire prevention, have input into the selection of staff and allocation of financial resources, and generally have involvement at the local level in ensuring that an adequate fire service is maintained in their respective districts. It is intended also that through delegation from the Queensland Fire Service Commission they will employ auxiliary staff. The Rural Fires Board will continue to provide advice to both the Minister and the commission on the operation of bush fire brigades. The board will also be involved in the promotion of fire safety, fire prevention and the reduction of fire danger within rural areas.

The role of fire brigades throughout the entire State has been expanded in the legislation to recognise those emergent roles which have been thrust on the brigades in recent years. In addition to their responsibilities to prevent and fight fires, the Bill recognises that there is now a need for fire officers to become involved in the protection of people and property from chemical incidents and to participate in the rescue of people trapped in vehicles and buildings.

The existing role of fire wardens and bush fire brigades in the prevention and control of rural fires is recognised in the legislation. In some instances, the powers and duties of these officers have been extended to better enable them to combat the threat of bushfire. I need hardly remind honourable members that vast areas of the State currently face the worst fire danger in more than a decade.

An initiative included in the legislation relates to the hazards that are more frequently being experienced from dangerous goods. Where there is a likelihood that an incident would have an effect on the population or the environment, authority is given to fire officers, to require the owner of premises on which dangerous goods are being stored to prepare an off-site plan which details action that would be taken to counter any problems that may arise from an incident involving the dangerous goods.

The Bill also incorporates amendments proposed in 1988 which were not proceeded with because of the review of the total fire service structure. These amendments which applied to the levy system are in the main procedural matters that clarify certain of the procedures relating to the collection of levies. In particular, provision is made for an appeal system which may provide for a variation of the levy on prescribed grounds.

The Bill is the first step towards the restructuring of the Queensland fire service and the development of a fire service to serve this State in the future. The Bill is both advantageous to members of the fire service and of benefit to all Queenslanders.

The priority tasks of the commission will be—

- identification of increased manpower and training needs;
- risk-mapping for all areas of the State;
- replacement and upgrading of fire-fighting equipment;
- provision of improved protective clothing for fire-fighters;
- special attention to chemical hazards and fire risk for high-rise tourists, business and residential areas; and
- improved strategic planning.

It is proposed that the members of the commission will be appointed initially for a two-year period, so that the operation of the commission can be critically examined

at the end of that period. It is proposed also that a White Paper be released at the end of the first 12-month period.

I think it appropriate at this time to pay tribute to the thousands of dedicated volunteer, auxiliary and full-time staff who have served Queensland so well in past years. This Bill will enhance their efforts to protect life and property in the years ahead. A special mention is due also to the urban boards, whose unselfish work has helped so many communities. I should point out that the auxiliary boards will operate as they do now, with the commission delegating powers to them to engage auxiliary firemen and so on. The urban boards will be intimately involved in assisting with recruitment and preparation of budgets. Their responsibilities increase in the area of fire safety and prevention.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate, on motion of Mr Mackenroth, adjourned.

POLICE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from 28 September (see p. 981).

Mr MACKENROTH (Chatsworth) (5.15 p.m.): On behalf of the Labor Party Opposition, I congratulate Mr Noel Newnham on his appointment as Queensland's new Police Commissioner.

A Government member interjected.

Mr MACKENROTH: The honourable member might well say, "Go on."

The Fitzgerald report recommended that the Opposition be consulted on the appointment of the new Police Commissioner, but there was no such consultation. Today Mr Newnham is being welcomed to Queensland in the normal, bumbling way in which we normally work in Queensland. Last night I mentioned to someone that, in accordance with the consultation process, a meeting had been organised between Mr Newnham and various people in Queensland, but no invitation had been extended to me as the Opposition Police spokesman. At 9 o'clock this morning, after that message had got back to the Premier, his office rang and extended an invitation to me to meet Mr Newnham at his welcoming function to be held at 5 p.m. today. It is now 5.15 p.m. and I am in Parliament debating Mr Newnham's appointment. The Police Minister is at the function, but I and the Liberal Party Police spokesman are here in Parliament debating the very Bill under which the new Police Commissioner is appointed. I hope Mr Newnham does not think that we have snubbed him and have not bothered to turn up to his welcome. It is our responsibility to debate this Bill here in Parliament and we are unable to attend his welcome. During the dinner recess I will endeavour to go to that function. If Mr Newnham is still there, I will introduce myself to him. Otherwise, I will make myself known to him in the future.

However, we welcome his appointment and we wish him well. I know no more about Mr Newnham's background than the publicity blurb that has been put out about him. That being the case, I certainly hope that he can get on with the job of rebuilding the Queensland police force, which certainly needs rebuilding. I will speak at length about that later.

The Police Act Amendment Bill deals with the appointment of the commissioner, his responsibilities, the relationship between him and the Minister, his conditions of employment and the transitional period. I would have preferred at this stage to have seen much broader amendments to the Police Act to deal with the recommendations of the Fitzgerald commission of inquiry or, in fact, a new Police Act. I believe that 13 draft Police Acts have been drawn up since the commission of inquiry handed down its report. Someone might be able to correct me; it may be more. However, I understand

that the last one that was around was referred to as draft No. 13. It would have been far more preferable to have been dealing with that rather than with minor amendments to the Act and then having a new Police Act introduced further down the track.

Be that as it may, we must deal specifically with the amendments before us and we must make our decision not on whether the Government has done enough in terms of what Mr Fitzgerald recommended but whether we should support or reject the amendments contained in this Bill. I believe our decision should be made on the individual items contained in the legislation, on whether we believe those amendments are necessary and on whether they accord with what Tony Fitzgerald recommended.

Subsequent to this Bill coming in last week, I read the amendments and went to the Police Act to understand fully what was being done. My interpretation was that there was nothing wrong with the amendments contained in the Bill before the House. The only minor thing is that I would have preferred not to have seen that a person over the age of 65 years can be appointed as Police Commissioner. Indeed, that is what this Bill provides. At that time I wondered who the Government had in mind to become Police Commissioner, but I see that Mr Newnham is only 51 years of age, so perhaps my fear there has been laid to rest. However, I would have preferred not to have seen that.

Certainly I was very surprised, when reading the *Courier-Mail* on Monday morning, to see the banner heading "Liberals set to fight against anti-Fitzgerald amendments to Police Act". That article outlined all of the reasons why the Liberal Party will oppose these amendments before the House. Immediately I thought that, goodness, I must really have missed something when I had gone through these amendments to the Police Act. In that article, Mr Gygar is reported as saying that the amendments would be opposed because they did not comply with Fitzgerald report recommendations. He went on to say that, although the Bill is a temporary measure, it contains no sunset clause and the amendments will become a permanent fixture in the Police Act. He also said that there should be a limit on the term of the Police Commissioner, that the Bill offered no such limitation and that the Government has offered no reasonable explanation for this discrepancy. Mr Gygar also stated that appeals against police promotions could be suspended in cases where the CJC chairman deemed it necessary, yet the Bill abolishes appeals unless consent is given by the CJC chairman. He went on to list three things: the sunset clause, the limited time of appointment of the interim commissioner as recommended by Mr Fitzgerald, and the fiasco the Bill had created over police promotion appeals.

As a result of reading that article, I went to the Fitzgerald recommendations, not to the major part of the report that deals with the ifs and buts of what Mr Fitzgerald said—we all seem to get our knickers in a knot about that part of the report when trying to interpret exactly what Mr Fitzgerald was saying, whether things should or should not happen and whether people should be looking at them—but to the actual recommendations, the dead-set, cast-in-concrete recommendations of Mr Fitzgerald. I shall refer members of the Liberal Party to just a couple of those recommendations and let them think about them in terms of their opposition to the Bill. I will now turn to Mr Gygar's allegation that the amendments will give the Minister absolute power to direct the new commissioner on priorities and policies and bind him to comply with written directions.

Mr Gygar: I didn't say that. You are on the wrong guy.

Mr MACKENROTH: That is what the honourable member is reported as saying. Recommendation No. 36 on page 383 of the Fitzgerald report states—

"a register be kept of policy and staff appointment recommendations provided by the Commissioner to the Minister, and policy directions given by the Minister to the Commissioner. The register would also record instances where the Minister or Cabinet declines to accept staff appointment recommendations put forward. The register would be tabled in Parliament annually."

So in regard to directions from the Minister to the commissioner in relation to policy, the amendments contained in the Bill are clear.

Mr Gygar interjected.

Mr MACKENROTH: The honourable member can blast the *Courier-Mail*, because it has reported that this is what he said. As the debate continues, perhaps he will claim that he did not say any of what is reported in that newspaper.

I now turn to the parts of pages 387 and 388 that deal with appeals. The report states—

“internal appellate processes related to promotions and transfers be suspended during the first stage of transitional arrangements and interim appointments;

appointment procedures to be applied in the later part of the transitional period be determined by the CJC in consultation with the Commissioner of Police.”

Fitzgerald recommended that appointment procedures and appeals against appointments should be determined at a later time in the transitional period, which has been stipulated as three years. Those appointments are to be determined by the CJC in consultation with the Commissioner of Police. However, we cannot have a Commissioner of Police until we pass this Bill. How could the Liberal Party expect those provisions to be contained in the Bill at this time?

Mr Gygar said that the Bill contained only minor amendments. He has just left the Chamber. He has probably run out to read the Fitzgerald report and will make an apology to the House later.

I have already stated that the legislation could have gone further than it has. However, I will examine the provisions in isolation.

At page 384 of Mr Fitzgerald's report, recommendation 39 is—

“the Police Act be redrawn and modernised to accommodate the recommendations of this report, with interim amendments as necessary to allow early implementation of proposals for lateral entry, interim appointment, and contract appointment.”

That is what the legislation is doing. I cannot see how Mr Gygar could oppose minor amendments. Fitzgerald stated explicitly that that is the method to adopt.

I believe that the Government should have gone further with the legislation. However, because the Government has introduced part of Mr Fitzgerald's recommendations, I cannot vote against it. The Labor Party will support the provisions that have been brought forward.

Mr Gygar spoke about a sunset clause relating to the appointment of the Commissioner for Police. Mr Fitzgerald pointed out clearly that the commissioner should be appointed on contract for a three-year term. I have not had an opportunity to see the contract, but the Minister stated—on this occasion I will believe him—that Mr Newnham has been appointed for a three-year term as recommended by Mr Fitzgerald. That being the case, no sunset clause is needed, because those conditions are contained in the contract of employment, as was specified in the Fitzgerald report.

I am at a loss to see what the Liberal Party opposes in the Bill. I cannot see how any of the provisions could be seen as being against the wishes of Mr Fitzgerald.

The Labor Party welcomes the new Commissioner of Police. He has one of the most difficult jobs that any person has ever taken on in Queensland. The morale of the police force is at the lowest that it has ever been. The Police Complaints Tribunal report contained a scathing attack not only on the police force, but also on the Government and the public service of this State. The commissioner, as one individual, has to get on top of those problems and develop a police force in Queensland that will not only have the confidence of the people of Queensland but also have confidence in itself. That is a daunting task and one in which I wish him well. He will not achieve that task without

adequate support from the Government. For many years, the police force in Queensland has not received that support from the present Government.

The police force is understaffed, underfunded and inadequately trained. Those problems have been highlighted time and time again in the Parliament and outside the Parliament, yet the present Government and past Governments have done nothing about them. However, without those problems being corrected, we expect the new commissioner to come here and make major changes. Unless he gets a commitment from the Government to immediately change its priorities, we are asking him to do an impossible job.

For many years in this Parliament statements have been made about the priorities of the Government relative to the police force. Earlier this year, the Premier and the then Police Minister said that they would inject \$1m into the police force to employ additional members of the Drug Squad. They stated that drugs was one of the major problems facing Queensland, that the Drug Squad was understaffed and that it needed additional members.

Eight years ago, the Drug Squad had 29 officers. Last week, in Parliament, the Minister stated that the Drug Squad now has 29 officers. Six months ago, all he did was increase the establishment figure. It is fine to have 51 officers on paper, but they should be on the job.

It is not good enough to simply increase the establishment figure to 51 and to leave the actual establishment at 29—what it was eight years ago. These are the challenges that the new commissioner will face when he tries to do his job. He will be faced with a Government that makes hollow promises and does not deliver.

At the end of January 1989, \$1m was promised for the employment of extra police officers in the Drug Squad. Recently I visited north Queensland and I spoke to an officer up there. I will not mention the name of the police station that he works at because the poor officer would probably find himself transferred to Barcaldine or somewhere like that. Besides that, I do not think it would be responsible of me to do that in view of what I have to say.

The officer in charge of this station told me that for the past eight months he has requested from Brisbane an undercover agent to go into particular areas in which he knows there are drug-dealers and drug-users operating on a large scale. I will not name any of the areas because I think it would be irresponsible to tip off those people. For eight months that officer has asked for an undercover agent. He cannot send in any of his own officers because, naturally, they are all known by the locals. He expects that, with the help of an undercover agent, the arrests would number 100. For eight months his request to Brisbane has been denied. This Government talks tough about drugs, yet a north Queensland police officer is screaming out for help to perhaps put up to 100 people dealing in drugs and involved in drugs behind bars and it will do nothing about it.

Queensland has a Drug Squad comprising 29 officers who are wholly and solely based in Brisbane. Throughout the State independent superintendents can decide to allocate some of their officers to deal specifically with drug-related matters. However, they have no liaison or direct communication with the Drug Squad. They cannot gain access to the Drug Squad computer. They cannot use the information that is available to the Drug Squad. In fact the Drug Squad in those areas is really a phantom Drug Squad.

If the Government is really serious about drugs, whenever legislation dealing with police is passed, the first thing the Police Minister would do is write a policy direction for the new commissioner stating that the No. 1 priority in this State is to get the Mr Bigs and the people dealing in drugs, to do whatever is necessary to get them, and to ensure that the establishment figures that have been increased by the Government are met.

I do not believe that 51 officers is enough to deal with the huge drug problem in Queensland. However, by God, it would be better than 29. Queensland needs a decentralised Drug Squad that is able to deal with the drug problem and has the support of Government and the top echelons of the force to ensure that it can do its job.

Understaffing problems are also experienced by mobile patrols. The officers working in mobile patrols have been told that because of understaffing they cannot take leave before Christmas. No-one is to apply for leave because there are not enough police officers in mobile patrols to do the job. In addition, for the sake of statistics, when police officers from mobile patrols are required to go to court, they are rostered for duty in the day-time. They sign on at work and then go to court and spend the day in court. They are then cited in statistics as having been out on the road in Brisbane as part of the mobile patrol team. It is a farce and a disgrace that those things should occur. Those officers should in no way be regarded as people who are out policing and enforcing the law.

Throughout Brisbane and all over the State, suburban and small police stations are closed down at 6 o'clock, 8 o'clock, 10 o'clock or midnight. The hours are different in different areas. That does not allow for adequate protection of the community.

I cite the example of the Gold Coast. At midnight in Coolangatta two police officers in one police car are on duty. They are expected to patrol an area from Coolangatta to the chair-lift at Miami. That is quite a number of kilometres—probably 30 kilometres. The smarties on the coast are well aware of that. If they want to do something at Coolangatta, they report something as having happened at Miami. If they want to do something at the northern end of the patrol area, they report that police assistance is required on the southern end of the coast. The smarties and the crooks know how the police force operates, and they know what they can get away with.

It is dreadful to think about that in light of the numbers of holiday-makers on the coast. The Government is trying to attract tourists to the Gold Coast; yet, despite all of the crime that takes place on the coast, the situation is that after midnight only two police officers are on duty.

These are the sorts of problems that we need to come to grips with. I hope that Mr Newnham reads the Fitzgerald report—and I am not being smart when I say that—and I hope that he is able to implement the community policing aspects of the Fitzgerald report in which Mr Fitzgerald talks about the need for police to be out on the beat, to be out in the community, to be engaged in pro-active police work and in fact stopping crime and not simply registering crime statistics. That is the major job of most members of the Queensland police force.

The two major areas in which a person comes into contact with a police officer, other than being booked for a traffic offence, are the breaking and entering of his home and the theft of his motor vehicle. When my home was broken into the first thing my wife said to me was, "I don't think the police did enough." I said, "Why?" She said, "They should have been trying to catch these people." She had the belief that the police should have been doing more than they did. I, too, believe that they should have done more. I do not believe that 10 officers should have come out and conducted a major investigation into the matter, but more could have been done.

Since becoming a shadow Minister for this portfolio, I have been able to find out exactly what happens when there is a breaking and entering. The police go out, record the details of the house broken into and what has been stolen. They return to the station and file the report as a statistic. About five weeks later, they contact the owner and say, "At this stage, we have been unable to apprehend the offender." Absolutely no investigation is made into that offence. It is not the fault of the police officer. After he returns to the police station and writes his report, he has to go out and investigate another breaking and entering or a car accident and file another report. He is unable to do any actual police work which would result in the apprehension of offenders.

The annual report of the Queensland Police Department, which was tabled today, contains statistics which show that the success rate in the apprehension of people who break and enter homes is 16 per cent, so there is an 84 per cent chance that the police will not apprehend such an offender. When a car is stolen, there is only a 28 per cent chance that the police will apprehend the person who stole it. Those figures are abysmal, not because the police do not want to do their job but because they are unable to do their job owing to understaffing and underfunding of resources over many years.

After one of the most damning reports on the police force that one would ever want to see anywhere in Australia, and particularly in Queensland, which identified most of the major problems in the police force, this year's Budget increases the allocation to police by 7.3 per cent. Taking into account inflation and population growth, spending in real terms this year has dropped 2.9 per cent compared with the figure for last year. Queensland spent \$24m to discover the problems yet it gives the police force no extra money in real terms to do anything about them.

It is not good enough simply to appoint a new commissioner who is well qualified and able to grasp the problems unless the Government is prepared to provide the money to overcome some of the problems which, as I said, are understaffing and underfunding for resources.

I am trying not to be my usual bucket-tipping self, Mr Speaker——

Mr SPEAKER: I appreciate that.

Mr MACKENROTH: But I will have to mention a name—the former Minister for Police, Mr Cooper, who is now Premier. I can remember when a reporter on *60 Minutes* was tape-recorded when he was giving a police officer a bit of touch-up. Mr Cooper said how wonderful it was that this police officer had been able to tape-record the conversation and supported the use of the tape recorder 100 per cent. What he did not tell the people of Queensland was that the Police Department does not purchase the tape recorders, the use of which he supports, and that the police officers have to purchase them.

I have a memo from the Police Department stating explicitly that it will not purchase the tapes for the tape recorders, which are such an effective tool for police officers. In fact, if police officers were required to use recorders at all times, far fewer complaints would be made against them. The department will not even supply the batteries for the recorders. Mr Cooper said that the Government supports the use of recorders 100 per cent yet, it provides no money for them.

Police need to use torches at night. Very limited resources are available to purchase them so very few are supplied. Quite often, those supplied are ineffective. So most police officers purchase their own torches. Once the sun goes down, a torch is a very important thing for a police officer to have either on his person or in his car so that, if somebody nips into a dark area, the officer can find him. But the Government will not provide adequate resources. The batteries in the torches that are used by officers in the mobile patrols are in short supply. The department runs out of them and is unable to purchase more for two months or so. The officers have to purchase their own batteries for their torches. If the Minister claims that what I am saying is wrong I will challenge Mr O'Gorman, who told me that it is correct.

Police stations in country areas do not have fax machines—which are a very important tool—or photocopiers. When somebody comes in to get a copy of a statement, the police officer or the person who is in charge of the station has to send an officer to a business establishment in the town and ask the owner if, out of the goodness of his heart, he would photocopy something for the police. Not only is that time-wasting but it is also very demeaning. Those machines are very basic tools.

Thirty years ago photocopiers did not exist. Today almost every small business has a photocopier. I believe that every Government department would have a photocopier and a fax machine. Yet those very important and vital tools are not provided to the

police force. Tools such as that would make the job of police officers easier, better and more satisfying. If the Minister wants to be the great white hope of the police force he should be positive and order those machines. Statements about their supply are not good enough.

For two years the police force has been told that new bullet-proof vests will be provided, but it has not received them. The Queensland police force is sick and tired of promises from this Government. It wants action by getting the resources that it has been asking for. I challenge the Minister not to make statements but to go out and do things. The Minister should not get his photograph in tomorrow's paper by saying that he is going to give photocopiers to police stations. Mr Lester should have his photograph taken with the necessary 100 or so photocopiers being delivered to the police force. Those are the sorts of things that the Police Commissioner will find vital.

In his report, Mr Fitzgerald spoke about the need to do something about training in the police force. Today in this Parliament the eighth report of the Police Complaints Tribunal was tabled. I am happy that, at long last, the tribunal has had the guts to say what it thinks. I would like to know why, for eight years, the tribunal has sat back and said nothing if, in fact, all of the things that are stated in its report as being wrong with the police force, the Government and the way that it has operated are true. Why has it taken eight years for the tribunal to tell the Parliament of Queensland about that?

Although one can congratulate the Police Complaints Tribunal for bringing to our attention the matters that are contained in its report, one must condemn the past tribunals for not having told the Parliament of Queensland about the problems that existed. Perhaps they informed the Minister of the day, but obviously that was not good enough. The tribunals had an obligation to report to the Parliament and to advise it about the problems and deficiencies that existed within the Queensland police force. If that had happened, some of the problems that exist today might not have arisen.

The tribunal was set up to investigate complaints against police. Only in recent times has something been done about it. The Fitzgerald report came to some of the same conclusions as are contained in the tribunal's report. I understand that, later tonight, the new Criminal Justice Commission Bill will come before the Parliament. Eventually that commission will take over the role of the tribunal. Certainly the tribunal will remain in existence for a period after the commission has been established, but my interpretation of the CJC legislation is that the tribunal will no longer be necessary.

The report of the Police Complaints Tribunal deals with the very basic problems that the Police Commissioner will need to address. Page 15 of the report cites police training as an elementary deficiency. Paragraph 17.1 states—

“The Tribunal's activities have revealed a lack of training in a number of members of the police force. The elementary deficiency found is that many members (including members holding senior commissioned rank) seen and heard by the Tribunal do not know the terms of their constable's oath. Of course, without knowing its terms, no member has any chance of understanding the duties to which he or she is sworn. This Tribunal considers that many, if not all of the matters before it arise because of the ignorance of the terms, true construction and effect of the constable's oath.”

The constable's oath states—

“I, A.B.”—

meaning the person who is swearing the oath—

“swear by Almighty God that I will well and truly serve our Sovereign Lady Queen Elizabeth the Second and Her Heirs and Successors according to law in the office of constable or in such other capacity as I may be hereafter appointed, promoted, or reduced, without favour or affection, malice or ill-will, from this date and until I am legally discharged; and I will see and cause Her Majesty's peace to be kept and preserved; and that I will prevent to the best of my power all offences against the same; and that while I shall continue to be a member of the police force of

Queensland I will to the best of my skill and knowledge discharge all the duties legally imposed upon me faithfully and according to law. So help me God.”

On 1 November Mr Newnham will be asked to swear that oath.

The tribunal is saying that the majority of the police officers serving in this State do not even know what is contained in the oath that they swore when they were sworn in as constables. I will not quote the entire oath. The officer signs the oath but he is not even given a copy of it. In fact, it is put away somewhere in a safe. One would think that at least the constable would be given a copy of the oath so that as he goes about his duty it could perhaps remind him of what is expected of him.

The report then deals with police training and at paragraph 17.8 states—

“The demeanour of a number of members of the police force who appeared before this Tribunal as witnesses revealed that they perceived those duties as if their basic training had been in infantry for the prosecution of a war by infiltration by Queensland citizens. Certainly, training is necessary for most rigorous measures to keep the peace. But training of that type must include content so that any two trained male members together know how to act when they intercept a lone female motorist at night driving in her vehicle on a quiet road and when she tells them at once that she wishes to drive on forthwith to a nearby railway station in an area with a history of abductions and rapes of females so that she can collect her teenage daughter about to alight from an incoming train. Not all of the circumstances of that particular pending matter are stated here. This Tribunal, as constituted after 5th April, 1989, will inherit the function of deciding whether it should make a public statement about the Acting Commissioner’s declining (upon a basis that they ‘stoutly deny’ the allegations) to discipline in any way at all two such male members after this Tribunal has reported its determination to the contrary. This is one of those approximately 100 matters present with Counsel assisting the Tribunal for his drafting of such a public statement of this Tribunal’s dissatisfaction, to the making of which public statement the complainant has been asked to consent.”

The tribunal saw what the problem was. I am not casting aspersions on the Acting Commissioner of Police as an individual but on the system that has operated in our police force. A lady made a complaint to the tribunal. In the first instance, the tribunal reported to the acting commissioner and he declined to take any steps in relation to the complaint because the officers concerned stoutly denied the allegation. If that is the way in which the acting commissioner or, indeed, any commissioner is going to treat recommendations of the Police Complaints Tribunal, it is a farce.

Is it any wonder that some members—and I believe it to be a minority—of the police force believe that they can do whatever they wish? The new commissioner will find that he has problems with some of those people. That is all contained in the police culture that Mr Fitzgerald outlined in his report.

The new commissioner will find that there will be people who will be opposed to change; who are not going to like discipline for members of the Queensland police force. That is something that has to be. Queensland cannot have a police force that is charged with upholding law in this State but which believes it is outside the law. It is evident that some officers believe that to be the case.

I know that complaints are made against police officers that are not true. On a quite regular basis people phone me, as the Opposition police spokesman, and make complaints against police. I take the view that, if the person wishes to make a complaint against a police officer, he needs to put that complaint in writing to me and sign his name to it. Ninety per cent of the complaints never come. People want me to do something but they do not want to be involved. If they are going to make a complaint, they have to be prepared to stand behind it.

Some complaints are made simply to try to get at a particular police officer or officers. An old story is that if one goes out to a prison one will find that everyone behind the bars is innocent. If asked, everyone would say that he is innocent, or certainly

wish people to have the belief that he is innocent, and that he has been verbally or treated wrongly. I do not believe that. I believe that there are some innocent people in prison; but surely the system could not be so wrong that 100 per cent of them are innocent.

Sitting suspended from 5.58 to 7.30 p.m.

Mr MACKENROTH: Before the dinner recess, I was referring to the deficiencies in police training and the problems that face members of the police force. The Police Complaints Tribunal report sets out some of those matters. At paragraph 18.4 on page 15, the report states—

“Members of the police force have many other powers conferred by statute upon them as such members—powers of seizure, powers of entry, powers of apprehension, powers of questioning, powers of search, etc—and in every case the enactment is not an enactment that something may be done upon certain circumstances arising by somebody acting as either an automaton and/or a ‘rubber stamp’, but by a person who is taken to know and who is sensitive to, aware of, has a knowledge of, and will observe the obligations, restraints, and duties of the constable’s oath and those standards of conduct which flow from a proper understanding of its terms.”

The report goes on to state—

“In this tribunal’s clear view this is the most serious gap in the training of those members of the Queensland Police Force which this Tribunal has seen. Needless to say it ought to be repaired at once; but having regard to the inaction that has been obvious from earlier reports that this Tribunal has been made in relation to other matters requiring action, this Tribunal predicts with some confidence that the matter will only be brought to order when this Tribunal, as constituted after 5th April next, recommends in its statutory reports again and again prosecutions of members of the police force for misconduct the essence of which is a breach of the constable’s oath.”

If the National Party Government is returned to office, one would hope that the tribunal will not have to inform the Government over and over again that new training procedures are needed in the Queensland police force. On many occasions I have mentioned that the very first step in a police officer’s induction into the academy is the undertaking of an aptitude test. The aptitude test used by the Queensland police force is a 1954 British army test that was used to get people into the army in the 1950s. The Government should be able to get a test that is a little bit modern and more up to date to select and recruit people who are worthy of joining the police force, instead of using an aptitude test that is 35 years old. Surely better methods could be used to find out whether or not a person has the right aptitude to enable him to serve as a member of the Queensland police force. That is a fundamental mistake that is being made. The Government is not picking the right applicants for the job.

After recruits arrive at the academy, they are not learning all the right things such as people and managerial skills. Earlier I said that the report states that recruits are being trained to be part of an army of which they seem to think they are members. They seem to think that they are fighting a war against the residents of Queensland. That is not what police should be learning. They should be trained in methods of dealing with people and they should learn managerial and people skills.

The report referred to a lack of training for leadership. At paragraph 20.1 it states—

“In the course of its activities, this Tribunal observed, time and again, that members of the police force in superior ranks lacked training, even to that which this Tribunal considers to be an elementary level, in techniques and responsibilities of leadership.”

The report refers to the commissioner's role, and states—

“The person for the time being discharging the duties of the Commissioner of Police (and by adopting that terminology the Tribunal wishes to refer to no such person in particular)”—

the report refers here to what is being debated in this Parliament tonight, that is, the person who will be appointed to the position—

“remains subject to his or her constable's oath while, by statute, that person is charged with the superintendence of the police force of the whole State and is generally responsible for the maintenance of peace and good order throughout the whole State (see Police Rule 33(1)).

Concentrating upon that Police Rule for a moment merely as the example which the Tribunal adopts for this part of its report, it is a matter of interpretation and construction of that Rule that the person so charged with that general duty is a person who is himself subject, and is a person who will not forget the terms of, and is a person who understands the nature of the duties of his or her own constable's oath.

Thus, the person for the time being who is the Commissioner of Police and subject to both the oath and the statutory duties just mentioned, would ensure, one would expect, consistently with both sources of obligation, that adequate measures were taken throughout the force for prevention of breaches of the law. That is one matter which the terms of the constable's oath requires.

So one would expect to see fewer ambushes and traps on the roads for speeding motorists and motorists who may be driving in not a fit state to do so; and more 'mere presence' of uniformed police themselves travelling openly and obviously on and about the roads as a deterrent.

So one would expect to have seen more members of the police force stationed at given geographical locations throughout the State (i.e. the 'local police station') and fewer mobile patrols and other centralised specialist activities. The members of centralised activities can do little for prevention of offences, for they are not before the public: they appear as 'strangers' from somewhere; and return to 'somewhere'—so far as the general public is able to see them. Time and again this Tribunal has seen, in evidence before it from many different members of the force from many different areas of the force, the great advantage which the member who is the local resident has in relation to events that come to the attention of this Tribunal from within his community—as opposed to when members of the force who are 'strangers' to the community and its geography are drawn in from, for example, a mobile patrol. The locally based policeman and policewoman are recognised immediately and are accorded respect. Their mere presence does more than the positive activities by others imported from elsewhere. Prevention under the constable's oath is the forgotten concept.”

I believe that that statement is absolutely central to the reforms outlined in the Fitzgerald report. They are reforms that the Government needs the Commissioner of Police to implement. They are reforms that the Police Minister should be implementing. As I said before the dinner recess, it is not good enough simply to talk about these matters. The Queensland public and the police force have had enough of talking. They want action, not words. It is up to the Police Minister in this State at this stage to ensure that the police budget is increased immediately, not next financial year or the financial year after that. As a result the actions outlined in that report can be taken and the police can be moved away from city locations and multistorey buildings where at times they are falling over each other trying to find things not to do. They can be put out into suburban police stations where they can go about the job that most police officers, if not all, originally joined the force to do; to enforce the law and protect people and their property.

The Police Complaints Tribunal report looked at the lack of police training in management. This is one of the problems faced by the new commissioner. Paragraph 21.2 of the report states—

“This Tribunal has received much evidence which indicates that internally the Queensland Police Force and its members are thought to be commanded and directed upon military lines appropriate to active service in a theatre of war, in the sense that the subordinate ought to obey the superior and do nothing else other than obey the superior. One consequence of this is that any given member of the force regards his functions, powers and duties as being restricted to those of his posting. For example, a member of the Traffic Branch would do nothing unless it was perceived to be concerned with the Traffic Branch.”

That is the very problem that brought about the Fitzgerald inquiry. Police officers believed that they had only one responsibility and some officers in the Licensing Branch jealously guarded their responsibilities. They would not allow other police officers to arrest anyone for crimes they considered to be the responsibility of that branch. In one instance a detective from the Woolloongabba branch knew that an illegal casino was operating at Woolloongabba. He started an investigation but, as soon as the heads of the Licensing Branch found out about the investigation, a direction was given to that officer to stop the investigation because it was the responsibility of the Licensing Branch. Even though the officer knew that an illegal activity was going on, he could do nothing about it.

The new leadership of the police force should look at these matters. Tony Fitzgerald and the Police Complaints Tribunal have both identified the problems and police officers must be told, “Get out there and do your job. Don’t be stood over by superiors in the force who say to you that you only have one responsibility, and because you only have one responsibility, you cannot go out and enforce any other laws.” That is wrong. The Police Complaints Tribunal states in this report that that is wrong and it is one of the main reasons given in the Fitzgerald report for corruption in the police force in Queensland. Since the Fitzgerald report was handed down nothing has been done about decentralising the power cells built by police officers. I will not cast aspersions on individuals, but in some instances insufficient research has taken place before the appointment of some officers since the Fitzgerald report was handed down. This will become apparent to people in Queensland later on this year.

The Police Complaints Tribunal report deals with the way in which the Police Department and the Acting Police Commissioner dealt with matters referred back to it by the tribunal. The action taken in the particular case referred to in the report is not what I would expect from a police commissioner, and I hope that is not what we can expect from Queensland’s new Police Commissioner.

Mr Lee: Did you meet him tonight?

Mr MACKENROTH: Yes, I met him tonight and I have not said one bad thing about him in the 60 minutes that I have been talking. All my comments have been good.

The report states—

“On or about 14th July 1988 this Tribunal received a complaint in relation to Sergeant 2/c Silvester, a member of the Queensland Police Force. The complaint alleged that Silvester misconducted himself in certain aspects on 10th June 1988. In respect of that matter this Tribunal made a report of its determination that the Commissioner should institute a summary inquiry under the Police Rules with a view to disciplinary action and sanction if the allegations against Silvester were found proved.

. . .

According to a copy of the Police Rules which the Tribunal has, those Rules do not contain any express power to impose a ‘counselling’ or any express power

to 'counsel' a member of the Police Force having been found to have offended against police discipline."

In this case the Acting Commissioner of Police conducted that inquiry and found that the person had been wrong. Instead of taking action against him, he decided that the officer should be counselled, which is in direct contravention of the tribunal's statement. The tribunal said that disciplinary action should be taken, but all that happened was that the officer was counselled. There was no action on the part of the Police Department when it came to dealing with its own members. During the next week of sitting the House will debate the CJC legislation and at that time I will speak further about the need not to have police investigating police, and the police dealing with such complaints and implementing those measures.

The most damning section of this report, and the one thing that the new Commissioner of Police will have to deal with, is this Government's treatment of bodies such as the Police Complaints Tribunal and the Queensland Police Department. Paragraph 7.7 of the report of the Police Complaints Tribunal states—

"The Tribunal's very small secretariat left it without the capacity to make any investigation. In practical terms, it continued to have no option but to rely upon s.9 (a) of the Act and to refer all matters requiring investigation to the then Commissioner of Police. Since the vast majority of these matters were complaints by citizens against members of the police force, those same citizens found, soon after making a complaint to the Tribunal, that their complaint against the police was being investigated by those police who came to interview them. Very quickly, this Tribunal was identified by the public as not the standing civilian Commission of Inquiry which its Act created, but as an agency of the Police Force."

That is the first problem that the tribunal faced. However, it gets worse. I will read from paragraph 7.30 onwards—

"From mid-May, 1988 until mid-December, 1988 this Tribunal made numerous requests for additional resources, for increased budgetary provisions, for additional accommodation, and for additional equipment and staff. Additional provision was made belatedly for the year ended 30th June, 1989; but the Tribunal never has been near to being adequately resourced.

In July, 1988 two Counsel were seconded from elsewhere within the Department of Justice to assist the Tribunal. Within a month of their arrival, one was directed to return without even there having been extended to any Member of the Tribunal the obvious and elementary courtesy of prior notice of an intention to take away this source of assistance. Discourtesy such as this was then typical from within parts of the Department of Justice.

From June, 1988 until late October, 1988 the Tribunal from time to time became aware of circumstances and matters which constituted attempts at interferences with its exercise of powers and functions."

Unfortunately the tribunal did not spell out from where that interference came—whether it came from the Government, from within the Police Department or from within some other Government department. In this report the tribunal should have spelt out where those attempts at interference with its powers and functions came from. As a member of Parliament, and particularly as a member of the Opposition, naturally I jumped to the conclusion that that attempt at interference came from the Ministry. That is a natural assumption to jump to. The tribunal should have spelt out in its report exactly where that attempt at interference came from.

The following part of the report is really a case of the tribunal damning itself. As I said earlier, whilst the tribunal states in this report that it had dealt with all the problems in the police force, it has taken eight years to do it. It is almost a swan-song because I believe that, once the CJC is operational, the tribunal will no longer exist. The report states—

"By approximately mid-October, 1988 the Tribunal's lack of resources and the consequences became so untenable that its Members considered the frustrations to

which they were subjected, and discussed then and thereafter from time to time whether the Members of the Tribunal ought to resign as a body, first making a public statement about its lack of resources. This issue remains before the Tribunal, has been considered from time to time, and has not been made the subject of that formal resolution, which, viewed with hindsight, it should have been."

What it is saying there is that last year things with the tribunal were so untenable because support from the Government—that is the only place from which it can get its resources—was so bad that its members discussed at each and every meeting whether they would consider walking out en masse and saying, "We have had enough. We are throwing in the towel. The Government is not prepared to support us as a tribunal."

One looks at that and then looks at the Government's treatment of the police force. It is no different. The police force has not been given the resources—the staffing and the support—that it needs.

Earlier I outlined the drop in expenditure in this financial year. Now I will look at the 1987-88 financial year. In that year in real terms spending dropped by 12 per cent. This year in real terms it dropped by 2.9 per cent. So the Opposition says that the Government is saying to the police force, "We support you; we are behind you; we are going to do something to ensure that you do regain the confidence of the people of Queensland; you will be the leaders in this State; but let us trim your cloth a little bit to see if you can do it with less money. This financial year in real terms we have cut the money we will give you by 2.9 per cent." As I said, in the previous year in real terms the cut was 12 per cent.

The latest figures from the Commonwealth Grants Commission are for 1987-88. Remember that the following year the Government cut expenditure in real terms by 12 per cent and that this year the cut has been 2.9 per cent. In 1987-88, per head of population Queensland spent \$82.43 on police. The national average expenditure per head of population was \$98.32. Western Australia, a State with similar geography and population to our own, spends \$103.16 per head of population. That means that in 1987-88—two years ago—for every man, woman and child Western Australia spent \$20 more than did Queensland. Is it any wonder that Queensland has the worst population-to-police ratio?

Although I welcome the new format of some of the statistics in the annual report of the Police Department, the Government should not use figures that are wrong in an attempt to make the statistics look a little better. In Queensland, the population-to-police ratio set out in the annual report, based on an approved strength of 5 332, is one officer for every 527 people. However, when one looks at the actual number of police officers in the State, the ratio is more like one police officer for every 538 people.

Western Australia, which is similar in size and population, has one police officer for every 439 people; almost 100 people fewer for every police officer. If the police force is to be adequately staffed, that imbalance must be corrected.

The figures throughout Australia indicate that New South Wales has a police-to-population ratio of 1 to 466; Victoria, 1 to 446; Tasmania, 1 to 418; South Australia, 1 to 413; and the Northern Territory, 1 to 207. Queensland has the worst population-to-police ratio of any State in Australia. We are asking our police officers to do more with fewer officers. The Government cannot ask that of the police force and expect to get results. Is it any wonder that the figures show that the clear-up rate for selected crime has dropped from a poor 40 per cent to 36 per cent? That has occurred in the past year with Mr Cooper as the Police Minister. He was promoted as the super Minister who got things done. All he achieved was a drop in detection figures in selected major crimes from 40 per cent to 36 per cent.

While Mr Cooper was responsible for the Police portfolio, the clear-up figure for the offence of breaking and entering private dwellings dropped from 18 per cent to 16 per cent. In the light of those figures, he cannot hold his head high and say that he did a good job. The figures do not back his claim that his leadership of the police force

helped to bring criminals to justice and to protect Queenslanders. The year before last, 7 800 assault cases were reported to the police. Last year, the number increased to 8 800. Under the former Police Minister, Mr Cooper, it was not safer to leave one's home, because the chances of it being burgled increased and the chances of the police finding the person who committed the crime decreased. As well, the chance of being assaulted increased by approximately 16 per cent. That is a disgrace.

The National Party Government cannot go to the people of Queensland and say that it has done well for them in relation to the police force and crime prevention. The people are very concerned about law-and-order issues. They are the major problems that the new Police Commissioner will face when he starts his job on 1 November.

It is not good enough to pick the best applicant for the job. I am not trying to be a smart Alec. However, if it is assumed that Mr Newnham is the best police officer in Australia, he can achieve nothing in this State unless the Government is prepared to support him. The Government needs to support him not by words but by actions. The only way that we will get action is, firstly, by providing the money to the force that it requires and, secondly, by providing the direction that is required to change training techniques. We will not change the police culture in one day by appointing a new Police Commissioner; it will be a long process. However, the start must be made at the Queensland Police Academy. The police officers of the future should be trained in a manner different from that in which they were trained in the past. It is obvious that previously they have not received the correct training.

A promise that I have made as Opposition Police spokesman that the new Police Commissioner could put into place would be the streamlining of work practices to keep officers operational. An example of that would be to design standard traffic accident reports that would be completed at the scene of the accident. In that way, police officers, who have basic typing skills, would not be required to return to a police station and spend an hour or an hour and a-half typing up a three-page report on a traffic accident. With a standard traffic accident report sheet, the police officer could draw diagrams and answer standard questions. In that case, when the police officer left the scene of the accident, almost all his paper work would be completed. He could be back out on the streets going about his police duties almost straight away.

Consideration could be given to having police prosecutors and typists on duty during peak hours in major charging centres to process paperwork. I believe that, where necessary, civilian workers within the police force should be not public servants but employees of the Police Department and that they should be required to work police hours when necessary, not simply nine to five. Policing in this State is a 24-hour-a-day, seven-day-a-week job. The civilian workers should not be told, "You will work nine to five but police officers will work around the clock." If it is necessary for the civilians to be working at night-time, that is when they should be rostered for duty. Consideration should be given to doing those sorts of things to give the necessary support to police officers.

The Government should ensure that police officers who have tertiary education are adequately rewarded by creating career paths for them, particularly in their area of expertise. This is something that is spelled out in the Fitzgerald report.

The Minister may be aware that at present in the Fraud Squad there is only one outsider, who is an accountant. That person is waiting for a decision to be made on an upgrading of his job so that he can be paid a higher salary. Naturally, with the experience that he has, he would like to stay in the Fraud Squad. However, there is a position vacant in the Office of Corporate Affairs that offers the kind of money that the Government is talking about offering in the Police Department. He has applied for that job and may be appointed to that position.

So the Fraud Squad is going to lose a staff member—a civilian worker, admittedly—who, in his capacity as an accountant, is an expert in detecting fraud, who can sit down and very quickly find where company directors have been defrauding people. The Police Department is going to let this person go because the process of making a decision is

going to take too long. As I understand it, by the end of the year a decision will be made which in effect will result in an upgrading of his present position. If the Government wants to be decisive, it should get in now and make a decision about it.

A constable in the Fraud Squad who likes his job and who has gone about obtaining a degree in accountancy is seeking a job outside the police force as an accountant where he will receive a lot more money than he gets in the police force. The Police Department is presently in the process of creating two junior positions in the Fraud Squad for accountants. Applicants for those positions will be required to have the same credentials as this person already has, yet they are going to be paid more money than he is at present. So a person who has furthered his education and wishes to stay in the Fraud Squad is going to be pushed out of the police force. One cannot blame anybody who has the credentials for applying for a job for which he would receive greater remuneration.

Mr Lester: I have asked that that be looked at today. I can't give you an answer, but I sympathise with what you are saying.

Mr MACKENROTH: I appreciate that. I raised this matter tonight in the hope that the Minister would say that.

The Fraud Squad receives a lot of complaints. Sometimes it is a year before the complaints are investigated. When people walk in the door of the Fraud Squad they are told, "The backlog is so great that we will get to it when we can. That may be in a year." We certainly do not want to lose two of the best operators in the Fraud Squad. Anything the Minister can do to ensure that those people remain in the Fraud Squad would be appreciated not only by that squad but also by the people of Queensland.

Court procedures need to be streamlined so that police officers do not spend days sitting in corridors waiting to give evidence. The Police Department, in conjunction with the Justice Department, needs to examine the way in which police officers are summonsed to give evidence so that these officers are not spending days just sitting around waiting to give evidence.

I believe that there is a need for a branch of the Bureau of Criminal Intelligence outside police headquarters. It is absurd that undercover officers are allowed to grow their hair long, wear ear-rings, grow moustaches and do whatever else is necessary so that they do not look like police officers, and then they are told, "Report to police headquarters to see your superior officer." That is ridiculous. The lives of undercover officers could be in danger if some of these members of the underworld knew that they were police officers. Those officers should not be required to report to their superior officers in police headquarters.

The purchasing procedures within the Police Department need to be examined. I find it incredible that the Police Department, through directions from Government, is required to purchase police vehicles that have the best resale value, which means that inferior cars are purchased. Inferior cars are purchased instead of cars fitted with what is called a pursuit suspension pack, which are so set up that a police officer who is engaged in a high-speed chase has the best opportunity of keeping that car on the road and preventing it from rolling over in an accident. Those cars are not purchased because they have a poor resale value. The majority of police cars are sold to taxi-operators and the majority of taxi-operators do not want cars fitted with the pursuit suspension pack because it is very heavy and uncomfortable for their passengers. This Government buys not what will be best for the police officers, but what will be best for the taxi-operators when the car has done the required number of kilometres. That is a ridiculous way of looking at it. I mentioned earlier that fax machines should be provided to each and every police station in the State.

Right throughout this year, I have stated that the Labor Opposition in this State does support the police force. We are concerned about the trials that police officers have been through. This year, I have endeavoured to make statements whenever possible that

are supportive of the police force. I believe those statements have been responsible and could be read by police officers to be supportive.

When incidents occur such as those in Toowoomba or on Thursday Island, the police force deserves and requires criticism from the Opposition in this Parliament. That is exactly what they get and what they will continue to get from me. If people behave in an irresponsible manner, they deserve criticism; but the vast majority of police officers in Queensland do better than that. I have endeavoured, in the statements that I have made, to push the Government into doing something better and I will continue to do that because the police force deserves better than it has received and, under a Labor Government, it will receive better.

As I have said throughout my speech, the police force does not want words; it wants action. I know that the Minister is good at getting his picture in the newspaper or his face on television. That is fine, but that is not what is required. I do not mind his getting his picture in the paper, but I do mind his sitting on a police motor cycle that the department already owns. I would prefer him to get his picture in the paper purchasing a new one, or putting a fax machine in an office.

Mr Lester: We are getting some new bikes.

Mr MACKENROTH: Well, the next time he has his picture taken on a motor cycle, could he wear a helmet, because it is against the law to ride a motor cycle without one? I thought the Minister may not be aware of that.

Mr Lester: I am more than happy to answer that. The motor cycle was stationary.

Mr MACKENROTH: I realised that it was still on the stand, because it was still upright.

The police force needs support. The Labor Party has given it support and will continue to give it support. I hope that, with the appointment of the new commissioner, which will come about following the passage of this Bill, the police force is taken off the front page of the newspaper for doing wrong things and is put on the front page for doing what the people of Queensland want, that is, getting out and stopping crime and detecting the people who commit crimes.

Mr GYGAR (Stafford) (8.13 p.m.): This Bill comes before the House on a very auspicious day for the police force of Queensland. It is the day on which some people of this State have been introduced to the man who the Government tells us is the Government's choice as Police Commissioner. He has not yet been appointed, because this Bill has not been passed. There has been no consultation with anybody else about who should be appointed. But he is the Government's choice. He was introduced to some people. Some people were invited and others were not. The Opposition spokesman said that this morning he received a belated invitation to this function. He did better than I, because I did not get an invitation at all, which is clearly——

Mr Hamill interjected.

Mr GYGAR: Let us be serious for a moment. The great underlying feature of the Fitzgerald report——

Mr LESTER: I rise to a point of order. The honourable member might recall that everybody was invited to that function. I did it here in the Parliament.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Row): Order! I take it that the honourable member for Stafford accepts the Minister's explanation?

Mr GYGAR: I accept the Minister's explanation. I am glad to receive it because it is indicative of the Minister's attitude and I will spend a few minutes talking about it. The Minister's attitude is that he does not pay any regard or heed to this Parliament and the special position occupied in it by the shadow Ministers in the opposition parties.

In fact, if he has read the Fitzgerald report, he has failed to understand it or, at the bottom line, he has failed to absorb it.

As I was saying when he took the point of order, the fundamental and underlying feature of the Fitzgerald report was the way the Executive Government has treated the Parliament and the processes of the Parliament with absolute contempt. I must say that this Minister is off to a very bad start for a man who says that he is concerned about the Fitzgerald report. By totally failing to comply with the specific recommendation of Mr Fitzgerald that there should be consultation with opposition shadow Ministers before any appointment or announcement of a new Police Commissioner, the Minister has brought the new commissioner in under a shadow.

All of Queensland should have been out there saying, "Look, it is open; it is above board. This man is obviously the best. Let's get behind him." But what do we find? The Minister has contemptuously ignored Fitzgerald and contemptuously ignored this Parliament. I remind him while he is sitting there smirking on the front bench that I specifically asked him a question in this House——

Mr LESTER: I rise to a point of order. I think the member for Stafford is behaving in a most irresponsible manner. I absolutely resent the remark that I am smirking and, just for his information, I used this Parliament to invite everybody to this function and I think the member should wake up to himself.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member to withdraw the words that he used.

Mr GYGAR: Well, I withdraw the fact that the Minister could be smirking. I cannot be held responsible for his facial gestures, but he can be held responsible for his actions.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! If I uphold a point of order, I expect it to be accepted by the member who has the call.

Mr GYGAR: I withdraw the remark, as I said, Mr Deputy Speaker.

What the Minister has just demonstrated again is that he is three miles behind the aeroplane. I was not talking about the invitation; I was reminding the Minister of the question that he was asked on notice in this House on Tuesday of last week.

The Minister had two weeks to consider the question and to get advice on it. The question was: as the announcement of the new Police Commissioner is obviously imminent, when will the consultation with the shadow Minister as recommended by Mr Fitzgerald take place? The Minister did not answer the question. He brushed it off, laughed it away and treated the Parliament and its processes with contempt. The Minister is off to a very shaky start.

Today in this House the annual report of the Police Department and the report of the Police Complaints Tribunal were tabled. Just after 10 o'clock this morning the Minister announced that he would table the reports and moved that they be printed. Obviously the Minister and his department have a total lack of understanding of what is going on in the parliamentary system. At about 3 o'clock this afternoon I received my copy of the report after it had finally made its way round the Parliament.

The Minister claims that I am not being reasonable. I will get reasonable when he gets reasonable and starts to show that he has an appreciation and an understanding of the Westminster system; when he starts to act in a responsible manner. It is irresponsible of the Minister to ignore totally Mr Fitzgerald's recommendations for consultation and it is irresponsible of the Minister to ignore the role and function of the shadow Minister in this House by not inviting him to the official function that was held for the new Police Commissioner.

According to Erskine May and other publications that have been written about the Westminster system, shadow Ministers have a specific role to play in this Parliament and should be recognised as such. Mr Fitzgerald stated that that was the case; but when

will the Government start to act on it? Until it does, it cannot complain about getting a few kicks for it.

The Minister knew that this Bill would be debated today in the House, and it would have cost nothing to ensure that copies of those reports were delivered to the honourable member for Chatsworth and me. But did that happen? Of course not! I do not believe that the Minister has the vaguest understanding of what Mr Fitzgerald was saying. Regrettably there will be no support for the Minister and his department until we start to see actions instead of words. The opposition does not want to see a lot; it just wants an indication.

I suggest that the Minister takes a glance at some of his ministerial colleagues who are demonstrating a quite different attitude. I will not name them in case I embarrass them, but some of the Minister's colleagues understand how the system works.

During the past month or so two successive Governments have acknowledged that they accept the Fitzgerald report "lock, stock and barrel". The underlying feature of the report was a recognition of the role of the Parliament as a check and balance against the Executive and the role of shadow Ministers in the public accountability of the police force and the Government. I do not know what has happened with Mr Mackenroth, but since the Fitzgerald report was released I have not received any formal contact from either the Minister's department or the Police Department.

Mr Mackenroth interjected.

Mr GYGAR: I suppose that is a formal contact. The honourable member has done better than I have done.

The Minister must realise that he is responsible to this Parliament; that other members have a role to play in this Parliament; and that, until he starts to recognise that role, the Minister will get a hard time not through ill will or malice but through the desperation of members of this House to ensure that the Fitzgerald report at least hits the deck.

It is time that the police force started to understand that it is not the personal tool of the Government; that it is responsible to the entire Parliament. Until some indications of that are seen, the Minister will not receive the trust of this Parliament.

At the end of this debate I will be asking for certain undertakings from the Minister. If they are not forthcoming, the Liberal Party foreshadows amendments to the Bill. Quite frankly, the Minister cannot be trusted. He has a dreadful track record.

Mr LESTER: I rise to a point of order. The attitude of the honourable member is absolutely disgusting. I find offensive the honourable member's statement that I cannot be trusted. I ask that it be withdrawn.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I accept the Minister's point of order. The honourable member will withdraw the offensive remark.

Mr GYGAR: I withdraw. I find offensive the Minister's statement that my attitude is disgusting. I ask that he withdraw that remark.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I accepted the Minister's point of order and asked that the offensive remark be withdrawn. I did not anticipate that the honourable member would attempt to qualify his position. The honourable member will withdraw unequivocally the remark.

Mr GYGAR: I withdraw the words unequivocally.

On a point of order, I find offensive the Minister's remark that my attitude is disgusting. I ask that he withdraw it.

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

Mr GYGAR: Everybody knows how the rules are played.

Let me turn now to the speech of Mr Mackenroth. For the first 20 minutes of his speech, the shadow Minister found it necessary to give me a hard time. Obviously he has misunderstood and has failed to come to grips with the reasons why the Liberal Party has objections to this Bill. Let me go through them.

The thrust of the Fitzgerald report and its recommendations about the way in which the new Police Commissioner—the interim commissioner—should be appointed was fairly clear. Mr Fitzgerald said that the commissioner should be appointed for an interim period of not more than three years.

The Bill makes no mention of any qualifying period whatsoever. That would not be a matter of any concern if what were being dealt with were amendments which were supposedly to form permanent parts of the ongoing Police Act. They are not. The Minister himself has stated that they are transitional amendments—features which are needed for the appointment of an interim commissioner and to carry forward for a limited period. If that is the case, why does the Bill not contain a clause spelling out that limitation period? Why does the Bill not do what the Minister says he is going to do?

I regret that I have to refer again to undertakings that have not been kept by the Government. It is not enough for the Government to stand up and say, “Trust us; we will do it”, because the Government stood up and said, “Trust us; we will consult with you about the appointments to the commission of inquiry into the judges.” That consultation did not take place. The Government said, “Trust us; we will implement the Fitzgerald inquiry recommendations”, which say that consultation should take place before the Police Commissioner is appointed. That did not happen.

In this case the Government stands up and says, “Trust us; we will only appoint him for three years.” I am afraid that that is not good enough. On two prior occasions the Government has not kept its word. I am afraid the patience of the Liberal Party is exhausted. From now on, if the Government gives its word, why does it not put it in the legislation? Hence the request, not unreasonable if the Government intends to implement the policies that it has stated, to appoint the interim commissioner for a period of only three years. Why not put it in the legislation?

I must admit that I failed to understand some of the points made by the honourable member for Chatsworth. The Fitzgerald report was quite clear in stating that the amendments that were required to the Police Act and to the police rules were to be developed by the new Police Commissioner in conjunction and in consultation with the CJC. We are told that the interim commissioner will soon be appointed. We are told that the CJC will be in place in a fortnight. Why then, if the Government is to comply with the Fitzgerald report recommendations, has it not placed a sunset clause in this Bill? If that clause is not inserted, massive amendments to the Police Act will be made in this Parliament some time in the March session next year.

If that is the case, why is this transitional Bill not fitted with a sunset clause? There is no reason not to do it. I invite the Minister to indicate to the House why he has not included provisions in this Bill for a three-year limitation on the appointment, if that is what he intends to do, as he has said. If the Government intends to comply with the recommendations of the Fitzgerald inquiry, why is there no sunset clause in the Bill? Without such a clause it is inexorable and inevitable that more amendments to this Act will have to be introduced in March to rescind the provisions that are currently contained in this legislation.

I turn now to my third point, which has been publicised. It relates to matters of objection to this Bill. I point out to the Minister that his second-reading speech does not comply with the provisions of the Bill about which it relates. As this is the most

appropriate time to deal with it, I refer in passing to the provisions of specific clauses of the Bill. On page 4 of the Minister's speech notes the following appears—

“Clause 10 inserts a new section in the present Act so as to provide legal protection to the vetting process”—

and this is the important part—

“and to suspend the promotional appeal system in cases where the chairman of the commission deems it necessary.”

In other words, the promotional appeal system will continue, but in specific cases the chairman of the commission will be given the power to suspend it when he deems it necessary. Reference to the Bill shows that that is not what this Bill would implement. The Bill states—

“No appeal shall be commenced or continued against a promotion in the Police Force, on and from . . . until a date specified by Proclamation, without the prior written consent of the chairman . . .”

I suggest to the Minister that it is quite a different thing to say that they are all allowed except for the ones that are prohibited and to also say that they are all prohibited except for the ones that are allowed. That used to be the old, classic definition of the difference between a dictatorship and a democracy. In a democracy, everything is permitted except that which is prohibited. In a dictatorship, everything is prohibited except that which is allowed. It is six of one and half a dozen of the other.

Have the Minister's intentions been misconstrued by the draftsman? Or has his speech-writer failed to read the Bill? I do not know which. But the House deserves to know on this important matter—and it is quite important as to the way the appeals will be run—whether the appeal system will be suspended completely, subject to some exceptions. Or does the Minister see the appeal system continuing except occasionally when it is thought to be inappropriate, and rather than producing evidence of that and having to submit it to any sort of a tribunal hearing, the CJC commissioner is given the power that was hinted at by Fitzgerald to say, “Look, we don't want to prove it at this stage, but there is such a sufficient cloud involved in this incident that we do not think an appeal should be allowed over a passed-over promotion.”?

I suggest to the Minister that the difference between those propositions is quite fundamental. I can assure him that it is one that will attract significant industrial interest from the policemen who have to work under it. I am surprised that the members of the Labor Party have not taken this matter up. This is surely a significant industrial issue. It is one that changes the whole playing-field with regard to appeals against promotion. It is one that needs to be clarified.

As I said, the commissioner to be appointed under the provisions of this Bill is appointed for three years. It does not say that in the Bill, but that is what the Minister has told us. So for the moment that can be presumed until we have had a chance to consider the Liberal Party's amendments. I foreshadow that at the Committee stage an amendment will be moved to clause 4 to insert a limitation as to the period of appointment for not more than three years.

I also foreshadow an amendment to clause 10 to insert a new clause which will include a sunset provision to ensure that the clause will expire on 1 July 1990—a date well after the period by which the Parliament could reasonably expect the new Police Act and rules, developed by the new commissioner in consultation with the CJC, being ready for presentation and for passage through the Parliament.

It is only appropriate to mention other matters that were raised in the annual report of the Police Complaints Tribunal and in the annual report of the Police Department. In its dying hours, the Police Complaints Tribunal has at last submitted a report that sums up the situation as it really is. Over the years, the Police Complaints Tribunal has been the subject of a number of debates in this Parliament. At times it has been roundly criticised although, I must admit, only after the balloon had gone up. Most of the time

prior to that, although unhappy with its performance, members were a little reluctant to stand up and say that something should be done about it.

It must be clearly understood by whoever wishes to carry out the function of investigating complaints against police officers that never again can a review tribunal be allowed to be merely reactive. It must be pro-active. That was a defect in the Police Complaints Tribunal. The attention of this House to that fault has been drawn by me and other members over a period of four years. The Police Complaints Tribunal was established to look into reports of misbehaviour and misconduct by police officers. It was not established merely to look into reports of specific complaints, but rather matters that were general knowledge in the community at large. The earlier Police Complaints Tribunal failed to meet that requirement and failed to fulfil that responsibility. It saw itself as a purely reactive body and, even worse—as the tribunal now acknowledges—it failed to take sufficiently strong action when the Police Commissioner and the Acting Police Commissioner from time to time completely rejected the advice that they were given by the Tribunal. They determined instead that they would act in their own way, regardless.

Any tribunal that has as its charge the maintenance of propriety in any organisation must have a pro-active, not merely a reactive, role. The Liberal Party will be examining that fundamental role when the EARC and CJC Bills are presented. If the tribunals are merely permitted to wait until someone complains and are unable to take on board matters of notoriety, they will be toothless tigers.

Perhaps the most significant and concise item of the annual report of the Police Department is the one appearing on page 81. One small line sums up entirely the problems of the police force in terms of its operational conduct. The line is the heading "Population to Police" and it accompanies a table showing the ratio of population to police officers. It clearly demonstrates that Queensland has the most undermanned and overstretched police force in Australia. The table shows that Queensland provides one police officer for every 527 members of the public. I suggest that the Northern Territory is the nearest comparison to Queensland and it provides one police officer for 207 members of the public.

Queensland is the most decentralised State in Australia. That factor leads to problems associated with adequate manning levels in the police force. For example, it means that staffing ratios may be quite adequate in cities and suburban areas but totally inadequate in rural districts. It must be acknowledged that Queensland has more isolated rural towns than all the other Australian States put together. It does not matter how small Augathella is because it has to have a policeman. Birdsville and Burketown are in the same category.

People in these isolated centres simply have to have police officers. In small centres, the population to police ratio will be quite favourable which should surely mean that Queensland should show the best ratio of population to police in Australia, if Queenslanders can expect to have the same standard of service, efficiency and competence in the police force as any other State in Australia and if Queenslanders are going to give police officers a fair go in carrying out their duties.

I am sure that other honourable members have exactly the same problems in their electorates as those I have described in mine. The north side of Brisbane simply does not have enough mobile patrols to go round. The situation is the same on the south side, the Gold Coast and everywhere else.

Local police stations are closed far too often for them to offer an adequate standard of service to the community. In my electorate, all the local hoons know when the Stafford Police Station closes. They know the nights on which it closes at 11 o'clock, 1 o'clock and 10 o'clock, and on which nights the patrol car is gone at midnight. I know the nights because my phone starts ringing at midnight. When the young hoons start playing up at the trouble-spots, mobile patrols are too overstretched to respond to complaints, except emergencies. The local residents are being driven crazy.

I inform the Minister and the Premier that over the next couple of weeks they will be receiving many, many letters from the people who live in the Stafford electorate because cards have been distributed that state, "Mr Minister, I called the police and they couldn't come. We want more police in our area so that we can have an adequate service." The service that these people receive at the moment is simply unacceptably low. The low level of service is not due to any fault of the police force or to the fault of any men or women who are patrolling the streets, but to the fault of the Government. This Government has known since 1983 that an expansion program of the police force was needed so that manpower levels could be built up. Queensland has had the lowest manpower levels in Australia for seven years, but nothing significant has been done to change that. Last year only 100 additional police officers were provided for the whole State of Queensland and in the same year, Mr Fitzgerald stated that Queensland's police force manpower level was 2 700 fewer than the required level. One might wish to dispute the basis of Mr Fitzgerald's mathematics and there might be a valid argument to suggest that the figure is not really 2 700, but 1 700. However, I believe that most people accept that the figure is at least 1 700. There is a desperate need for increased numbers of police officers to patrol the streets in Queensland.

In this year's State Budget there were no provisions whatsoever for an increase in police-training facilities. The police colleges simply cannot cope. I am advised that, even if they ran at maximum capacity for 52 weeks of the year, on a mathematical projection it would take 14 years to train all the police officers necessary to give Queensland a police-to-population ratio that reaches the Australia average. The Government needs to commit itself to a rapid and immediate expansion of police-training facilities so that we can start to train the police officers who are needed to do the job out in the community. Other initiatives can also be implemented, and I commend the honourable member for Chatsworth for his suggestions. He must have read my policy documents in the last few weeks. Such things as computerised word-processing systems in police stations and pre-printed forms from laser printers would cut down the unnecessary burden of non-productive paperwork that police men and women are forced to bear.

Sir William Knox: They are still hand-writing reports.

Mr GYGAR: Yes. As the honourable member for Nundah said, they are still hand-writing reports.

Police should be policing and typists should be typing, because it costs the Government much less to hire and train typists who could do the job better than highly skilled and trained police men and women. The police should be out on the streets engaged in crime prevention, because, when it all boils down, that is what the police force is for.

There is a huge argument about efficiency and effectiveness, but personally I would like Queensland to have the most inefficient police force in Australia if efficiency is measured by how many crooks per hour each policeman is arresting. I would rather there were no criminals for policemen to arrest, because when we reach that stage the police force has reached maximum effectiveness. They will be preventing crime before it occurs. The major thrust of a police force is not the chasing and prosecuting of criminals; it is the prevention of crime before it occurs. When police get into the syndrome of having no time between investigations to carry out crime-prevention work, they are sentenced to the option of being ineffectual. This major problem of police manpower and equipment must be thoroughly and completely addressed. No matter who the commissioner is, how good he is or how well intentioned he and his force are, Queensland's police officers will be unable to perform to the standard that they and the public expect until this Government makes a commitment to proper resources, proper manpower and total political support.

Mr SMITH (Townsville East) (8.41 p.m.): My contribution to this debate will be comparatively brief. Nothing that the Liberal spokesman has said in half an hour has convinced me that there is anything wrong with the legislation, but I share his concern

that the Opposition was not involved more in the consultative process. I thought that the Minister would have been prepared to go to some lengths to get the matter of the appointment of the Commissioner of Police off the political agenda, but that has not happened. It is a pity.

One thing that happened today is typical of what occurs in this Parliament. The Police Act Amendment Bill is being debated tonight and only today were the police and Police Complaints Tribunal reports circulated. Surely these reports could be circulated some time before a debate is due in the House. It happens all the time. Another incident occurred yesterday when I was chastised by the Minister for not having read a particular document. I said that I had not had the opportunity to see it this year. However, I checked today and found out that it was issued in July, but the mailing list was at the discretion of the Minister. That means that Government members received that document—the one containing details of the phantom projects in Queensland, such as Port Petersen costing \$350m—but it was not sent to the Opposition. I find this irritating and irresponsible.

One of the matters I was pleased that Mr Fitzgerald addressed concerns the recruitment of mature police officers. There are certain advantages in recruiting people to the force who have had work experience in a range of occupations. Also, if after some time those officers, be they male or female, find that a career in the police force is not to their liking, they have an opportunity to return to their previous occupation. That happens in the airline industry. For exactly that purpose, the airline companies changed from recruiting very junior people to recruiting people with greater maturity. Today most people are better educated and there is an expectation in the community that people will change jobs. There is no reason why police officers should be exempt from that expectation.

Management skills are terribly necessary in this complex world. If people have no concept of how organisations operate, it is difficult to police, and I am sure that the new commissioner would agree. I am pleased that in tonight's television interview the new Police Commissioner expressed support for the RBT program and video and audio-taping of evidence. I was a little surprised when he said that he could pick corrupt police officers, which is a remarkable statement. I have visited several gaols in my previous capacity as shadow Minister for prisons and was amazed to see all the different types of people. I would say that many of the people on the inside bear some resemblance to some members opposite. However, I think it is very difficult to pick someone out as a potentially bent officer based purely on his appearance. I hope that some time down the track the commissioner will clarify that statement.

Another Fitzgerald matter that the commissioner will have to address is the suggestion that in certain circumstances police could operate independently rather than in two-man teams. In operational situations, I do not know that I would buy that. However, sometimes two police go out to serve very simple notices or to check up on people's driver's licences and that type of thing. Quite clearly, that should be a civilian responsibility. It is certainly a waste of police resources to send out two police.

Police are also subjected to instances of having their time wasted. Most members of Parliament have experienced complaints about the police. The large majority of them are anonymous. I never act on those anonymous complaints. However, some do prove to have substance. Before Fitzgerald, particularly people who happened to be public servants coming in with problems, I had no choice but to advise them in good conscience not to take the matter to the Police Complaints Tribunal, because it seemed inevitable that there would be some sort of a pay-back down the road. All of those issues need to be addressed.

I wish to mention the case of a supposedly responsible leading citizen in the community who deliberately wasted the time of police. This gentleman was apprehended by a radar patrol at 6.45 p.m. on 15 February this year. His conversation with police was taped. Until the celebrated Richard Carleton case, I did not know that police taped those types of conversations following traffic incidents. In fact, this person was caught

travelling at 78 kilometres per hour. The police, as they always do, asked this man why he was speeding and he said that he had been called to the Good Shepherd Hospice, a facility in Townsville. He gave that as his reason for travelling at speed.

The police were then obliged to follow that up, so they went to the Good Shepherd Hospice and spoke to the sister on duty, who informed them that no call had been made from there. The police then found that a patient in that hospice had been asked to say that she had initiated the call. The next day the police had to go there again to double check with the matron of that facility, Matron Bushby, who was quite definite that no call had been made from the Good Shepherd Hospice. I could provide the names of the patient and the sister on duty, but I will not do that.

The person involved is Dr Tom Pietzsch, who is well known for preaching to the community at large. He is a frequent letter-writer to the newspaper. He is for ever attacking the Medicare system. He generally attempts to set community standards, but he is not maintaining those standards himself. He told an outright lie. No call had been made. He is to be charged with hindering police. I was concerned because we are now into the tenth month and that charge has not been laid. I understand it is in the system. I have no particular reason to believe that it is being held back. It will probably take that long for it to wind through the bureaucratic system.

I find it rather disconcerting that anyone, more particularly a leading citizen, could put himself in a position that warranted such a charge. That does not set much of an example to the rest of the community. The Minister is placed in a difficult position over this, because now he is not only Minister for Police but also Minister for Training, which embraces TAFE colleges. The gentleman of whom I am speaking is the chairman of the Townsville TAFE board. That puts the Minister in a rather difficult position, but I hope that he will address the matter.

I wish to touch briefly on the celebrated Shrebniak land case, which has been mentioned in this House on several occasions. Briefly, the story revolves round a land swap involving people who are known National Party supporters. This is an example of how police are put into impossible situations and used as tools. I have found out that, following the swap of Black River land for some land at Belgian Gardens, nobody ever asked the police whether they thought it was a suitable piece of land for their use. Down the track, the Government agreed to the swap, and presumably it has gone through.

For a couple of weeks there was a new Minister, Mr Gilmore. There was correspondence with Mr Gilmore and a meeting between the interested parties. For the first time the police were consulted and they immediately said that the piece of land at the Black River that had been traded with the Shrebniaks was totally unsuitable. It would mean that police would be wasting their time taking drunken persons some kilometres out of town to the facility. That would be a thoroughly time-wasting exercise. I put it to the Minister that the police also have to be protected from that sort of thing. Police are few in number; we want more; but we certainly do not want their time wasted by being caught up with that sort of thing or by being mucked around by people who deliberately hinder their activities.

I hope that the Minister will ensure that the case that I mentioned earlier is not buried and that it is brought on for hearing as soon as possible to give the gentleman an opportunity to clear his name or to receive the penalty which should be imposed if he is found to be guilty. I believe he will be found guilty, because the episode is on tape.

Mr PREST (Port Curtis) (8.53 p.m.): I join the Opposition spokesman on Police in extending a welcome to the new Police Commissioner. We wish him well. Unfortunately, over the past years in Queensland the Police Department, under the previous commissioner, Mr Lewis, was merely an arm of the Government. We hope that that will not be the case in future. It was not only an arm of the Government; it was the arm of people who held high office in the National Party in Queensland. Mr Fitzgerald

found that the Police Commissioner was merely doing as directed by the knights of this great State.

I wish to talk about a better deal for the police in Queensland. From time to time, we read that the police are understaffed and underarmed. That is a fact.

Mr Lester: Are you going to come and see me when I go to Gladstone?

Mr PREST: Yes. I am always there.

On 28 August last year, a newspaper article reported—

“Detective Sergeant George Sharry, in charge of the armed hold-up squad, said: ‘The reduction of armed hold-ups this year could stem from the arrest and conviction of multiple offenders . . . ’”

Unfortunately, on 6 August one year later, the same officer referred to more statistics. A newspaper article titled, “More violence in hold-ups. Nasty turn in robberies”, stated—

“Queensland was rocked by 239 armed hold-ups last year which netted the robbers hundreds of thousands of dollars.

The criminals’ main targets from June 30, 1988, to April 30, 1989, were banks (67), service stations (22), building societies (14) and shops (16).”

In 1988 Detective Sharry stated that armed hold-ups had fallen by 40, but in 1989 he stated that they had increased by 35.

Unfortunately, the morale of the police is very low. The police force is understaffed. Officers are required to attend robberies without the protection of vests. Honourable members will remember the episode when Paul Mullin was shot during an attempted arrest.

A newspaper article of 18 September 1989 was headed—

“Mobiles police ‘buy own torch batteries’ ”.

It is shocking that the Police Department does not have funds to buy those small items for police officers. The article says—

“Mobiles police had no hand-held radios, bought batteries for their torches and rarely went on patrol, the Police Union president, Sgt John O’Gorman, said yesterday.

Sgt O’Gorman, a supervisor with mobiles, said the unit was dangerously short staffed and ill-equipped to respond to crime at night.

‘It’s pretty awful—there is little preventive work done and we are so flat out responding to calls many cars can go a whole night without conducting a single patrol . . . ’”

They are the things that are occurring. As Mr Mackenroth said, at night Brisbane is handed over to criminals. Offences are being committed. Plain clothes police officers do not have police cars and have to take a bus from point A to point B to carry out their duties. With a new Police Minister and a new Police Commissioner, I hope that funding of Queensland’s police force will increase.

It is essential to have a good relationship between the police force and the public. I will refer to two episodes that occurred last year. A policeman entered a yard at Tannum Sands, which is in Mrs McCauley’s electorate. No-one was home. The visit concerned a trivial matter. He could have returned when someone was home. However, he knocked on the door. The dog was locked in the garage. When no-one responded and the dog kept barking, the police officer let the dog out of the garage, pulled out his service revolver and shot the dog in the yard. That happened on 28 April 1988. On 21 July 1989—15 months later—I received a response from the then Minister for Police, Mr Russell Cooper, who said—

“Dear Mr. Prest,

I refer to the complaint of Mrs. Susan Williams dated 29th April, 1988, concerning the destruction of her dog by a police officer on 28th April, 1988.

The Acting Commissioner of Police has advised me that this matter has been investigated by a Commissioned Officer of Police.

I understand the police officer concerned has been interviewed and has denied all allegations of impropriety on his part.

The Acting Commissioner of Police further advised that this matter has also been examined by the Solicitor General, who has advised that it appears the Sergeant did have reasonable excuse for entering the premises.

On the evidence available, the Acting Commissioner of Police considers there is in sufficient evidence to warrant or justify any disciplinary action being taken against the police officer.

Therefore, it is not proposed to take any further action in regard to the matter.

Your attention is drawn to Section 18 (3) of the Police Complaints Tribunal Act of 1987. Should Mrs. Williams not be satisfied with the outcome of this investigation, she may make a further complaint to the Police Complaints Tribunal.

Yours sincerely,
Russell Cooper"

I think that that sort of thing could have been avoided. The dog was locked away. It was not attacking the sergeant. I hope that these sorts of things will not happen again in the future. It is not good public relations for the force. The sergeant left the dog lying in the yard. When the owner arrived home the neighbours said, "The police came and shot your dog."

On 20 June this year I received a letter from a firm of solicitors in relation to a raid on the Showmans Guild while the Gladstone show was under way. A similar letter was sent to the inspector of police, at Gladstone, and also to the Police Complaints Tribunal. That letter states—

"Dear Sir,

We advise that we have been consulted by the undermentioned persons who are either members of the Showmans Guild of Australasia or travelling with a member of that Guild, either as a guest or employee . . ."

He then goes on to list some eight names. The letter continues—

"Each of the abovenamed persons instruct this firm to file complaints on their behalf arising out of the actions of approximately ten Police Officers in the early hours of Thursday, 8th June, 1989. We are instructed that the following events took place:

Our clients occupied caravans set up in Scenery Street, Gladstone, which is closed for the week for the Gladstone Show, in a area set apart for them.

At about 6 a.m. to 6.30 a.m. on 8th June 1989 we are instructed that a number of Police entered various caravans, without permission, failed to produce identification on request, used unlawful force and acted in a manner calculated to intimidate and harass people conducting themselves lawfully and in a proper manner. Messrs. Miller, Trevors and Johnson are long standing members of the Showmans Guild of Australasia and have stated that they have never in the past been subjected to such harassment, and consider that as a group of persons they have been improperly harassed as a group allegedly in the course of Police investigations.

Brief statements have been obtained from five persons"—

and I have copies of those five statements—

"as being representative of the group and of the conduct of the officers generally. Statements given by those persons, namely Kenneth Langtree, Karren Miller, George Woolley, Candice Ross and Arthur Bettridge, are enclosed.

In discussions with Sergeant L. Burt and Sergeant Secker and various members of the Showmans Guild (discussions at which the writer was present)"—

and that was the solicitor—

"it was alleged by Sergeant Burt that the purpose of the presence of ten Police Officers at 6 a.m. was to check amusement licence permits issued by the Justice Department.

Members of the Guild produced licences which clearly indicate that same were issued in respect of premises used for amusement and are required by regulation to be kept at the place of amusement. Members of the Guild believe that they are not obliged to produce permits unless they are conducting a place of amusement and also only required to produce the permits at a time when such place is open for business.

It is the view of members of the Showmans Guild that the Officers exceeded their authority by requesting production of amusement permits—

- (a) at a time when the place of amusement was not open for business; and
- (b) at a place other than the place at which the amusement is being conducted.

Other complaints in relation to the actions of Officers are—

1. Police Officers entered caravans without possessing a warrant for that purpose;
2. Officers failing to produce identification when requested to do so;
3. In the case of Miss Candice Ross, being forcibly taken to the Police Station without warrant.

It is considered an abuse of the powers given Police Officers under the Drugs Misuse Act to conduct a drug search of premises and invoke the powers to detain without any grounds whatsoever for suspicion (except a refusal to give name and produce identification).

Sergeants Burt and Secker later stated that in addition to inspecting permits they were looking for two persons wanted on warrants of commitment for non payment of traffic fines. Again, there was an absence of grounds for suspecting that the persons wanted were present on the site and certainly no grounds for suspicion that either person was an occupant of any particular caravan.

We would ask that the actions of the Officers involved on the morning of Thursday 8th June be fully investigated and if it is confirmed that those Officers exceeded their authority, that action be taken to ensure they are made fully aware of the limits of their authority and that action be taken to prevent any repetition of the conduct displayed on this occasion.

We would mention that a copy of this letter and the Statements is being forwarded to the following persons—

- (a) The Honourable Mr. T. R. Cooper, Minister for Police;
- (b) The Police Complaints Tribunal;
- (c) Mr Bill Prest, M.L.A. and member for Port Curtis.”

At this point in time, some three or four months later, no replies have been received to that letter of complaint. I would say that is quite understandable when one considers that it took some 15 months to answer a complaint about an officer shooting a dog.

I draw those matters to the Minister's attention in the hope that they will not be repeated. I believe that in the first instance it was unnecessary to shoot the dog. I also believe that checking on permits at 6 a.m., only a few hours before a show was about to start, was not in order and that 6 a.m. is not a proper time to conduct such a raid.

It is to be hoped that things will be swept clean by the new broom of this new commissioner and that there will be a greater understanding between members of the public and members of the police force.

Hon. V. P. LESTER (Peak Downs—Minister for Police and Minister for Employment, Training and Industrial Affairs) (9.08 p.m.), in reply: I thank the honourable members for Chatsworth, Stafford, Townsville East and Port Curtis for their contributions.

At the outset, the Parliament should record its pleasure at the appointment of the interim commissioner, Mr Newnham. It does appear that there is unanimous good will in that regard. He has an outstanding record in Victoria in all facets of the police force. There is not one ounce of suspicion about him or any of his actions and I have heard only good reports.

The Opposition spokesman put a lot of effort into his speech and I commend him for it. What he said was very constructive. As the new Minister for Police I will endeavour to take up a lot of the suggestions.

Mr Mackenroth: You didn't say that on ABC radio the other day. You said I wasn't a gentleman.

Mr LESTER: Perhaps the honourable member has mended his ways. We might have needed a little bout of fisticuffs at the beginning, and now we seem to be getting down to something rational. That is very good and I hope it can continue in a sensible way.

I do not intend to reply in detail to all that the honourable member said. I have noted all of his comments and I hope that there will be action in some of those areas.

The honourable member for Stafford said that nothing had been done. I cannot quite work out the wisdom of saying that. Immediately I became Minister, we moved on the promotions, and so we should have. The people were not under suspicion according to Mr Fitzgerald and, provided they were vetted, there was no reason why they could not be promoted. In fact, we went one better. We promoted them for 12 months to give the new commissioner time to assess their performance, something with which he agrees. Also it helps correct the superannuation difficulties. We have also moved in a number of other areas and it is hoped that there will be constant action.

Unfortunately, I cannot promise the world. I have budgetary problems. I will have a lot to do in helping the new commissioner restructure the force. I can assure honourable members that I will be fair dinkum about this job, as I was in my other portfolios.

Mr Smith: It is supposed to be one of the Premier's new priorities.

Mr LESTER: Well, I have the job now and I will handle that little battle.

Mr Casey: If you get on that motor bike you will get around faster.

Mr LESTER: Let me just get on with my summing-up and we will all get to bed earlier.

The honourable member for Townsville East commented on the police in general. I do not disagree with what he said.

The honourable member for Port Curtis raised a matter to which I will reply. It is sad when there is an incident such as a dog being shot. We cannot defend it. Certainly I hope that we can develop a spirit in the police force so that that sort of thing should not happen again or, if somebody has to do it, he feels very bad about it. We must get that gung-ho attitude out of some small sections of the police force.

I will leave it at that. I have taken on board everything that honourable members have said. Most of it is fairly relevant.

Quite frankly, there is no need for the sunset clause. The three years is there, and we are redoing the Bill. This is simply an enabling Bill to allow the appointment of the commissioner and to enable the vetting. I shall be moving an amendment to tidy up the superannuation. I thank honourable members for being involved.

Motion agreed to.

Committee

Hon. V. P. Lester (Peak Downs—Minister for Police and Minister for Employment, Training and Industrial Affairs) in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 3, as read, agreed to.

Clause 4—

Mr GYGAR (9.14 p.m.): Before proceeding with the amendment standing in my name, I want to point out that I was baffled by one thing the Minister said. In his summing-up, he said—I seek not to quote him out of context and I think I have his words correctly—“There is no need for a sunset clause. This is only a transitional Bill. The three years are there.” I will be the first to admit that I failed to detect that and I invite the Minister, before I proceed to the mechanism of moving my amendment, to inform me where the three years are and how is that taken on board in this process.

Mr LESTER: The first amendment that the honourable member has foreshadowed—

Mr Vaughan: He hasn't moved it yet.

Mr LESTER: I know that. It is as simple as this: the three years are there.

Mr MACKENROTH: Perhaps the Minister could clarify the position. Correct me if I am wrong, but is the Minister trying to say that the three years are written into the contract of employment that the new Police Commissioner is going to sign; that he will be employed for a period of three years and no more than three years, which is in line with what Tony Fitzgerald is asking? The Minister is not being very clear in what he is saying about the three years. Will it be a three-year contract of employment?

Mr LESTER: The three years of employment are in the contract and they are in line with Fitzgerald's recommendations. It is all in order.

Mr GYGAR: In a spirit of conciliation—and I hope that this is noted by the Minister, because it takes two to tango in this business—I accept the Minister's word and will not move the amendment that stands in my name.

Mr LESTER: It looks as though we are even and we can move together graciously to make the police force better.

Mr SCOTT: Clause 4 refers to the new subsection 5D—Delegation of powers and functions. The need to educate Aboriginal police is a very contentious and very important issue in my electorate.

I was impressed by the media coverage of the pre-legislative appointment of the new Police Commissioner, who made an impression this evening on television. As the day went by the jowls got darker and the dress changed from a Victorian police uniform to civilian clothes, but the impression of authority remained. Media reports have stated that the commissioner is a disciplinarian. If anything is needed in the police force, it is the right sort of discipline.

One issue that will be amongst the commissioner's many responsibilities is the education of Aboriginal police, which has never been given any attention by this Government despite much representation not only by me but also by people from the former Department of Aboriginal and Islander Affairs and what I would call the Aboriginal movement. In the past the Government made promises and claimed that something was being done, but nothing serious has been done.

I realise that the Minister is taking on board my comments, but I would like to see him nodding. It has been claimed that courses have been formulated for the education of Aboriginal police. In my experience in this matter, a very simple series of lecture notes was written by a senior sergeant on Thursday Island and an attempt was made by conscientious police officers, particularly on Thursday Island, to get Islander police, who are the equivalent of Aboriginal police, to come in from outer communities to take part in training seminars on Thursday Island.

During his earlier career an officer who is now an inspector was charged with the responsibility of not only educating Aboriginal policemen but also liaising with them and trying to smooth out the many problems that existed. However, no serious effort

was made to formulate an education course for Aboriginal police. The example for such a course exists in teaching. Only after a great deal of struggle did the Government make any real contribution towards training Aboriginal or Islander teachers, who have shown themselves to be an outstanding success.

For many years in the Torres Strait islands education was undertaken by the Department of Community Services and the Department of Aboriginal and Islander Affairs in extremely primitive circumstances. A small number of teachers were removed from the Education Department and transferred to the Department of Community Services. They were the European teachers on five island communities. The other eight island communities had Islander teachers who were responsible for education. They were Government teachers who were in charge of five or six teachers. On those other five islands there were four or five Islander teachers, which was a totally unsatisfactory method of education. For many years the results were apparent, so little progress was made in Aboriginal and Islander affairs. On the mainland of the strait, where the schools were almost up to the standard of the rest of Queensland, the standard was a little better, but in the Torres Strait islands it was extremely bad.

Following much representation and urging by a wide range of people, the Government decided that the Education Department would take over the responsibility for the education of Torres Strait island children and something quite amazing and almost magical happened. With the help of the Commonwealth Government, a vast amount of funding was provided for the upgrading of those schools and their teacher accommodation and a great transition of education occurred there. That is yet to happen in the police force.

The need for and the use of Aboriginal and Islander people in that area has very clearly been demonstrated. It is just not possible for mainstream-educated police officers to operate satisfactorily. That applies for a number of reasons. There are a whole range of things that pertain in Aboriginal communities of which European people have very little understanding. It is long past time for that to change. It applies particularly to police officers. I give the greatest commendation to police officers who are posted to those remote communities. It is not an easy job; it is not a particularly well-paid job and it is often not easy to get the appropriate posting after serving the relevant period of time in those remote areas.

I can recall an instance in one of the communities at which there was a fracas in which a rifle was produced by a local person. The European sergeant, as he was commonly called, was called on to work out how to cope with the situation. I give that sergeant the greatest credit. I hope he reads this in *Hansard*, because I do not intend to mention his name. He actually shot the rifle out of the hand of the local person. To my mind, it was an amazing feat for several reasons. I know what I would have been tempted to do. The average mortal with a gun in his hand, unfortunately, would have been tempted at least to shoot the person in the legs. But with calm and selective judgment and the accuracy that he had as a rifle-shot, this officer was able to take that action. It completely saved the day. That is one instance of the type of activity that police officers have to engage in in those communities.

At present, because they have the assistance of untrained Aboriginal police officers, it is quite amazing what can be achieved. Without the aid and assistance of those officers, the life of the European officer—the white policeman—would be so much harder. However, it would be so much better if the Aboriginal police had the proper training. This Government has to finally grasp the nettle and train them.

That is why I am choosing the debate on this clause to make suggestions about a formal course of education. The example is there in regard to the education of teachers. It has been undertaken by the appropriate teacher education colleges. The courses have been written, or they are following the ordinary teacher training courses. Those people have the primary and secondary education to enable them to enrol at those colleges of advanced education as trainee teachers and to undertake that training.

Perhaps no-one is asking that a course sufficiently rigorous, or rigorous to that extent, should be established at colleges of TAFE or at the Queensland Police Academy. But the Government should not do nothing, as it has done over so many years. It should not sit on its hands. I do not have a great deal of faith in the Minister. It might be a shame to stand here asking a man in whom members on this side of the Chamber do not have real faith to undertake that type of a project.

I will give one example of why we lack that faith. One of the concepts that have been bandied around and debated at trivial length in the media and other places is the separation of powers under the Westminster system. A classic example is a newly appointed Minister who, ignorant and inefficient as he is on police matters, pops himself into a police car and says, "Take me to Parliament House." It is a script out of *Z Cars*.

Mr R. J. Gibbs: "I am your leader."

Mr SCOTT: That is right. But what a shocking way to do it. What the Honourable Minister did not realise was that by doing that he was abandoning any concept of the separation of powers.

Mr Milliner: They think the separation of powers is a brewery term.

Mr SCOTT: I do not think the Minister would be subject to the effects of the Power's brew of the sort that the honourable member is talking about.

He was subject to the mental power brew: "I am the Minister. I am getting into the police car and I am going to ask to be taken to the House." It could have eventuated that the sergeant may have happened to say to the Minister, "Just because you are here, Mr Minister, and you are sympathetic, you know that damned inspector of mine, he doesn't know what he is doing." It cannot be said that that will not occur. That is the type of thing that the Minister is subjecting himself to by getting in a police car. There is only one way in which the Minister can have dealings with the Police Department and with police officers—apart from when he makes nicely rounded morale-building and uplifting speeches in front of their organisations, as he is quite entitled to do—and that is through the commissioner.

We saw another example when he tried to upstage the Premier. Mr Chairman, I realise that I am drifting away a little from clause 4.

Mr Mackenroth: It is as wide as anything. It deals with the whole role of the Police Minister.

Mr SCOTT: It is, inasmuch as it delineates the delegation of powers and functions.

Mr Casey: How come this Government has got very few of our black people in the police force—the ordinary students who go to our colleges now?

Mr SCOTT: That is a very good question. The fact is that the people in those communities have the necessary basic education. I do not know the answer.

Mr FitzGerald interjected.

Mr SCOTT: Was that a fair interjection from the new Minister for Community Services, or was it facetious? His department also has a lot of responsibility in this matter. It has never dealt with that. It is a wide clause—the delegation of powers—and it involves Mr FitzGerald's department. There is no doubt about it. He should ask his department why there has been no liaison; why there has been no driving force to try to get the former Police Minister to do certain things. I can see Mr FitzGerald nodding intelligently, so I will accept that non-verbal interjection. He does take on board the comments.

A clear example of what is expected of Aboriginal police at present appears in section 41 of the Community Services (Aborigines) Act, which states—

“An Aboriginal Council may by its by-laws or otherwise as it thinks fit charge Aboriginal police appointed for the area for which the council is established with responsibility for”—

and I draw honourable members' attention to the following words—

“ambulance services, fire-fighting services, emergency services and such other services associated with the local government of the area as it thinks fit.”

That is not the role of policemen of any sort. Policemen in mainland Queensland have a responsibility under SES legislation for moving in where necessary; but that, except in times of emergency, is a very minor part of their role. Their training fits them to move in—as the SES would, because of their education and training—to take control of an emergency. The Aboriginal policemen I am talking about have no training—not only in police work but also in such things as ambulance services, fire-fighting services and emergency services. Those skills are very important.

One could say that Aboriginal police should be proud to have the authority to move in and take control under those circumstances, but the clause is perpetuating what has been done in relation to Aboriginal affairs by the National Party Government since its inception, that is, putting down Aboriginal people. The clause should simply state that Aboriginal police will be trained because they are badly needed in those communities.

I commend the appointment of the commissioner. I commend the fact that this Bill provides for a delegation of powers. I am pleased to note that the Minister has taken on board comments relating to Aboriginal police. I urge the Minister and the department to use these delegated powers and take action in this most important area.

Mr LESTER: I thank the member for his comments. I have already indicated my concern and what the Government is able to do in the field of Aboriginal police. I am not very impressed that the member said that he did not have a lot of confidence in me. I do not think that on any occasion I have ever let him down when he has asked me for assistance. There is not much point in commenting further on that matter. I will take up the other matters mentioned.

The amendment deals with superannuation. It simply means that if the Government appoints a person from outside the police force or outside the terms of the Police Act, no superannuation benefit will be paid. Basically, this clause will assist with the working of the contract. I move the following amendment—

“At page 4, after line 19, insert—

‘(3) If the Commissioner upon appointment—

- (a) was at that time a member of the Police Force, he shall continue to possess all rights under the Police Superannuation Act 1968-1988 and the Police Superannuation Act 1974-1988 save as modified by the conditions of his employment which modification shall prevail over any provision of those Acts;
- (b) was not at that time a member of the Police Force, he shall not be subject to the Police Superannuation Act 1968-1988 and the Police Superannuation Act 1974-1988 but shall have such rights in relation to superannuation as may be provided for in the conditions of his employment.’ ”

Mr McLean: You sound like a broken man tonight.

Mr LESTER: I have a wog; that is the problem. The honourable member might have noticed earlier that I had to leave the Chamber in a hell of a hurry. That is the only reason I sound different. A lot of people have that problem at the moment.

Mr MACKENROTH: In the spirit of co-operation, the Opposition has supported amendments to the Police Act to allow a Commissioner of Police to be appointed. At

the second-reading stage I indicated that the Opposition believed that beyond that point, the new Police Act would finally come into being.

When I read the Minister's amendment, I began to fear what the Minister was really on about. I can understand the need to insert in the amendment a provision that would not allow Commissioner Newnham to come within the Police Superannuation Act, but I ask the Minister to explain why proposed subsection 3(a) is needed. It deals with appointing a member of the Queensland police force to the position of commissioner. I do not understand that because that is not the intention of the Government. The Government is appointing someone from Victoria, and proposed subsection 3(b) deals with that appointment.

If reports are to be believed, the new commissioner will be given a contract agreement and will be paid \$120,000. He is being amply compensated for not being a member of a superannuation scheme. A subclause relating to the appointment of a member of the Queensland police force to the position of commissioner is not needed.

Tonight we have been told that the Government has appointed someone from Victoria for three years. If one is to believe the Government when it says that these amendments are necessary to appoint the commissioner for a three-year term to get the Fitzgerald report off the ground, and that the entire Police Act will be completely reviewed, I would think that this amendment would be more suitably dealt with in that review so that it might deal with what is likely to happen in the future and apply for all time, not merely for part of the time.

Mr LESTER: The subsection is included to cover unforeseen circumstances, and for no other reason.

Mr GYGAR: I agree with the remarks made by the honourable member for Chatsworth. This Bill is becoming confused. It started out being a transitional Bill. The Minister was asked why the three-year period could not be included if it was intended to be a transitional Bill. The Minister said that the period of three years was not necessary because of the contract. Now the Committee is being told that the subclause has to be included because of unforeseen circumstances.

I draw the Minister's attention to the fact that the present interim commissioner is eligible for reappointment. Mr Fitzgerald specifically stated that the commissioner should be appointed on an interim basis for three years and that he could then be reappointed for a longer period.

I have only had this amendment to clause 4 in my hands for half an hour, so a detailed analysis of it has not been possible, but I suggest to the Minister that if proposed subsection (3)(a) of proposed new section 5E is included in the legislation it will be a clear indication to the interim Police Commissioner—who three years from now would be a member of the police force if he applied for his job back—that he could cash in on a superannuation scheme if he managed to be reappointed.

This is not the time nor the place to start considering the long-term complications of this appointment. Proposed subsection (3)(a) makes no sense. It would be okay to include it in a long-term Bill. It is the sort of provision that one would expect to see brought forward in the March session of Parliament next year when, after consultation, the extensive amendments to the Police Act will be introduced. Proposed subsection (3)(a) has no place in this Bill and gives a false indication to the present interim commissioner who, being a member of the police force three years down the track, could become eligible for superannuation. On my understanding of the present Police Act, it defines "members" and the commissioner is defined as being a member of the police force. Things are getting very confused, because this Bill is becoming a bit more than simply a transitional Bill.

Mr LESTER: The provision is there to cover unforeseen circumstances. It is a protection provision. My department takes its advice from the Crown law office. What

would happen if interim Commissioner Newnham were to fall seriously ill or die? This is simply a protection against unforeseen circumstances.

Mr MACKENROTH: I understand what the Minister is saying, but on this occasion I do not believe that this type of provision should be included in the Police Act. Tonight this Parliament is amending the Police Act to allow for the appointment of a named individual. On this occasion we should not set up a process for the replacement of that individual.

The Opposition has been very supportive of these amendments so that the interim commissioner may be appointed. Mr Gygar from the Liberal Party has shown his party's co-operation by not moving his first amendment and taking the Minister's word on the three-year contract. I would like the Minister to delete proposed subsection (3)(a) from the amendment to clause 4. We have shown faith in the Minister by agreeing to these amendments to the Police Act and to the commitments that he has given to us. Proposed subsection (3)(a) could be completely deleted and paragraph (b) would remain, which would allow the interim commissioner to be appointed and not be a member of the superannuation fund. Parliament rises in two weeks' time, and, irrespective of what happens at the election, it should be back by some time in mid-February. If something happens and it is necessary for a new commissioner to be appointed, the acting commissioner and the Criminal Justice Commission—which will be set up in two weeks' time—will have had enough time to look at the Police Act and bring a completely new Police Act before this Parliament. In effect, that would do away with all of the amendments that we are dealing with now. The Opposition is showing its good faith in the Minister and he has promised that he will do these things if his Government is returned after the next election. Therefore, the Minister should show the Opposition a bit of faith by deleting proposed subsection (3)(a) from his amendment and including it in the new Police Act next year, which in a proper sense will cover all likely events.

Mr LESTER: At the beginning there was some debate amongst my legal advisers on this matter. I am happy to withdraw proposed subsection (3)(a) from proposed new section 5E of the Bill.

Mr GYGAR: Because *Hansard* does not record the interjections that have just occurred in the Chamber, it is appropriate to put on record the applause that the Chamber has given the Minister for adopting this appropriate and reasonable stance.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr Booth): Order! The question was that clause 4, as read, stand part of the Bill, since which it has been proposed to amend the clause on page 4, line 18, by deleting (a) and inserting the following words—

“(3) If the Commissioner upon appointment was not at that time a member of the Police Force, he shall not be subject to the Police Superannuation Act 1968-1988 and the Police Superannuation Act 1974-1988 but shall have such rights in relation to superannuation as may be provided for in the conditions of his employment.”

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 4, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 5 to 9, as read, agreed to.

Clause 10—

Mr GYGAR (9.45 p.m.): Two matters arise in clause 10. Perhaps it would be better to deal with them seriatim rather than confuse things by dealing with them together. The first point is a relatively minor one, but one which has caused some confusion. We are making some progress and getting some co-operation on this Bill, so I think this can be sorted out in about half a minute.

I again draw the Minister's attention to the fourth page of his prepared second-reading speech where a certain procedure was outlined. The speech reads—

“... to suspend the promotional appeal system in cases where the chairman of the commission deems it necessary.”

That is not what appears in the Bill. What appears in the Bill is a provision that suspends appeals—full stop—during a transitional period unless they are allowed. It is the old argument: instead of everything being allowed except that which is forbidden, what the Bill says is that nothing is allowed except that which is permitted. I merely ask the Minister to clarify that. Incidentally, the Bill reflects exactly what Fitzgerald said. If the Minister could just indicate that somebody wrote his second-reading speech a little incorrectly and that that was not the Government's intention at the time, I would be happy to accept that and we can get on to the next order of business.

Mr LESTER: Part of the problem to be dealt with is on page 343 of the Fitzgerald report. It states—

“Internal appellate processes related to promotions and transfers should be suspended during this first stage of transitional arrangements and interim appointments. The primary objective is to provide a better, more reliable leadership during the next three years.”

The head of the Criminal Justice Commission, Sir Max Bingham, was most emphatic that it be done this way. He is the one who has the final say on the appeal procedure.

Mr GYGAR: I must note with regret that the Minister has missed entirely what I am talking about, because the same provision, which we accept, is repeated in paragraph 11 on page 387 of the Fitzgerald report. There is no argument that the Bill reflects the Fitzgerald report. I am just trying to find out why the second-reading speech contained those words. If it was a misprint, say so and we will move on.

Mr LESTER: What is in the Bill is correct.

Mr GYGAR: I think we have probably exhausted the capacity to exchange views on that one. I will move on to the next point, which deals with the same clause.

I had indicated to the Committee an intention to move a sunset-clause provision, to be inserted as a last clause to this Bill. I do not yet move it, but my intention was to say that, unless it is sooner revoked, this section shall expire on 1 July 1990. That relates to this appellate provision. We are back to the discussion we were having before: is this a permanent Bill or is it a temporary Bill? With the Minister by his last concession saying quite clearly that this is a temporary Bill, we have got a fair way down the line. I would be happy not to move this amendment also if the Minister would indicate to the Committee that it is his, the Government's and Sir Max Bingham's intention, and the intention of everybody else, to proceed to a full review of the Police Act in the March session or as soon as possible thereafter in this place next year.

Mr LESTER: That is most definite, and the new interim commissioner will be involved in that, as well.

Clause 10, as read, agreed to.

Bill reported, with an amendment.

Third Reading

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

ELECTORAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW BILL

Hon. T. R. COOPER (Roma—Premier and Treasurer and Minister for State Development) (9.51 p.m.), by leave, without notice: I move—

“That leave be granted to bring in a Bill to provide for an Electoral and Administrative Review Commission and for a Parliamentary Committee for Electoral and Administrative Review and for related purposes.”

Motion agreed to.

First Reading

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

Second Reading

Hon. T. R. COOPER (Roma—Premier and Treasurer and Minister for State Development) (9.52 p.m.): I move—

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

The report of the Fitzgerald commission of inquiry highlighted the fact that our administrative and electoral laws and processes are in need of independent and comprehensive review. The report further said that enduring processes with adequate independence and parliamentary support must be set up to review and recommend the necessary laws and guide-lines and to attend to the multitude of matters which need improvement. A properly authorised and satisfactorily resourced commission reporting directly to a parliamentary select committee is needed. The commission should comprise members of the highest integrity, necessary experience and independence, able to act at all times in a fair and impartial manner.

This Bill establishes the Electoral and Administrative Review Commission—EARC—and the Electoral and Administrative Review Committee. The establishment of these bodies is a major event in the history of this State, and deserves the support of the Opposition and the Liberal Party in this Parliament and the general community.

In the short time since the change of leadership of this Government, much has been achieved in ensuring that the reforms recommended by the Fitzgerald report are implemented without delay. The Bill for the Electoral and Administrative Review Commission is the product of a process of wide public consideration. Submissions have been accommodated to the maximum possible extent consistent with the principles and recommendations of the Fitzgerald report. The Bill will immediately be circulated to allow interested groups and individuals to make further submissions in writing by 4 p.m. next Thursday, 12 October 1989, to the director of the implementation unit.

When the earlier draft EARC Bill was initially made public, there was considerable disinformation and false propaganda spread by those opposed to reform. Much of this was based on misconstructions of the Bill, extreme theoretical instances of the Bill's suggested operation, and inaccurate generalised assertions, often expressed in emotive language. Despite all this, most issues of any validity were related only to points of drafting.

A similar campaign may be undertaken in relation to the present Bill by those opposed to reform. However, public comment is a healthy part of the democratic process. Those who genuinely wish to assist in the reform process should direct their submissions urgently to the implementation unit responsible for drafting the legislation. The comments received will be analysed and again accommodated to the greatest possible extent consistent with the principles and recommendations of the Fitzgerald report.

It will undoubtedly assist the community to understand and accept what is proposed, and hopefully will obviate political controversy and point-scoring, if a summary is now given of the philosophies and objectives of EARC. Firstly, some specific points need emphasis.

The first task of the Electoral and Administrative Review Commission is to review the electoral system and report thereon to Parliament. This arrangement is consistent with the Fitzgerald report, which stipulates that the commission should report its electoral review findings directly to Parliament. The EARC Bill does not automatically require Parliament to adopt the EARC's recommendations, but enables this decision to be determined by parliamentary process. However, I have given and now restate my public assurance that my Government will abide by the umpire's decision and will implement the recommendations of the commission dealing with electoral reform.

To affirm my commitment to this course of action, my Government is prepared to consider introducing amendments to the present Bill to provide that future Parliaments shall accept in full the electoral reform recommendations and accompanying draft legislation submitted by EARC. My Government, on the basis of submissions received, and to the extent that it is legally possible, will also consider moving an amendment to entrench this provision so that future Parliaments cannot resile from it except with the approval of the people of Queensland at a referendum.

I also give a commitment that, if the Government proposes any such amendments after the period for submissions, the draft amendments will be provided to the other parties in sufficient time for their consideration prior to parliamentary debate.

Other matters which merit emphasis, and reflect points of clarification compared with the previous draft tabled, as a result of over 100 submissions received, are as follows—

- Parliament retains its supreme role, and will determine the outcome of any review undertaken by the EARC other than the review of Queensland's electoral system which I have promised will be implemented. Otherwise, the Electoral and Administrative Review Commission only reviews and recommends, it does not decide or direct.
- The EARC reviews systems, principles and practices with a view to recommending their improvement. It does not focus its investigations on particular instances of alleged inefficiency, dishonesty or partiality. It acts publicly only where that is fair and in the public interest.
- In sensitive areas, Parliament will control the exercise of the EARC's powers, which are in other respects subject to judicial review.
- The EARC strengthens the supremacy of Parliament by reporting both sides of the issue being addressed, thereby facilitating parliamentary debate. It will complement Parliament's role in an independent and professional manner to ensure the Parliament can approve of improvements to Queensland's systems and practices shown by the report of the commission of inquiry to be deficient.

I now turn to the remaining key features of the Electoral and Administrative Review Commission.

The object of the commission is to provide reports to the Legislative Assembly and to the Minister with a view to achieving and maintaining efficiency in the operation of the Parliament and honesty, impartiality and efficiency in elections, public administration of the State and local authority administration.

I stress again that the commission is concerned with systems, principles and practices and not with particular instances of alleged inefficiency, dishonesty or impartiality. Matters of that kind will come within the responsibilities of the Criminal Justice Commission. In summary, the commission has a very simple but essential task: to review matters, to fully consider the issues reviewed and to recommend and report thereon through the parliamentary committee to Parliament and the Minister.

The commission will be constituted by impartial and independent persons of integrity who have a mix of skills and experience covering the areas of commercial enterprise, community affairs, electoral matters, law, public administration and trade union or other industrial affairs. In selecting a chairman and part-time commissioners, the Government will consult with the other parties. Names on the short list put forward by the director of the implementation unit following the process of public advertisement and interview will be provided to the leaders of the other two parties and I shall take into account their views.

This process will ensure that persons appointed as commissioners do not hold, or have not held, appointments or associations so as to put in question their capacity to act as commissioners free of improper influence as provided for in this Bill.

In conducting its investigations, the commission shall at all times act openly and in the public interest especially in regard to reviews of the whole or part of the Legislative Assembly electoral system or the whole or part of the local authority electoral system. With regard to its other reviews and investigations, the commission shall also act openly, except where, for reason of public interest or to prevent unfairness to individuals, the commission will respect the confidence of information with which it is supplied.

With regard to reviews in local authorities, or the Parliament, the commission shall not exercise any of its powers, unless expressly authorised to do so by the Legislative Assembly, in the case of reviews of the Parliament, or the Legislative Assembly or the Governor in Council in the case of investigations into local authorities.

With regard to the review of the Legislative Assembly electoral system, the commission shall by public notice invite submissions from the community seeking their views and opinions about the type of electoral system desired, especially the issue of electoral zones. The commission may conduct hearings to enable people making submissions to further express their point of view and, after full and careful deliberation of all issues and matters received, shall furnish a report on the matter to the Legislative Assembly together with a draft Bill for an Act which will ultimately become the new Electoral Districts Act for Queensland. This draft Bill shall set out fully the conditions under which the commission believes the State Government elections for the Legislative Assembly should be conducted.

The new Electoral Districts Act will also set out in detail the procedures to be followed by the commission in determining the boundaries of the electoral districts into which the State should be divided in accordance with the principles and steps laid down in the Act. These steps will include those that are considered desirable by the commission to ensure, once again, full, frank and open disclosure of all information that the commission feels in the public interest should be disclosed. Processes such as publicising draft boundaries and seeking public input would be expected to be specified in this legislation.

Reports of the commission shall be furnished to the chairman of the parliamentary committee, to the Speaker of the Legislative Assembly and to the Minister. In reporting, the commission is obliged to present a summary of all information received that is relevant and present both sides of the argument so that the Parliament and the public of Queensland can understand the issues involved in any of the matters investigated by the commission and draw their own conclusions based on a fair representation of the views and a clear understanding of the basis on which recommendations were formed.

Division 4 of the Bill outlines the commission's powers, which relate only to the right of the commission to have access to information essential to its tasks. At all times, the commission shall give due notice and act with professionalism in requesting the co-operation of executives or office-holders within units of public administration to provide information essential to the review of systems, principles and practices.

Those powers enabling entry to public premises and inspection of records or seizing of material will be subject to claims of privilege on the grounds of self-incrimination, legal professional privilege, Crown privilege or other public interest or parliamentary privilege.

A person has a lawful excuse of not complying with a notice or with the power to inspect, seize, remove or copy material if it is found by a judge of the Supreme Court that the claim of privilege is valid and well founded. Where the claim is made on the ground of Crown privilege or other public interest, the basis for determination is whether, on balance, the public interest is better served by withholding the information, or by disclosing the information. Claims of privilege shall be processed in strict accord with the provisions of this Bill. The costs of privilege claims shall be borne by the commission unless determined otherwise by the judge.

This Bill also provides that the commission shall do everything within its power to prevent victimisation of any person who assists the commission, and to ensure that

action is taken to demonstrate to all that co-operation with the commission is a useful and constructive process and bears no repercussive effects on a person's career or is in any other way detrimental.

The commission may refer a matter to a unit of public administration or the principal or other officers therein and request a report. This provision is particularly important as the commission has a responsibility to oversight and monitor reforms in systems, principles and practices of public administration in Queensland, including reforms outlined in the Fitzgerald report which are attached to this Bill as a schedule. A referral made to a unit of public administration must be complied with; in other words, a person is obliged to submit a report to the commission along the lines of the information requested.

The commission shall act as an independent body and have discretion in the appointment of its staff. It shall be subject to ministerial and parliamentary committee oversight regarding budgeting and subject to the Auditor-General's inspections regarding its financial affairs. In establishing the parliamentary committee, the Bill follows traditions already established in this Parliament for the establishment of Public Works and Public Accounts Committees with regard to membership. The functions of the committee shall be—

- (a) to monitor and review the discharge of the commission's functions; and
- (b) to report to the Legislative Assembly with any comment it thinks fit on any of the matters pertinent to the commission or the discharge of the commission's functions or the exercise of powers of the commission.

The committee has an important task in participating from time to time in the constitution of the commission and, if necessary, the removal from office of a commissioner as prescribed in this Bill. The process requires that there be support of the majority of the commission comprising members of more than one party with regard to the appointment of a commissioner and for a unanimous decision of the committee and recommendation to the Parliament for a decision to remove a commissioner.

The Standing Rules and Orders of the Legislative Assembly relating to select committees shall apply in relation to this parliamentary committee and the conduct of its business. The parliamentary committee also has the responsibility, at the end of each term of Parliament, to provide a report to the Legislative Assembly outlining its views about the operation and effectiveness of the commission's activities and making any recommendations it thinks appropriate to the Parliament about the issues therein.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate, on motion of Mr Goss, adjourned.

CRIMINAL JUSTICE BILL

Hon. T. R. COOPER (Roma—Premier and Treasurer and Minister for State Development) (10.04 p.m.), by leave, without notice: I move—

“That leave be granted to bring in a Bill to provide for the establishment and operation of a Criminal Justice Commission and of a Parliamentary Committee to be called the Criminal Justice Committee and for related purposes.”

Motion agreed to.

First Reading

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

Second Reading

Hon. T. R. COOPER (Roma—Premier and Treasurer and Minister for State Development) (10.05 p.m.): I move—

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

The second Bill to which I refer deals with the establishment and operation of a Criminal Justice Commission and of a parliamentary committee to be called the Criminal Justice Committee. This Bill creates a milestone for the reform of criminal justice in Queensland. The criminal justice commission shall have a number of vital functions to perform, the most significant of which shall be—

- review and recommend to the Parliament reforms considered necessary in the criminal law and its administration;
- to investigate official misconduct, corruption and organised criminal activity and ensure referral of matters to necessary authorities for determination; and
- to supervise and advise on the administration of criminal justice in Queensland.

The commission shall have the capacity to hear and determine disciplinary charges of official misconduct and, most importantly, shall oversee reforms within the criminal justice system, particularly within the Police Department. This will ensure Queensland has a police force that is honest, effective and efficient and of which all Queenslanders and all serving police officers may be justly proud.

In the case of the Criminal Justice Commission, the chairman shall be qualified as a judge of the High Court of Australia, the Federal Court of Australia, the Supreme Court of a State or Territory of the Commonwealth and shall be the chief executive of the commission. The chairman shall be selected by a process of consultation as outlined in the Bill, including national advertisement, consultation with the parliamentary committee or with leaders of other parties in the Assembly. The chairman shall have a consultative role with the Minister in referring to the committee or the other party-leaders persons considered suitable for part-time membership, including a selection of one person from four nominated by the Bar Association of Queensland and the Queensland Law Society. The chairman shall be the chief executive officer of the commission and meetings shall be held at regular intervals as prescribed by regulation.

Within the commission there shall be a number of divisions. The Official Misconduct Division will continue the work of the commission of inquiry and form Queensland's equivalent of an independent commission against corruption and organised crime. The commission shall also comprise misconduct tribunals, the Witness Protection Division, Research and Co-ordination Division and the Intelligence Division.

In undertaking its investigations, the commission may choose to hold public hearings; it may in other circumstances choose to have closed hearings if it is considered in the public interest to do so.

In regard to investigations of official misconduct, the division shall operate on its own initiative as well as respond to the incidence of misconduct reported through the complaints section of the commission.

The commission shall maintain a panel of at least three persons qualified for appointment as judge and who hold no other office in a unit of public administration to constitute, as necessary, individual misconduct tribunals which shall have original jurisdiction to investigate and determine charges. If a tribunal finds such charges established, orders shall be made that the person suffer such disciplinary punishment as is authorised by this Act. Tribunals are subject to judicial appeal.

The research division of the commission will review problems that beset the administration of criminal justice and co-ordinate the activities of the commission and other agencies in the State concerned with the administration of criminal justice.

The intelligence division shall maintain a professional criminal intelligence unit as a hub of an integrated approach to combating organised criminal activity. The division shall have access to the police force intelligence system and shall assume control of data holdings of the commission of inquiry.

A witness protection division shall also be established to ensure those assisting the commission are properly protected and to ensure an accurate register is kept in regard to persons who have assumed new identities consistent with arrangements currently

being finalised between the State and the Commonwealth in regard to a national witness protection program. Access to this register shall be restricted to the chairman, the executive director of the commission, and the director of the witness protection division.

The powers of this commission are essential to enable it to perform its important tasks, but are always subject to claims of privilege and judicial review. The parliamentary committee established to monitor and review the discharge of the commission's functions shall operate in a similar fashion to the committee established and described with regard to the Electoral and Administrative Review Commission.

The establishment of this commission in Queensland represents a milestone of achievement in criminal justice administration. Together with the EARC it will ensure that Queensland does bring to fruition and reap the benefits from the findings of the commission of inquiry contained in the Fitzgerald report.

The Bill will immediately be circulated to allow interested groups and individuals to make further submissions in writing by 4 p.m. next Thursday, 12 October 1989, to the director of the implementation unit.

By the time that Parliament reconvenes on 17 October, all submissions received will have been analysed and any desirable amendments will be circulated to all parties in this Chamber. This Bill will be available for debate when Parliament resumes, and the legislation will be enacted at that parliamentary sitting.

The chairmen of the two commissions may then be appointed. The process of selection of those chairmen will commence in the intervening period while Parliament is in recess, and the leaders of the opposition parties will be afforded the necessary consultative participation in that process.

Members will be aware that there is a commitment for the post of Criminal Justice Commission Chairman to be offered to Sir Max Bingham, who currently is heading the ongoing commission of inquiry.

The program which has been outlined means that, by the end of October, major progress will have been made upon the reforms recommended by Mr Fitzgerald. From that point on, it will substantially fall to the parliamentary committees, the chairmen of the commissions, the recently appointed Police Commissioner, and others who are selected to assist them, to carry out the next phase of the process of reform.

This Government is committed to providing total support to the reforms which have been recommended and is committed to depoliticising the reform process to ensure that it does not fail for party-political reasons or by reason of any lack of political will. It will at all times be willing to co-operate and consult with the opposition parties in the Parliament to ensure that they are duly consulted and properly involved in the reform process.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate, on motion of Mr Goss, adjourned.

MINERAL RESOURCES BILL

Withdrawal

On the order of the day being discharged, the Bill was withdrawn and the Deputy Clerk read the original order.

New Bill, Remaining Stages

Hon. R. C. KATTER (Flinders—Minister for Mines and Energy and Minister for Northern and Regional Development) (10.12 p.m.): Mr Speaker, I move—

“That another Bill be brought in founded on that order and that so much of the Standing Orders be suspended to enable the Bill to proceed through its remaining stages forthwith.”

Motion agreed to.

First Reading

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

Second Reading

Hon. R. C. KATTER (Flinders—Minister for Mines and Energy and Minister for Northern and Regional Development) (10.14 p.m.): I move—

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

The Mineral Resources Bill which was introduced by my predecessor earlier this session has been withdrawn by me to allow its reintroduction with a number of technical and drafting changes and certain important amendments negotiated with the mining industry and the major rural organisations over the last week.

The provisions of the Bill relating to prospecting permits have been reworded to allow the mining registrar to advise the land-owner by telephone or similar method immediately he issues a prospecting permit and further to clarify that the holder must give notice to the land-owner prior to entry.

Provisions have also been incorporated throughout the Bill to ensure that no activities pursuant to the legislation can be carried out on the surface of the land of an owner that is within 50 metres laterally of the principal stockyard of that owner. This was requested particularly by the Primary Producers Association, and the Cattlemen's Union and the Chamber of Mines were very good in agreeing to this and the other amendments.

Additionally and, I believe, most importantly, the provisions of the Bill relating to compensation in respect of the grant of mining claims and mining leases have been extended to provide that, when compensation has been determined in relation to all the criteria details, including an additional premium related to the status and use of the particular land of the owner, a further amount must be added to reflect the compulsory nature of the action, which amount shall be a minimum of 10 per cent.

The Bill has also been amended to clarify that local authorities may lodge objections in the Wardens Court to the grant of mining claims and mining leases.

This Bill should not be seen as a panacea for all the problems that could confront a land-owner when exploration and mining takes place on his land. However, it does contain a number of new initiatives that should lay the foundation for a more balanced approach to any such issues in the future. Therefore, I would call upon all parties to make a genuine effort to ensure that the legislation is given a fair chance of success. Nevertheless, honourable members will appreciate that, because I was not the Minister for Mines and Energy who was involved in the initial review of the Mining Act 1968-1986, I shall approach certain issues somewhat differently from my predecessor. I will address a number of issues even though they are not incorporated in the legislation as such.

For example, it is imperative that the security to be deposited in respect of mining claims and mining leases be reasonable for the mining program that is put forward, thus ensuring protection both for the miner and for the land-owner. Members of the Chamber of Mines have expressed grave fears that the security and bonds, particularly in relation to small miners, will be so high that they could prevent mining in the future. Similarly, from the land-owner's point of view considerable worry was expressed by primary producer organisations that the bond would be insufficient and that, where reclamation work was necessary, insufficient funds would be available to meet the requirements of such a restoration program.

Furthermore, although the Bill provides for the mining registrar to investigate and take action if he considers that the explorer has not complied with the requirements of

his permit or the legislation, it should be incumbent on the mining registrar to ensure that minimal disruption is caused to farming and husbandry programs. Any requirements that are not unreasonable to the miners should and will be departmental policy and will be part of the prospecting or exploration permit.

I draw to the attention of the House at least two of the examples that have been cited to me. For example, if a contour bank on the side of a hill is heavily overgrown with grass, nobody will be able to tell that it is a contour bank. By driving a mining vehicle down that bank, a mining company could, in all innocence, wipe it out and, if it rains, half of the bank will end up in the creek.

Those problems can be overcome if the land-owner is given the right to be able to talk to the mining registrar and to point out such things as part of the exploration program. Not only will that save mining companies from losses that they would otherwise have incurred, it will also provide protection for the land-owner who has not been there in the past.

Tied to that is the fear of land-owners that a situation of Caesar judging Caesar will be created, with the mining registrar presiding over actions relating to mining. I assure honourable members that I will take a keen interest in ensuring that the decisions in any such cases are fair and equitable and that the policies of the Mines Department are applied consistently and fairly.

That apprehension will be addressed by a working party that will monitor and recommend future amendments. That working party will comprise representatives of the Chamber of Mines and any other bodies that wish to be represented. No doubt pastoral interests would be keen to be represented and will be represented.

I have concerns also that the current restriction on watering facilities on the larger properties in excess of 100 square kilometres, for example, may be inadequate. Personally, I consider that 400 metres from such watering facilities—the distance that applies in other States—rather than the 50 metres that is provided on such properties would provide for optimal stock disturbance minimisation.

For example, where wild cattle are involved, that policy will be implemented within the bounds of reasonableness and the responsible discretion of the warden that the flight distance—a DPI term that is used for wild cattle—will be the operating distance at watering points. While it must always remain at the discretion of the warden, it will overcome some of the very grave apprehensions that are held by some of the northern cattlemen who, because of distance, had little opportunity to participate in the discussions that were held in this part of this State.

In all matters such as the above, which impact on existing land-management principles, the mining industry organisations should, in consultation with rural organisations, develop a code of conduct to reflect the thrust of the Government for balanced land use by which members of such organisations should abide.

Land-holding and pastoral interests have made very strong representations that they should be able to negotiate an agreement with respect to exploration and mining before they proceed onto a land-owner's property. The Chamber of Mines has taken a very strong position to the effect that that would create inordinate problems for it and would do very serious damage to mining in the State of Queensland.

I hope that the ability of the land-holder to speak to the mining registrar before permits are issued will give him an opportunity to have an input in the exploration permit that would issue. I hope that that system will work. If it does not, the Government will have to reconsider it.

The at-risk land-owner situation is another matter on which I have strong views. I assure honourable members that, should it come to my attention that the current voluntary arrangements are not proving successful, I will act to incorporate relevant provisions in the legislation that at least recognise the existence of the at-risk tribunal. However, I am advised that, to date, the voluntary arrangement has worked well.

Because of the necessity of having to come to grips with that most difficult of problems, the Government will seek Governor in Council recognition of the existing tribunal. The at-risk situation is very serious. I do not believe that legislation can reconcile the competing interests in this case. The current program seems to be working and, when a team is winning, it should not be changed.

It is proposed to monitor closely the implementation of this new legislation to ensure that it has the impact that I believe is necessary to provide a balanced multiple land use throughout the mineralised regions of the State. I give the assurance to the small oil-producers that the issue of explosives for hand-miners and a number of other issues will be dealt with. I understand that the Act covers both of those issues, but, if it does not, I assure the small oil-producers that this Government will be looking to doing something for them as soon as possible.

Accordingly, I propose to establish a committee consisting of departmental officers, representatives of the major mining and rural organisations and the representatives of such other organisations as are considered appropriate from time to time to monitor the legislation. I have never considered that legislation is a block of concrete. It is something flexible that should come to grips with problems as they arise.

In reintroducing this Bill, I pay tribute to the enthusiasm, energy and commitment of my predecessor and retiring, unconquered, long-time champion of the far north, Martin Tenni, whose tough commitment to development and a definite feel for the industry marked him, as I have said many times before, as one of the best State Mines Ministers in recent times.

In conclusion, let me assure honourable members that in view of the wide-ranging impact of this legislation and the sweeping conceptual changes incorporated therein, if it becomes obvious that any of the provisions do not adequately address the Government's intent, appropriate amendments will be brought forward immediately to achieve that intent.

Many serious problems remain. I see some of them as being irreconcilable. I feel that, with proper time and attention, some of them can be remedied. I would be very optimistic that they can be, to the satisfaction of the mining interests and the pastoral interests. Most people in my home town of Cloncurry own a few head of cattle or have worked cattle at some time in their life. Most of them have worked small mines in their life-time as well.

Over the years we have had no difficulty living with what I think was quite a brilliant Act—the old Act—and I am quite sure that the same legislative achievements can be gained in the new Act as were gained in the old Act. Because the nature of mining and the nature of land tenure in the State are changing, it is a changing Act. It is hoped that the new Act reflects those changes successfully. If in certain areas it does not, we will be most amenable to change.

Accordingly, I commend the Bill to the House.

Mr VAUGHAN (Nudgee) (10.25 p.m.): The Minister indicated in his original introductory speech that this Bill, which will replace the Mining Act 1968-1986, is the result of an exhaustive process of consultation which commenced with the release of a Green Paper in May 1987. According to the explanatory notes on the Bill, draft legislation which was subsequently produced was the subject of detailed discussion between senior officers of the Mines Department and major mining and rural organisations as well as other Government departments.

As a result of those discussions, the draft legislation was changed and distributed to the parties with whom discussions had taken place, further submissions were received and, after subsequent discussions with the Queensland Chamber of Mines and the Queensland Producers Federation, the original Bill that was before us was prepared. Despite the extent of the consultation that has taken place, there are organisations and interested parties who are not happy with many of the provisions contained in the Bill.

Although I can appreciate that when undertaking a complete review of the legislation covering the State's mining industry it is difficult, if not impossible, to satisfy all of the parties involved directly or indirectly in the industry. Nevertheless, I can understand why there is a feeling in some quarters that consultation in relation to the draft legislation was restricted to selected organisations. As I am sure the Minister is aware, calls have been made for the legislation to lie on the table for a reasonable time to allow adequate public scrutiny. Under the circumstances, I believe this is not an unreasonable request, and the Opposition will be opposing the second reading of the Bill.

However, as the Bill is now before the House for debate, I will proceed with my comments on the provisions contained in it. I would preface my remarks by acknowledging how helpful the explanatory notes on the Bill are.

The Bill provides for prospecting permits which will allow the holder, subject to certain conditions, to prospect for minerals, to hand mine and peg land. A prospecting permit replaces a miner's right, which was provided for in the Mining Act and which has existed since the Victorian gold-rush days in 1855. However, whereas a miner's right was granted for a year, a prospecting permit is granted for only three months.

The holder of a miner's right could occupy vacant Crown land and hand mine, could occupy occupied Crown land with the consent of the owner and hand mine, and could, if consent was not given, enter the land and mark out a claim and then hand mine until the claim was determined. Although the holder of a prospecting permit has similar entitlements, the provisions of the Bill go further.

The area that the holder of a prospecting permit can prospect is limited to 300 hectares except under certain conditions. A sketch and a description of the area to be prospected must be submitted and a security deposit may also be required.

Under the old Mining Act, less than two pages was devoted to a miner's right. In this Bill, over 10 pages are devoted to prospecting permits.

Having regard to the history of the miner's right and the way in which a miner's right was used by the small prospector, who is a particular type of person, I can imagine that the aspect of prospecting permits was the subject of considerable discussion in the preparation of this Bill. Although I appreciate that, because of the manner in which some holders of miner's rights may have acted in the past, there may be a need to lay down some stringent conditions with which small prospectors must comply, the provisions in the Bill relating to prospecting permits appear to be very restrictive. It almost seems as though they are designed to discourage people from applying for a prospecting permit.

The Bill also contains a lengthy section devoted to mining claims. Even though the provisions relating to mining claims in the current Act are somewhat comprehensive, it is obvious that since their introduction in 1979, mining claims have created problems for some land-holders and the discussions that have taken place in relation to this legislation have resulted in the attention given to them in this Bill.

Although the prescribed area of land over which a mining claim may be granted has not been altered, the number of mining claims a person may hold at any one time has been reduced from ten to two. As I understand it, there are very good reasons for this reduction.

Even though the present Mining Act provides that a mining claim shall be continuously worked, except that the warden may grant an exemption from work for a term not exceeding six months, I am advised that this provision is blatantly breached and, like many other provisions in the Act, not policed. As an example, if the Minister cares to do so, I suggest he look into the mining claims, and, for that matter, the mining leases held by a Mr E. J. Vella. That is only one instance that has been brought to my attention. If the Minister wants details, I would be happy to provide him with them; otherwise I will save them for reference in the not-too-distant future.

The Bill spells out in considerable detail the requirements for marking out land proposed to be the subject of a mining claim. These requirements are currently prescribed in the regulations.

The owners of land which is the subject of an application for a mining claim may now seek a conference with the applicant. The inclusion of this provision is obviously designed to overcome problems that have arisen in the past. The Bill does not spell out the precise purpose of the conference, but the explanatory notes indicate that it is to address any initial concerns the owner may have in relation to the application. The Bill states that any agreement reached between the parties at a conference shall be reduced to writing.

The Bill provides that the matter of compensation is to be settled before a mining claim is granted and states that this be done by agreement or by determination by the Wardens Court. Obviously, compensation is one of the matters to be the subject of discussion and possible resolution at the conference, but that is not spelt out. I think that this provision of the Bill could be set out a little more clearly for easier understanding. Objections to the granting of a mining claim will still be heard in the Wardens Court, which will also determine the matter of compensation if agreement cannot be reached.

The conditions under which a mining claim is granted are fairly comprehensive and are spelt out in detail in the Bill. While it is one thing to lay down stringent conditions, it is another thing to ensure that they are complied with. As I have already pointed out, that is one of the problems that currently exists. The provisions of the Mining Act are not being policed. The parties that have sought such provisions in this Bill will no doubt consider that they have achieved their objective, but unless the provisions are complied with, they are useless, and the problems that have occurred in the past will continue to occur.

The initial term of the mining claim has been reduced from 10 years to five years. A holder of a mining claim may apply for a renewal of the claim for a period not exceeding five years. Currently, the period is 10 years. I note that in the Minister's second-reading speech he referred to his view that in some instances the initial term of five years could be too short. He said that he would keep an eye on that provision, particularly in respect of the effect it could have on the small gouger.

The Bill now spells out that a mining claim or an interest therein may be assigned or mortgaged. There is also provision for the holder of a mining claim to be fined for non-compliance with the conditions under which the mining claim was granted.

The attention given to mining claims in the Bill is much more extensive than in the current Act and as with prospecting permits makes the application process more complex. It would seem that although the intention today is to streamline the processes, the achievement of that objective is more easily said than done. However, while the provisions may look complex on paper, in practice that may not be the case.

While the prospecting permit is the means by which the small-scale prospector can access land to search for minerals, the exploration permit, which replaces the authority to prospect, is the means by which large-scale exploration can be undertaken by mining companies. The maximum term of an exploration permit cannot exceed five years, the same as for authorities to prospect under the current Mining Act. However, in special circumstances this term can be extended by the Minister.

The Bill also provides that the Minister may from time to time renew the exploration permit for a term such that the sum of the term of the original grant and all subsequent terms does not exceed five years, unless the Minister in a particular case determines otherwise. This limitation of the term of an exploration permit to a maximum of five years, including any renewals thereof, is more specific than the provisions in the present Act and are, in my opinion, a step in the right direction. It is my understanding that at present the holder of an authority to prospect, which may have been held for four years and 10 months, can, at least 30 days prior to the date of expiry of the authority, make application for renewal of that authority to prospect.

The Bill also provides that the area of land in respect of which the exploration permit applies, shall at the expiration of 24 months from the grant of the permit, be reduced by at least 50 per cent and at the expiration of each 12 months thereafter by

at least 50 per cent. This is a departure from the previous policy of requiring 50 per cent relinquishment at the end of the first year. Therefore, it would appear that the practice of mining companies sitting on authorities to prospect should disappear with the introduction of exploration permits and the passing of this Bill.

I am sure that this would be welcomed by many people in the mining industry but, unfortunately, as I will illustrate, this is not the case. The Bill further provides that where the term of an exploration permit expires, none of the land covered by that exploration permit can be the subject of an exploration permit until the expiration of two calendar months from the end of the month in which the exploration permit expired. The period has been reduced from three months in the Mining Act. However, this two months' period does not apply to a person who surrenders an exploration permit for the purpose of being granted a further exploration permit over the whole or part of the land over which he held the surrendered exploration permit. I take this opportunity to elaborate a little on this point. The clause that covers this matter contains an initial provision that refers to two calendar months. However, the relevant subclause does not apply to a person applying for a new exploration permit in respect of land over which he held an exploration permit which he had surrendered for the purpose of his being granted a further exploration permit in respect of the whole or part of that land. On page 74, clause 5.33 deals with the surrender of an exploration permit. It states—

“(1) The holder of an exploration permit may, by notice in writing to the Director-General surrender the permit.

(2) A surrender of an exploration permit shall take effect on the next day following its acceptance by the Minister except in respect of sub-blocks the subject of an application for a new exploration permit made under subsection (3).

(3) Where, at the time when the holder of an exploration permit purports to surrender the permit, the holder duly makes application for a new exploration permit in respect of the whole or part of the land to which the firstmentioned exploration permit applies, the purported surrender shall take effect immediately prior to the grant of the new exploration permit.”

This is where the provisions of the Mining Act and this Bill become a farce. One of the constant complaints of many people in the mining industry is that large areas of the best mineral areas of the State are locked up under authorities to prospect which certain mining companies are sitting on. As I have indicated, the situation will apparently not change with this Bill. Although the term of an exploration permit is supposed to be a maximum of five years, although the area of an exploration permit is supposed to be reduced by 50 per cent each year after the second year, and although the sum of the terms for which an exploration permit may be renewed must not exceed five years, all the holder of an exploration permit apparently has to do is to surrender his exploration permit and apply for a new one. The magic word appears to be “surrender”, not “renew”, because a renewal is still limited by the five-year maximum. Furthermore, what is the point in reducing the area of an exploration permit by 50 per cent each year?

According to the provisions of the Bill, the holder of the exploration permit is required to make a submission identifying the land to which he wants the permit to apply after the 50 per cent reduction, as the Bill provides that the permit only applies to the land specified in the submission. The question is: can an application be lodged for an exploration permit over the land reduced from a permit? As I see it, the answer should be, “Yes”. Another question is: over what land does a holder apply for renewal of an exploration permit? Is it only the land remaining after the area has been reduced, or does the renewal application automatically cover the whole area of the original exploration permit? I suppose that from the way the Bill reads the answer to that question could be, “Yes” or “No”.

A person could apply for an exploration permit over an area for a period of four years; after two years the area is reduced by 50 per cent; and after a further two years the area is reduced to 12½ per cent of the original area. In accordance with the provisions of the Bill, at least 28 days, or such shorter period as the Minister in the particular case

allows, and not more than three months prior to the expiration of the term of the permit, the holder of that exploration permit can apply for renewal of that permit and the Minister may grant a renewal for a maximum period of one year in such case. On the assumption that the exploration permit holder has carried out extensive prospecting on a large scale, as is supposed to be required, he should only require the renewal to explore the remaining 12½ per cent in the 12 months allowed. On the other hand, the Bill refers to the renewal of the exploration permit.

The Bill also provides for an applicant for an exploration permit to lodge a security deposit and, in addition, contains a provision which enables the owner of land to seek compensation in the Wardens Court for the cost of rectification of any damage caused to land by the exploration permit holder.

At present, an applicant for an authority to prospect is required to lodge a deposit of \$2,000 with his application, and normally it is a condition of grant of the application that a further amount of \$2,000 is lodged as security to cover rehabilitation and restitution. There is no provision in the Bill for the lodging of a \$2,000 deposit, but only a security deposit the amount of which will be determined by the Minister. Regarding the deposit of \$2,000 required under the present Act, to my knowledge this amount has not been increased for over 10 years.

There is no reference in the Bill to the maximum area of an exploration permit, whereas in the current Mining Act the maximum area of an authority to prospect for all minerals other than coal is 100 subblocks or 300 square kilometres. I would therefore assume that the maximum area of an exploration permit will be left to the discretion of the Minister. As a guide to exploration permit applicants, I believe that a maximum area should be spelt out in the Bill, otherwise there will be applicants who, with the periodic reduction of permit area provisions of the Bill in mind, will apply for areas far in excess of their exploration capabilities.

The provisions in this Bill relating to exploration permits are fairly comprehensive. However, to be effective they must be made to work. Unfortunately, this can only be done if there is compliance with the terms and conditions under which the permits are issued.

The Bill provides for a mineral development licence, which is new and which will enable an exploration permit holder to evaluate the potential of a mineral occurrence prior to proceeding to the mining stage. Under the present Act, holders of an authority to prospect are allowed to surrender all or part of an existing authority in order to obtain an authority to prospect for retention purposes. A number of such authorities, mainly for coal, exist throughout the State. The Bill provides that the maximum initial term of a mineral development licence is five years, but it can be renewed. I believe that, except in exceptional circumstances, five years is sufficient time for an assessment to be made of the economic potential of a mineral occurrence. At the end of that time the holder of a mineral development licence should be in a position to determine whether to apply for a mining lease or relinquish his tenure on the area in question.

The Bill does provide that the Minister may at any time direct the holder to apply for a mining lease. Where the holder does not apply for a mining lease within a specified time, the Minister may cancel the mineral development licence and the land covered in the licence then ceases to be part of the land covered by any current exploration permit.

As is provided in other parts of the Bill, there is provision for the lodging of security deposits and for land-owners to pursue compensation for damage caused to land.

Although the provisions in the Bill relating to mining leases are similar to those contained in the present Mining Act, the Bill now provides that an applicant for a mining lease must hold a prospecting permit or permits, an exploration permit or permits or a mineral development licence or licences. Where an area of land ceases to be covered by an exploration permit for a period of two calendar months, a mining lease application in respect of land contained in that permit covering an area of more than 50 hectares is not to be granted. Although the explanatory notes state that the legislation restricts

the aggregate area of mining leases available to an applicant in an area released from an exploration permit to 300 hectares during the two-month moratorium period, I have difficulty relating that statement to the provisions in the Bill. The owner of land which is subject to a mining lease application can also now apply to the mining registrar for a conference with the applicant.

As in the clause covering mining claims, the Bill does not spell out the precise purpose of the conference, but does provide that a mining lease will not be granted or renewed unless the matter of compensation to the land-owner for loss of use, damage, etc., has been determined by negotiation and agreement or by the Wardens Court.

While the Bill spells out that the Wardens Court shall settle the amount of compensation an owner of land is entitled to as compensation for deprivation of possession of the surface of land, diminution of the value of land or any improvements thereon, etc., and all loss or expense that arises, there are many land-owners who consider this section of the Bill does not go far enough.

In this regard, the Minister indicated this evening in his second-reading speech to the new Bill, which is now before the House, that certain changes have been made and that these are in accordance with many of the wishes of land-owners. I am aware that this is the case; I am aware that last Sunday there was a meeting of land-owners in Charters Towers and that that meeting intended to put certain submissions to the Minister for his consideration. I am pleased to see that the amendments have been included in the Bill, even though I have not had a chance to see how they fit in. From what I heard the Minister say this evening, I would say that they are in accordance with the general wishes of a number of people who I know were concerned about the provisions of this legislation. That is an indication of the reason that last week during the Estimates debate I foreshadowed that I thought this Bill should lie on the table for a little longer. I am aware that there are still many people in the community who are not completely happy with its contents.

The initial term of a mining lease is still to be for a period approved by the Governor in Council on the recommendations of the Minister, but the period will not be limited to the maximum of 21 years, as it is at present.

The Bill provides for the establishment of mining registrars and field officers throughout the State. This must certainly assist the State's mining industry and improve the administration of the provisions contained in the Bill. Hopefully it will lead to better policing of the mining laws, which is something that for some reason or other has in the past been lacking. As I indicated during the Estimates debates, I note that applications for the positions of mining registrar, district tenures officers and field officers were called in the *Queensland Government Gazette* on 9 September 1989.

As I indicated at the start, the explanatory notes are very helpful in understanding the contents of this Bill. I also believe that the manner in which the Bill is set out enables easier reading of it and an understanding of its contents. However, as I have indicated, in a couple of places the intention could be made clearer.

When the Minister introduced the new Bill, he referred to amendments relating to principal stockyards. Throughout the Bill there are references to prospecting permits, mining claims, exploration permits, mineral development licences and mining leases and to distances from dwellings. The section relating to prospecting permits states—

“A prospecting permit does not authorize a person to enter or be upon the surface of land of an owner which is within 100 metres laterally of a dwelling-house, or other building . . . or within 50 metres laterally of a . . . dam, bore, or artesian well of that owner or other artificial water storage . . .”

This evening in his second-reading speech the Minister said—

“Provisions have been also incorporated throughout the Bill to ensure that no activities pursuant to the legislation can be carried out on the surface of the land of an owner that is within 50 metres laterally of the principal stockyard of that owner.”

The Minister has included stockyards.

Just as other members would have been contacted—I am sure the member for Mount Isa has been contacted by many people—I have been contacted by many people putting forward their point of view on the contents of the Bill. What the land-holders require is a distance of 500 metres from such area of land that is in occupation or upon which a house or other substantial building is erected and 100 metres laterally from a garden, orchard, cultivation, plantation or airstrip. The Minister has indicated the principal stockyard but, of course, airstrips are fairly prevalent in country areas. In my opinion it is not unreasonable that an airstrip be included in the provisions of the Bill. I have noted that the Minister has said that he will keep an eye on this. In his second-reading speech he also said—

“I also have concerns that the current restriction in relation to watering facilities on the larger properties, say in excess of 20 square kilometres, may be inadequate. I personally consider that 400 metres from such watering facilities, rather than the 50 metres provided, on such properties would provide for optimal stock disturbance minimisation.”

The matter of stock disturbance has also been raised with me and, as I continue, on the assumption that I accept what has been told to me, I may make some reference to some instances that have been reported to me. In the circumstances, some additional attention needs to be given to these distances of 100 metres and 50 metres. On the properties out in the west that I have visited throughout my life-time, 100 metres is not a great distance, particularly when this does not apply only to exploration permits; it also applies to mineral development licences and mining leases. If a large open-cut mine is 100 metres from a dwelling, that is pretty rough. As the Minister indicated, he has included principal stockyards. I suggest that some consideration be given to airstrips. Perhaps at some time in the future that entire matter could be reviewed.

I note that the Minister has foreshadowed that a committee made up of departmental officers, representatives of the major mining and rural organisations and representatives of such organisations as are considered appropriate from time to time will be set up to establish better dialogue between miners and land-owners. That is a pretty good idea, because it will help to overcome many of the problems that have arisen from time to time through mining. It is most important that there be harmony between those involved in the mining industry and those on the land. They both play an important role. We do not want miners fighting with land-owners, and vice versa. I hope that the Minister will take those comments on board in regard to that committee.

Another clause of the Bill that has caused considerable contention in central Queensland—the Minister for Police would be interested in this matter, because it is in his electorate—relates to the miners' common. At page 213 of the Bill, miners' commons are to be abolished. From information that I have received, people on the central Queensland gem-fields are very concerned about that provision. The gem-fields contain a miners' common of 9 000 acres that was designated for fossicking under the Mining (Fossicking) Act that was introduced in 1986. My first thoughts about the matter were that, if it was covered by the Mining (Fossicking) Act, it was a designated area and should not change; therefore, there was no need to worry. However, the people on the gem-fields are worried about it. A group is attempting to take up a permit to occupy over the area.

I have not had an opportunity to consider the ramifications of that, but the Minister should clarify the position of the miners' common of 9 000 acres on the gem-fields. The people on the gem-fields are a particular type of people. They are concerned for their future. They are concerned that large machine-mining operations might move into those gem-fields. The former Minister visited the area earlier this year and articles appeared in the press about large-scale mining operations on the gem-fields. As I have indicated from time to time, it is Labor Party policy to strictly control machine mining on the gem-fields. They are a valuable part of mining operations in this State and they also play a very important part in the tourist industry.

On numerous occasions, the member for Peak Downs has commented on what a great asset the gem-fields are as a tourist destination. When I first visited the gem-fields in 1979, he was critical of some statements that I made in my capacity as the Opposition spokesman on Mines and Energy. At the time, I said that the gem-fields looked like a moonscape. From my observations, the amount of restoration being carried out was practically negligible. The member took me to task in the local press and made capital out of my statements. I understand that things have improved there. However, because of the depth of feeling, I would like the Minister to comment on the possible loss of the miners' common on the central Queensland gem-fields.

The matter of compensation is addressed in the Bill. It contains provisions relating to prospecting permits where the Crown or a land-owner can recover costs of rectification of damage to land in the Wardens Court. The same provision applies to exploration permits. As far as mining claims and mining leases are concerned, the provisions are more extensive. I have dealt with those. The land-owner can request a conference before the mining registrar or he can apply to the mining registrar for the Wardens Court to determine the matter of compensation. After three months, if the matter has not been dealt with by the methods to which I have referred, the mining registrar shall refer the question of compensation to the Wardens Court.

The new Bill contains amendments to the area of compensation. The Minister said that, when land is to be acquired by a mining company, compensation in addition to what is prescribed in the Bill for mining claims and mining leases will be made. He mentioned additional compensation of 10 per cent.

Mr Katter: A minimum of 10 per cent.

Mr VAUGHAN: When compulsory acquisition of a person's property takes place, payment of market value is grossly unfair. If a person is forced to give up his property, he should be entitled to more than the market value for the property.

Mr Katter: Hear, hear! I agree.

Mr VAUGHAN: I agree completely with that provision. A person does not want to leave his property; it is his home. However, somebody comes along and says, "I want to acquire your land and all I am prepared to give you is the market value." That is grossly unfair. Compensation should be made for the disturbance to that person. The Bill will assist in that regard.

The Minister referred also to agreements being reached between miners and land-owners. The Cattlemen's Union was part of the original negotiations. It is argued that it backed off from the original agreements that were reached. I know for a fact that that union was very concerned to have a formal agreement drawn up which spelled out exactly what the score was for its members. Having regard to what I have already said, I must say that I can appreciate that union's thinking.

A lot of attention was given to the provisions that exist in mining legislation in other States. I was able to obtain a copy of the format of agreements in other States. In addition, through the good graces of a chap whom I consider to be a friend, I obtained a copy of a proposed agreement that the land-owners were floating around Queensland. I hope that the provisions that have been incorporated in this Bill will appease or satisfy the land-owners. Perhaps a formal agreement such as the one that they have been promoting could be incorporated in the legislation at some future time.

The Minister also mentioned a code of conduct. I am aware that there is a code of conduct which genuine and sincere mining companies adhere to when they go onto properties. I would say that the majority of companies would abide by that code of conduct. However, I am aware that there are what are referred to as cowboy mining companies that go onto properties and do all sorts of things.

I have received a copy of a veterinarian's report relating to a property up north which details what happened on that property. In view of the lateness of the hour, I

will not go into that now. However, my information is that steel pickets were placed in paddocks and helicopters flew in and upset the stock. Information was given to the landholder about when the exploration company's people were going to come onto the property but that was changed at the last minute, in spite of the fact that the landholder had made arrangements to relocate his stock.

Incidents such as that one destroy the relationship that should exist between landholders and mining companies. If mining companies want to go onto properties to prospect or to explore, they should respect the position of the people who own those properties. The instance that I cited is not an isolated case. My information is that that sort of thing was fairly widespread. I repeat that, if I had had the time tonight, I would have gone into the cases in a bit more detail. I sincerely hope that the problems of which I have been informed regarding miners going onto landholders' property have to a great extent been overcome and that in future there will be better relations between the parties.

I cannot miss this opportunity to respond to some remarks that the Minister made last week during the Estimates debate about what is commonly called, in the mining industry, the gold tax. It is not a gold tax. I want to clarify the position. I will outline the facts as they have been presented to me. From 1 January 1991, normal company tax will apply to profits from gold-mining. At present, gold-mining companies are the only profit-seeking firms that are exempt from tax on their profits. All other industries, including other mining industries, pay company tax.

The existing exemption from company tax is a subsidy. At present that subsidy costs tax-payers approximately \$300m. Major beneficiaries of the exemption are foreign Treasuries. As much as 50 per cent of the industry is foreign owned and dividends paid are assessed in other countries. Withdrawal of the exemption is not expected to have a significant impact on exploration activity, and after 1 January 1991 immediate deductibility of exploration expenditure will be available to the gold-mining companies. In addition, Australian companies are investing in gold-mining ventures abroad, where they have to pay this so-called gold tax.

As the Minister indicated last week, and as is indicated in the Budget papers, mining companies looking for gold are springing up like mushrooms. From time to time I have asked questions about the number of companies in operation. The last time I asked such a question was in 1987. The former Minister gave me a very comprehensive answer. He said that gold-mining activity in this State was looking great.

I cannot see that the so-called gold-mining tax will have an adverse effect. That remains to be seen. However, the argument that is advanced is, "All right. If gold-mining companies are not going to be required to pay normal company tax, why should other mining companies have to pay? Why shouldn't they all be exempted?"

The tax-payer has to subsidise these companies, and the royalty that the State receives from the gold-miners is really very small. I do not think it is unreasonable. Anyway, let us see what happens. The forecast is that it will result in all of these gold-miners abandoning their plans and not involving themselves in gold-mining. As I say, that remains to be seen. If it has an adverse effect, I will be the first to admit that I was wrong.

I wanted to state the facts as I understand them because a somewhat biased version has been portrayed in regard to what is simply the imposition of normal company tax on gold-mining companies.

Mr Simpson interjected.

Mr VAUGHAN: Let us see what happens.

I reserve any further comments to the debate at the Committee stage.

Mrs McCAULEY (Callide) (11.08 p.m.): Before I commence my speech, Mr Speaker, may I draw your attention to the temperature in the Chamber. I can only think that

someone entered the Chamber, thought it was the morgue and put the temperature down accordingly. My only consolation is that, if the cholesterol level of the honourable member for Southport polishes him off in the next few hours, he will keep pretty well in this temperature for several weeks.

I welcome the introduction of the Mineral Resources Bill. It has been a mammoth task to review the mining legislation in toto and to arrive at such a workable piece of legislation. I commend Kevin Wolff and the previous Minister, Mr Tenni, for their efforts.

As a grazier who is married to a miner, I can see both sides of the argument in this story. It seems to me that it is a case of: you can please all of the people some of the time, some of the people all of the time but you can never please all of the people all of the time.

I am a member of the Cattlemen's Union and, while I have been lobbied quite intensively by that union by letter for the last few months, I have never been lobbied by anyone from the mining lobby, such as the Queensland Chamber of Mines. I know that two years' work has gone into this Bill in consultation with the Queensland Chamber of Mines and the Queensland Producers Federation, which comprises the Queensland Graingrowers Association, the Cattlemen's Union and the United Graziers Association. The final product, while it will not please everyone, is a very good piece of legislation. I personally never aim to please everyone. I aim to please 60 per cent of people and that is probably a good working figure.

First of all, I would like to talk about the benefits that accrue to land-holders. This needs to be spelt out very clearly. I hope that those who intend to discuss the merits or otherwise of this Bill are familiar with the old legislation so that they know exactly the differences between the new and the old legislation.

The substantial gains that land-holders will have from this Bill include—

prior notification of any entry to land for prospecting or exploring;

security deposits in respect of all prospecting or exploration activities to ensure rectification of any damage to land or improvements, with no limits specified;

no prospecting, exploration or mining on Crown or freehold land within 100 metres laterally of dwellings, places of business, stockyards, etc. and within 50 metres laterally of artificial storages of water;

the removal of the current provision which allows the Minister for Mines to prevent freeholding of Crown leasehold land in areas of mineral potential, and this is very important in the Callide electorate because I have graziers who have been waiting to freehold their land and have not been able to do so and are looking forward to this legislation going through;

land-owners requiring potential miners to attend conferences to resolve concerns, and these are virtually compulsory conferences;

compensation payable on mining leases and mining claims for loss of profits from land;

compensation value capable of being enhanced where evidence is produced that the status and use of the land warrants it, and I feel that that is a very fair clause which states that a premium, plus not less than 10 per cent, is to be decided by the Wardens Court, with appeal to the Land Court, which is a very fair way of doing things;

compensation for damage to surface of land where no surface area is included in the mining lease;

terms of compensation agreement to form part of the conditions of the lease or claim and non-adherence to terms or non-payment of amounts to lead to cancellation of the mining title; provisions whereby persons who are non-performers and breach the mining legislation will not be able to obtain further authorisation under the legislation, and this again related to Boyne Valley in my electorate where some

mining companies have badly degraded hillsides, silted up creeks and generally caused problems that have taken a long time to sort out; and

provision for appointment of local resident field officers to investigate any land-holder complaints and provide liaison between miners and land-holders.

They are the major benefits to land-holders from this piece of legislation.

The mining and rural industries are the driving force of this State's economy. This Bill proposes a balanced approach to multiple land use, with substantial gains to land-holders when compared with the current legislation. Lack of support for this legislation can only place the future of the mining industry in jeopardy.

For the benefit of those honourable members who think that that is not such a bad thing, I quote the following figures: in 1985-86, the total value of mining production in Queensland was \$3 billion. That is a lot of money. Because the major mineral in my electorate is coal I can point out that the coal industry is Queensland's largest export industry. It earned \$3.3 billion or 42 per cent of the State's total exports. In 1986-87, coal represented 66 per cent of the value of all Queensland minerals, more than 90 per cent of which comes from the central Queensland area.

The coal industry has been a prime mover in the decentralisation of Queensland, and we should never forget it. It built towns where previously there were none and financed the construction of social and industrial infrastructure. In the last decade, over 40 per cent or \$1.95 billion of the capital spending by the coal industry has been devoted off site to the construction of power, water, road, rail, port and residential town facilities. This infrastructure has also benefited the grazing and agricultural industries, and the people who live out in the remote areas now have schools, better roads, better health facilities and better social infrastructure with hotels, golf-courses, etc., all brought in by the coal-mining industry.

The coal industry is responsible for 30 000 jobs Statewide and \$6.6 billion worth of industrial output in Queensland. It is interesting to note that research shows that Queensland coal mine households spend over \$300m annually and Queensland coal mines spend \$900m annually on goods and services in the State. The coal industry is estimated to impact directly and indirectly on the lives of 250 000 Queenslanders. Unfortunately, I am not in possession of similar figures for the grazing industry and the agricultural industry, but the mining industry's figures are certainly impressive.

Although the Queensland Producers Federation agrees with this legislation, the Cattlemen's Union has expressed some concerns that I would like to deal with. The Cattlemen's Union requested seven days' notice to object to prospecting permits which, as Mr Vaughan pointed out, replace the miner's right and permit to enter that were included in the old legislation. Under the original Bill, neither of those permits was subject to objection. The permits are for only three months and there is the safeguard of a security deposit, which was not included in the original legislation.

Notification by phone of these permits and notification of entry is also required, which is a very fair and sensible way of doing things. As to exploration permits—this new legislation makes the mining companies responsible to the Minister for Mines, who can oversee exploration projects, including rehabilitation and any other conditions that are imposed and which would allow for special concerns or local circumstances.

The Minister has mentioned that this could be Caesar overseeing Caesar, but it would be rather foolish if the Mines Department did not pay very close attention to what is going on. I cannot see how it would benefit the department at all not to use its powers wisely. In other words, the farmer has the satisfaction of knowing that the conditions are imposed by the Government and may be enforced through both an Act and regulations with proper penalties.

By contrast, the New South Wales system of exploration agreements, which has no legal status, does not provide for a security bond and has no authority in law. It is, in fact, a toothless tiger. In addition, the Queensland land-owners also will have the code

of conduct that was recently revised by the Chamber of Mines and the major rural groups. That code of conduct has been in force since 1982.

Compensation for damage will be a requirement under the legislation in Queensland. It is simply part of the voluntary agreement in New South Wales. It must be understood clearly that the Queensland legislation will give land-holders in Queensland far greater protection and legal backing than does the Act in New South Wales. Any presumption that New South Wales land-owners have concessions that are not available to their Queensland counterparts is simply not true.

The arguments that have been put forward by the Queensland Cattlemen's Union request requirements for up-front payments by explorers for every activity to be undertaken on the owner's land, which could, I suppose, be seen as a cynical money-making exercise by some people. I am sure that it was not intended that way, but it really is not acceptable to the mining industry.

The Cattlemen's Union suggested that the at-risk agreement be included in the legislation. Once again, that is unnecessary because the agreement is working well and is acknowledged by all other rural groups. It should be that the only time that the legislation is needed is when the system is not working. As the Minister has promised to keep a close eye on this legislation, I am sure that, if it is not working or if it breaks down, the Minister will rectify it. A committee comprising a Mines Department representative, two mining representatives and two rural representatives has been set up to monitor that agreement. The committee is working well.

I welcome the idea of a working party, which was expounded by the Minister, to keep a close watch on this Bill and, hopefully, ease the concerns that are still being felt in some quarters. I believe that the Bill will be welcomed by graziers who are wanting to freehold. Hopefully the working party that will monitor the implementation and working of the new Bill will avoid any of the pitfalls that exist at the moment.

I believe that the miners and the farmers who are the producers of our primary wealth have to live and work together. This legislation provides a very good basis for that working agreement.

Mr BEARD (Mount Isa—Deputy Leader of the Liberal Party) (11.20 p.m.): I wish to open my speech with a little bit of background on this industry. The mining industry, which I know so well, has no parallels in any other industry in the world with regard to how much has to be invested at such a high risk for such a long time before there is any chance of getting any return at all. No industry in Australia has contributed as much in our history as has the mining industry.

This is a very unusual country. It is pretty well a first-world country because it is an affluent, developed nation that has all the benefits of an industrial society and, unfortunately, many of its problems. Australia relies on its primary products for its well being, so it could be said that it is a first-world country with a Third World economy.

Until the early 1920s the mining and rural industries accounted for virtually for all of Australia's exports. Today both industries still provide almost 80 per cent of Australia's export revenue, which is easy to say quickly but, when one thinks about it, it is 80 per cent. Over 80 per cent of Australia's mineral production is exported. In 1988 that production was valued in excess of \$16.6 billion. It is expected to reach \$20 billion this year, which represents something like 45 per cent to 50 per cent of total export revenue.

In nearly all of the major instances of mineral development large amounts of money have had to be spent on infrastructure and services. Mineral deposits cannot be worked and the products cannot be sold overseas without the development of deep-water ports and efficient railway facilities, the construction of towns and the development of communication links with the rest of the country.

I turn now to some figures that will make people think. Not too many people in Australia get the opportunity to see mining at first hand. I take every possible opportunity to remind them of the wealth that mining brings to this country.

For example, since 1967 the mining industry has built 25 new towns, 12 new ports, 20 airfields, 2 000 kilometres of railway line, 15 dams and thousands of kilometres of roads at little or no cost to the tax-payer.

In the coal section of the Queensland mineral industry in excess of \$10 billion has been spent on those sorts of infrastructure. Unfortunately, in Australia the level of taxation, Government charges and direct Government intervention in the mining industry have reached the point at which the industry's competitiveness has been seriously eroded. That is one of the main factors that has caused Australia to slide down the standard of living in the world, hurtling past 23 countries at an ever-increasing rate of knots.

For example, in 1986-87 the mining industry paid direct taxes of approximately 55 per cent of pre-tax operating profit, and total payments to the Government totalled \$3.7 billion. That figure does not include any of the taxes that are dressed up as rail freights or port charges. That was at a time when the industry saw its sixth consecutive year of poor returns.

Governments are not only taking an increasing share of the mining industry's earnings, but also at a higher proportion compared with other industries. If anyone points the finger at mining, as a member did earlier tonight when he was speaking about gold taxes, he should listen to this. Taxation Institute figures show that in 1985 the mining industry paid 8.4 per cent of gross sales in taxation, compared with 2.3 per cent for the finance and insurance industries, 2.2 per cent for rural production, 1.7 per cent for manufacturing and construction and 0.8 per cent for wholesale and retail. I am not about to listen to anyone in this House saying that mining does not pay its way in Australia. It pays its way, and then some.

In terms of total tax revenue raised from companies and the major industries, the mining sector contributes almost 19 per cent and is the single largest industry contributor to tax revenue. There is no doubt that Governments operate the most successful extractive industry in Australia today.

For much of the mining industry, the largest imposed costs are State Government taxes and charges such as royalties, energy costs and rail freights. These charges and taxes are not sensitive to the international markets and hence to the capacity of the Australian mineral-producers to pay. I say here and now that the proposal on coal rail freights, which was prepared by the Queensland Coal Association in March 1989, has the full and unqualified support of the Liberal Party.

It is time that we as a nation started looking at what obstacles can be removed from the path of resource development.

Mr Katter interjected.

Mr BEARD: That is well and truly paid for. In Queensland in the last decade, not a single new green-field coal mine was brought in, and there is none on the books now. That has stifled investment, and it has stifled development. There are alternative ways of getting the money. It can be obtained from expanding the industry and benefiting from the taxes and the infrastructure and the employment that flows from that, not by stifling the industry with coal rail freights which have well and truly outlived their usefulness.

We have to look at what obstacles can be removed from the path of resource development rather than devising further impediments to test the limits of the industry's endurance and hamper and discourage expansion and investment. I think that this Bill addresses some of those impediments. I compliment the Government for that.

In fact, as has been said previously, this legislation is the most comprehensive mining legislation to be introduced in Queensland this century. Previously we have been working on what was essentially the 1898 Act with amendments, and there have been very few indeed since 1968. I am happy to say that this legislation is well in line with Liberal Party mining policy and therefore I have no trouble at all in supporting it.

As a matter of fact, I offer sincere compliments to the Government for developing this legislation. I also compliment the Department of Mines, the Queensland Chamber of Mines, and all the rural producers represented by the Queensland Producers Federation who have worked so hard and so long over two and a-half to three years developing it.

I pay top compliments to the previous Minister for Mines and Energy, Mr Martin Tenni. It was a great effort to shepherd this legislation through a number of mine-fields—a number of barriers—and he has done it. I have had plenty of phone calls from people in Queensland, as has Mr Vaughan, about this legislation. It has been generally greeted with great goodwill and great enthusiasm and great hopes that it will pass through the House tonight without any further problems.

I am happy to say that I compliment the former Minister. He does not belong to my party. I have to confess that, from outside, I have had a few shots at him in the past. But I have certainly not fired any shots at him over this legislation.

Mr Katter is now responsible for Mines and Energy. I am delighted that he has brought this legislation forward tonight. I do not have to tell him that over the last week there has been a lot of concern that maybe it would not be passed, because some people got hold of his ear and certainly put some impediments in the way of the legislation. I will speak about that in a moment. I am not knocking those people. Every organisation and every person has a right to put forward arguments and look after No. 1; to look after his own interest. However, for a while it seemed that two and a-half to three years of very hard work might have gone down the tube. That would have been a tragedy. I have paid enough compliments.

Those people in Mount Isa who are called the gougers, the small miners, those rugged individuals who go out into the hills and make practically nothing, do so because of their independent streak. They choose not to work for a crust, receive a good income and live in air-conditioning in the town. Even they were invited down to Brisbane in May to be briefed on this new legislation. They had their day in court. Their concerns were listened to.

The body which did break ranks—although that term may not be strictly accurate—from the Queensland Producers Federation in the last few weeks and put some impediments in the way of this legislation was, of course, the Cattlemen's Union. That union has been mentioned previously. Maybe not entirely as a result of its intervention, but certainly subsequent to its intervention, there has been, as we all know, an extensive rewrite of the legislation. That included something like 107 amendments, which I believe were purely mechanical matters such as correcting spelling mistakes and so forth. However, the rewrite included four substantive amendments that were included at the request of the Cattlemen's Union following Mr Katter's extensive consultations with it. I have seen those four amendments. I have heard them talked about tonight. They are certainly okay by me. I understand that the mining industry accepts them. There are two in particular that have been referred to, one of which provides for extra compensation for compulsory acquisition. That is fine. That concerns a man's living. That is his own land. If a person is unlucky enough to have extensive mineral deposits under his land, then some dislocation can occur and a fair recompense is certainly not against the Australian spirit.

The other amendment, which was substantive, refers to stockyards and artefacts around the property which can be included in the provision relating to the 50-metre exclusion. There are no problems with that. I understand that that amendment was accepted by the industry.

However, I understand that the Cattlemen's Union still has some strong reservations about the legislation. I fear that it will be heard from again. As I said, that is that union's right. It is the duty of the Minister to listen to its reservations. I suspect that next year some amendments may be made to the legislation.

Cattlemen will not get any rubbish from me. Queensland has two primary industries which take their own risks and are not supported by commodity marketing boards and

by extensive regulations and protection. They are the mining industry and the beef cattle industry.

Mr FitzGerald: What about the fruit and vegie growers? There are a few of those.

Mr BEARD: They are a little more protected than the fellows out in the west, but I will take the honourable member's interjection. Because Mr FitzGerald grows onions, I will accept that onion-growers in the Lockyer valley are rugged individualists deserving of our entire respect.

Mr Simpson: What about the cane-farmers?

Mr BEARD: What does Mr Simpson want? What should I include for him?

Mr Simpson: Ginger.

Mr BEARD: Ginger-farmers? I will include the ginger-farmers, particularly those who live near Mr Simpson.

I want to talk for a little while about the cattlemen.

Mr Veivers: What about the dairy-farmers?

Mr BEARD: Dairy-farmers? Mr Veivers has put on more weight through protection of that industry than I could put on in a million years through mining.

What about those fellows out in the west—the cattlemen? Over the years they have been penalised by fringe benefit taxes. They have to include their assets in means tests so that they can get an Austudy allowance for their kids. They have to put up with unfenced highways that cause stock losses. They have inadequately resourced stock squads that try to stop stock thefts and find burglars. There is insufficient funding by both Governments of the Royal Flying Doctor Service which is supposed to—and does—spread a mantle of safety over inland regions.

Mr FitzGerald interjected.

Mr BEARD: I have statistics that the Minister might be interested in. West of the Great Dividing Range from the border near Goondiwindi to as far north as the gulf and the cape, there are three surgeons. One is Dr Ariotti who lives in Charleville. I believe that he will be retiring shortly, so there will be only a surgeon in Roma and a surgeon in Longreach. That medical service covers the whole western region of this State; nevertheless, cattlemen live in those areas and do without medical services. The people of western Queensland also have to put up with poor roads that require a great deal of maintenance. If they live far enough away from a town, they have to spend \$10 to send a lettergram through Australia Post. They also battle drought, floods and fires.

I am not going to rubbish cattlemen because they have always co-existed well with miners. Miners and cattlemen are the fellows who made the west. They settled the west. I have to admit, however, that in the past some miners have not done the right thing by cattlemen. Sometimes they have wrecked fences and left gates open, made a mess and have not rehabilitated the land. Sometimes they have not provided any recompense for damage, or for killing or disturbing stock. Generally, though, miners and cattlemen get along very well together as they have opened up the western regions of this State.

A very few cattlemen have been unlucky enough to have major mineral discoveries made on their properties. The Campbell family in Mount Isa comes to mind. When people have development of something as large as Mount Isa built in their back yards, it tends to cause a fair bit of dislocation. However, what must be remembered—and I say this for the benefit of people who do not know very much about mining—is that the total area being mined in Australia is 0.02 per cent of the surface area of this country. More land is dedicated to roads and highways than is used for mining. The outback is so vast that it is even possible not to see a city the size of Mount Isa, with a population of 25 000 people, if a person does not look out the windows on the right side of an

aeroplane. I will not for one moment buy all the nonsense that is continually spoken about miners raping and despoiling the land and leaving a mess everywhere.

This afternoon I listened with some pleasure to what the member for Mourilyan, Mr Eaton, had to say. The honourable member should be often quoted because he comes from the Australian Labor Party and shows a commendable balance in his views. He said today that there is a middle road between development and conservation. He also said that he would not picket to stand up for the protection of the one-legged flea. I think that was the term he used. It is refreshing to hear a parliamentarian for whom other members of this Assembly have great respect refer to the existence of the middle road. It is refreshing, particularly in the light of the fact that for the last week or two a great deal has been said about Coronation Hill in Stage 3 of the Kakadu national park, which is supposed to be a conservation zone that is open to full exploration for a period of five years. Within 12 months of the announcement to establish that zone, people were talking about locking up \$7.5 billion worth of gold, palladium and platinum. The total area of exploitation will amount to one-quarter of the site occupied by Parliament House in Canberra. A person could walk within 100 yards of it and fail to see it.

Even in the Australian Labor Party's Cabinet, there are some sensible Ministers. Mr John Kerin and Senator Peter Cook certainly know what it is worth, and so does Senator Bob Collins from the Northern Territory. They talk sense, as does Mr Bill Eaton. However, a turkey like Graham Richardson spoils everything. Every time I read about Richardson I am reminded of what Winston Churchill had to say in 1939. He spoke about appeasement and said that, as far as appeasement was concerned, everybody was feeding the crocodile in the hope that it would eat him last. Graham Richardson has been feeding the greenie crocodile and it is going to eat him. He has gone so far towards appeasing the greenies that they now think they have him in their jaws. He will have a great deal of trouble with them.

The pragmatists in the Labor Party—Kerin, Cook and company—know very well that Australia's mineral wealth has to be extracted. Mineral wealth is the whole future for Australia's export income. I could go on and on about the Kakadu issue but will simply warn honourable members to watch out for it. I repeat that the area that will be mined will occupy one-quarter of a site the size of Parliament House in Canberra but it will produce \$7.5 billion worth of gold, palladium and platinum. Incidentally, palladium and platinum are minerals that are used in pollution controls in automobiles. However, the Australian Conservation Foundation and some of the wilderness and wildlife lobby groups do not know that. They take uncompromising stances and refuse to discuss the issues. They want all or nothing at all. They get the Aborigines on side. I firmly believe that the Jarwoyn Aboriginal people are being exploited by people who live in Canberra, Sydney and Melbourne and have never been past the tram terminus. Those people would not know how to make a dollar in export earnings. They only know how to take in each other's laundry. They do not know how to create wealth. They use every trick and device they can, including getting the Aboriginal people on side, to stop this country being developed.

The mining industry can be developed and the Kakadu area can retain its beauty. Many other mining properties have been able to preserve their natural attractions over the years. The national interest must be the pre-eminent consideration. No-one wants to destroy the environment.

During the Estimates debate on Mines and Energy, I mentioned that I live a kilometre from a lead smelter. I live comfortably and I enjoy great health. I am not at all concerned about what my children might be breathing, hearing or experiencing. I know from personal experience that it can be done. Mining companies everywhere have been able to do exactly that.

Mr Katter: I lived there for six months. I am a great advertisement for lead smelters.

Mr BEARD: Mr Deputy Speaker, can I pass by that comment?

Cattlemen are not stupid. They know the benefits that mining brings to Australia and that, if mines are established in the outback, they benefit from the towns, dams, power, roads, rail, airports, shops, hospitals, schools, ports and royalties. They know as well as other people in Australia know the benefits that mining can offer. However, they should be treated with respect and given fair warning when people want to come onto their land. They have to have agreements and they should receive recompense. Rehabilitation of the land should be guaranteed. Mining companies will provide those benefits for them. This legislation addresses those matters.

The legislation is acceptable to all primary producers. I sincerely hope that the Cattlemen's Union will accept the four proposed amendments and take it as a good compromise that will result in benefits for all concerned. Everything is a trade-off. No-one wins 100 to nil. For the good of this country, people should always be prepared to accept a trade-off. National wealth has to be provided for all to share. It cannot be locked up by selfish people who do not know what they are talking about and who do not understand the simple basic truth that minerals must be mined where they are found.

It would be lovely if all the mineral deposits could be put into the desert and mined there, but that is not possible. They have to be mined where they are found. I would like to spend a few minutes talking about mineral sands, but I will not open that Pandora's box now. There are special cases in relation to some minerals but the most important consideration is that Australia's national wealth is properly looked after.

Reduced land access is a growing concern for miners. I will mention a couple more statistics. Details recently released by the Australian Mining Industry Council clearly show that 23.5 per cent of Australia's land surface is now prohibited or severely restricted to mineral exploration and/or development. Single-interest groups—such as the one-legged-flea people—have already given notice that another 20.2 per cent is under threat. If they succeed, nearly half of Australia's land area will be locked up to prospectors. Without access for exploration and possibly later for development, the Australian mining industry has a very limited future. It is of considerable concern that no-one in Government or Opposition seems prepared to champion the cause of a cohesive, sensible policy on the environment which would protect the interests of all Australians but allow development to continue. A week or two ago it was announced that some taxation concessions would be removed from the exploration for future minerals.

Mr Vaughan: Not from the gold-mining industry.

Mr BEARD: No, exploration.

A few years ago, I listened to a very entertaining speech by Professor Don Nicklin at the University of Queensland. He entitled his speech, "The critical importance of the twenty-seventh fortnightly pay to the planning for the University of Queensland." After that brilliant title, the theme of his speech was that, as there are 365 days in a year—that is 26 fortnights plus one day—after 10, 11 or 12 years, there is an extra fortnight, or twenty-seventh fortnight, in that year. If the paymaster at the University of Queensland, who has a pay-roll of some \$5m per week, or \$10m per fortnight, does not plan for that extra twenty-seventh fortnight every 10 or 11 years, all of a sudden the bin will be \$10m shy. He and the university will be in big trouble because they have to find the money from somewhere.

I equate that sort of planning and thinking to exploration in mining. People who have not visited mining areas do not understand. For example, over \$1 billion of revenue per year is being produced from that one mine—at Mount Isa—but the company is already planning what it will be mining in 20 years' time. It is well advanced on what it will be mining in five or 10 years' time. They are called the short-term and long-term plans. The people in the industry have to drill, explore, assay and measure the ore bodies so that they know where to mine and when to provide all the services and access. They work out that they can afford to mine the mineral at a certain cost. For example, the cut-off rate might be 3 per cent. However, some Government three years down the

line might change all the rules, taxes and everything else so that suddenly it is no longer economic to mine the ore at 3 per cent. The company might have to mine at 3½ or 4 per cent, which might make the whole operation completely non-feasible. Instead of having a 10-year supply of ore from the mine, they may only have a four-year supply, and the ore that is left behind is left irretrievably in the ground.

People have to understand that mining is long term. Big capital is involved. It creates enormous wealth for the country. When the land is locked away, the rules are changed and new regulations are brought in, we are destroying our heritage and birthright. I do not feel sorry for someone sitting in the middle of the road who is holding a sign, wearing a band round his head, earrings in his ears and beads around his neck, and saying, "Don't destroy this beautiful little piece of country. I do not care if there are \$7.5 billion-worth of minerals underneath it and I do not care if I live in a timber house, drive a car and use power and all of Australia's other resources."

Mr Eaton: If you are polluting the air, you should walk.

Mr BEARD: No, not me. The honourable member is talking to the wrong horse.

Conservation of the environment, the retention of national parks, reserves, sacred sites and rainforests, and exploration and mining are not mutually exclusive activities. It must be recognised that land can be and is used for many purposes and that modern mining is compatible with the environmental requirements of society. I read recently that someone said, "There is not a great deal of difference between a developer and an environmentalist. A developer is someone who wants to build a cabin in the woods; an environmentalist is somebody who already has one there."

Given what mining has done for Australia over almost 200 years, it goes without saying that any concerns of the mining industry should be the concerns of the whole nation. Some years ago Sir James Foots, a great mining man, said—

"Each generation gives the impression of not having read the minutes of the last meeting."

As a result, Australia, which in 1900 was the richest country per capita in the world, today languishes at No. 23 and is still slipping.

On the Federal scene, the coalition policy was released at the beginning of August and was well received by the mining industry. The industry welcomed the Federal coalition's commitment to stable, simple and consistent resources and energy policies. Mr Lauchlan McIntosh, the director of the Australian Mining Industry Council, said that the coalition's objective of minimising Government intervention in the industry, and eliminating duplication of Government functions across Federal, State and local boundaries would help make the industry more competitive internationally. It was particularly helpful that the coalition had recognised that restrictions on access to land were hindering resource development and that the coalition policy was to promote multiple land use. I see echoes of this sort of policy in the legislation before the House, particularly the consultation with all groups—and I have spoken about the cattlemen.

I would like to make a few brief comments about the small miners and gougers, because they do have some concerns. These people were instrumental in opening up Australia. Even Mount Isa, where I come from, was discovered by a gouger, John Campbell-Miles, in 1923.

Mr FitzGerald: What was his wife's name?

Mr BEARD: He was not an onion-farmer.

The small miners are concerned because, with this new legislation, they will be reduced to two contiguous claims, with no machine mining allowed. They will have to hand mine, which is sad but necessary. I accept it because there are some factors which offset it to some degree. It must be admitted that some of the old-time gougers thought a miner's right allowed them to go anywhere and do anything, but it never did. It was their old, independent streak.

Mr Katter: I must interrupt you there. They are allowed to use some presses and they are allowed to use explosives, and that's all they have ever used in hand mining.

Mr BEARD: On the gem-fields I was terribly concerned that someone might be able to move in on a small tourist claim and rip out the gems with heavy earth-moving machinery, but I accept the Minister's guarantee.

I refer to page 104 of the legislation, Part 7, clause 7.7. The moratorium of two months will stop legal officers of the big companies playing with lease applications and keeping the small miners out. The small gougers do get some advantages under this legislation. For example, there will no longer be rental on mining lease applications, no bonds to be lodged until immediately before commencement of mining and bonds can be transferred from one mining operation to another. The legislation does not specify any restriction on shapes, areas, or terms of the claim, as long as they can be justified.

I hope that the miners will read what they are getting as the trade-off and accept it as beneficial to the whole industry in Australia and to all the people of Australia. It has to be admitted that very often in the past it was the small miners who did some of the damage; they were hard to control. Because the big companies cannot afford not to, they have always looked after the land. They have too much invested in it and they have always found it easier to look after the environment. They have always had to deal with rehabilitation, security deposits, compensation and so forth.

With this legislation we are looking for—and I think we will get it—the best possible use of land. In almost every way that I can see, this Bill improves on what existed before. That has been recognised by almost all groups of people affected by it. I will not list all of the parts of the legislation that set that out because there are 250 pages in the Bill. It is terribly complex and long. One of the things that the Bill does do, however, is to simplify what was previously a very complex piece of legislation, which makes it much easier to understand and to administer.

Another attractive feature of the legislation is that the Minister loses the power to prevent a resident from freeholding a miner's homestead perpetual lease. That will be well received in places like Mount Isa, where many residents live on such leases.

One thing I would like to see in this House and for this State is a proper review of royalties. From friends I have within the industry, I understand that a proposal for a resource rent tax was put up, but was thrown out before it saw the light of day. I understand further that the Department of Mines has had a new royalty proposal ready for some six months but Treasury—I guess it is Treasury—will not allow that department to release it. This leaves the industry in limbo and makes companies very nervous about what might happen in the future. I believe that the royalty review could have been, and probably should have been, tabled with this legislation. As it has not been tabled with this legislation, I hope it sees the light of day shortly. The gold-miners, in particular, are obviously very nervous about it because they are already facing up to the Federal Government's proposed gold tax.

I will conclude in a moment or two. The State Government can do much to increase and encourage mining to create further wealth for this State. Unfortunately, as we all know, much of the legislation that is needed to make mining better and wealthier—and therefore us wealthier—is in the hands of the Federal Government. I am speaking about interest rates, inflation and the value of the Australian dollar. With the Australian dollar sitting at more than 75c against the American dollar, in the last few years we have not been able to take advantage of the high prices for our commodities. That money has gone, never to be recovered.

The Australian dollar has been propped up artificially by high interest rates and monetary policies from Canberra. Not only the mining industry but also our other great primary industries have suffered. There must be much work and much lobbying of our Federal politicians on behalf of the great wealth-producing industries of this country. Unfortunately for us they are situated away from the capital cities, which have large numbers of seats in the Federal Parliament, and just do not have the clout that the

cities have. We must never let the Federal Government rest on that. I will take every opportunity I can at any venue—wherever I go—to keep harping on this: the Federal Government is destroying our great primary industries.

That is the only reason, really, why I entered this place—the Federal Government's actions in 1986, which had a tremendously adverse effect on the mining industry and on other primary industries. It was that straw that broke this camel's back. I was doing okay. I was heading towards retirement with a fair sort of a job in a town that I liked and with a company that I enjoyed working for. But with the imposition of the fringe benefits tax and the monetary policies artificially inflating the value of the Australian dollar, the great mining companies had to cut their costs. They had to put men off; they had to battle to stay alive. When I saw that, that was the straw that broke this camel's back. I said to myself, "Go and get somewhere where you have an opportunity every now and again to say something about the wealth that the mining industry brings to this country and to talk about some of the policies that have to be rejected so that it can play its full role in Australia."

Mr HINTON (Broadsound) (11.50 p.m.): I rise to support the Mineral Resources Bill and, in doing so, to add my voice to compliment, in particular, the former Minister for Mines, Mr Tenni, on the very difficult job that he has had. Having been involved in some of the intense negotiations of the last two or three days, I appreciate what a difficult job he has had in bringing together what might be called the wide, diverse views on land use in this State and the conflicts involved in that use. To gain this degree of consensus has been a great achievement. A very large degree of consensus applies to the Bill now before the House.

I also wish to compliment Mr Katter for his efforts, particularly in relation to the concerns of the beef industry. Over the last couple of weeks many of those concerns have been relayed to me. Certainly there are many concerned people out there. I support what the member for Mount Isa has said. There has been a reasonable trade-off and we should be able to bring people together to get some degree of satisfaction. However, there will remain some lingering concerns.

I wish to take a couple of minutes to mention a point made by the member for Nudgee. I am not in any way trying to score points off him, because I certainly did not know the answer. He mentioned that automatic renewals of authorities to prospect could occur under this Bill so that they could continue indefinitely, particularly if authorities to prospect or exploration agreements were voluntarily surrendered. I made the effort to check that out. In fact, if there is a conditional surrender, the only way to get a new grant of an exploration permit is pursuant to clause 5.12 of the Bill, which gives the Minister the discretion to extend the permit. So in fact there is no automatic extension of that permit; they do not go on and on; it depends on the Minister's view at the time.

Without question, Queensland ranks as one of the world's greatest mining areas. At the same time it is a State that contains prime agricultural lands and prime areas for Australia's great pastoral industries. The combination of those two industries gives us great strength. When one measures the size, the value and the importance of the mighty mining industry, one is constantly compelled to use a scale that can only be assessed in international terms. That did not happen by accident. The development of the Queensland mining industry has been achieved through a successful partnership between the State Government and private enterprise, supported by huge capital expenditure which, since the beginning of this decade, has averaged \$602m per annum.

In common with the member for Callide, I have a large coal industry in my electorate. Approximately one-third of my constituents are miners or are involved in the mining industry. As well, my electorate contains a very large agricultural and pastoral industry. My electorate has the lot. As the member for that electorate, both industries are very important to me.

Queensland's coal industry alone is responsible for the tremendous infrastructure development that has occurred in the past decade in the form of new and expanded

towns, electrified railways, power stations, dams, communications and port facilities. I may well be swinging on the member for Callide's skirt with this speech, because I have agreed with so much of what she has said. The member for Mount Isa also pointed out the enormous value of the mining industry to the inland parts of the State. Modern health facilities, daily air services, shopping centres and all other amenities would not have been available to the people in the western towns of Dysart and Middlemount in my electorate if the mining industry had not come into those areas.

It is a great shame that the rural community and the mining community do not seem to mix. In fact, in my electorate, there is a barbed-wire fence between the two communities and very little interaction. While I was listening to one of the previous speakers, I was reminded of the song from *Oklahoma* that indicated that the cowboys and the farmers could be friends. It would be a good thing if the pastoralists and the miners in my electorate could be friends. It would improve the situation, because there is little interaction. In fact, further than that, there is some hostility between the two sections of the community. It is a great problem.

Mr Lee: It is a great pity.

Mr HINTON: As the member for Yeronga said, it is a great pity. However, regrettably, it is a fact of life. Part of that hostility stems from the enormous salaries that are paid to miners. People in the rural areas are struggling and share-farmers are having difficulties. Problems also face public servants and bank employees when they are transferred to mining communities. They receive lower salaries than mine-workers and see themselves as second-class citizens. As well, the miners are well looked after and are provided with subsidised housing. That causes friction. Nevertheless, it does not detract from the fact that the mining communities have brought to the rural and isolated areas tremendous benefits in the provision of infrastructure.

The legislation is balanced between the two conflicting interests so far as competing land uses are concerned. The Bill has the support of the mining sector and also the Queensland Producers Federation which is the major spokesman for the rural sector in Queensland. That is important. As the member for Mount Isa pointed out, there is no doubt that there is lingering discontent on the part of the Cattlemen's Union, which is a powerful organisation with approximately 7 000 members. It is certainly very strong in central and northern Queensland. However, once the advantages of the Bill are spelt out to those members, they will come to appreciate that they cannot have it all and that they have received a good deal. Many of their concerns that have been expressed tonight will have been alleviated. I refer to the concern that freeholding can be held up by virtue of the fact that land might be subject to a mining tenure.

I turn to resumptions. People are concerned about getting value for their land. In negotiations with mining companies, property-owners obtain a price that is many times the value of their land. I have negotiated on behalf of a couple of land-holders in my electorate whose properties have been in the path of coal-mining development. Some of the land was very poor box country and not of much value for grazing, yet they received almost treble the value of the land simply because the mining company wanted to avoid the difficulty of going to the Wardens Court and did not want to create discord in the district. As well, the value of the land was insignificant in the total cost structure of the mining operation. Most negotiations are settled without going to the Wardens Court. In most cases, the land-holders do well out of those negotiations with the mining companies.

In the new Bill I am pleased to see the provision for additional compensation that was negotiated by the Minister, Mr Katter. To his credit, he negotiated a deal over and above what was agreed to by the farmers federation. The value of a property is enhanced by the application of all the criteria that are relevant to it. Those criteria might be the fact that the property has been in the same family for generations and has tremendous sentimental value to the family; the fact that it is a well-known stud in the district, and to shift its location would be detrimental to business; or it might be a particularly choice piece of land which enhances the value of the property. If agreement is not reached in direct negotiations with the company, the matter will go to the Wardens Court. Under

the new provision, after those criteria are assessed and the value is set, agreement has been reached that a minimum of 10 per cent will be added. That is a significant factor. I stress the word "minimum"; it could be more than that.

Mr Lee: It may not be enough.

Mr HINTON: It may not be enough. However, one must recognise that that occurs only after the parties have failed to reach agreement. My electorate contains mining and pastoral interests. I have yet to see a situation in which the parties have gone to court and agreement has not been reached. The money involved is not a great percentage of the cost of the overall mining operation. Therefore, the mining company is prepared to pay a substantial premium to avoid the disruption, the irritation in the community and the hostility that will be created. As well, the mining company wants to get on with the job. That is a very important provision for the producers.

I want to deal with some of the other benefits to be gained from this legislation by the cattlemen. I am going to a Cattlemen's Union meeting on Saturday. I will have to face the music, but I am certainly going to be suggesting to those people that they have gained a great deal from this Bill. Those benefits include prior notification by the mining registrar or the licence-holder before entry onto land for prospecting. Of course, that is well warranted. I was pleased to hear the Opposition support that so strongly.

Explorers are to advise the land-owner at least seven days in advance of an intended entry and the program of work proposed, which is renewable every three months. So consultation will be taking place whereas, as the Minister said, that did not always happen. Somebody might find that a gate was open and a person was in there, going for his life. That could cause considerable disruption and certainly a great deal of anger, if nothing else. If the gates are left open and the bulls get in with the heifers at the wrong time of the year, a breeding program can be ruined or other disruption to the pastoral operation can be caused which can certainly be expensive.

No prospecting, exploration or mining on Crown or freehold land can take place within 100 metres laterally of dwellings, places of business, etc., and within 50 metres laterally of the principal stockyard and artificial water storages. I think that that is a great step forward, particularly the provision relating to buildings. I share the Minister's sentiments in regard to storages.

In some of the northern properties, particularly where there are shy Brahman cattle, the 50 metres is certainly not adequate. Perhaps that could be reconsidered in the future. I would have thought that up to half a kilometre would have been a reasonable distance because some cattle are shy. If a drilling plant is located near a windmill or a watering point and there are shy cattle out in the bush and they are disturbed, under some circumstances those cattle would die rather than come in to that watering point.

Mr Vaughan: The 50-metre limit also applies to mining leases, not only exploration.

Mr HINTON: That is quite true. I take the honourable member's point. That is quite valid.

Mr Katter: I think we might be able to do something by regulation or by administrative fiat to help out in these cases. There is a discretion still with the warden, but we are listening to you and we will try to do something.

Mr HINTON: I thank the Minister. In the northern part of my electorate—and I am sure in the Minister's electorate—that is a very important factor indeed.

I have already mentioned removal of the current provision which allows the Minister for Mines to prevent freeholding of Crown leasehold land in areas of mineral potential. I suppose that that is really the greatest plus for the pastoral and agricultural industries. To some extent this is a trade-off. There is now improved freehold land access, which was virtually limited to some degree not by law but by ministerial discretion. I think that that will be appreciated by the pastoral and agricultural industries. A great deal of

concern has been held for quite some time in regard to the fact that freeholding could be prevented by virtue of the land having mineral potential.

The Bill provides for land-owners and potential miners to attend conferences to resolve concerns. The member for Callide covered that point fairly well. I think that is a very important provision.

Compensation will be payable on mining leases and mining claims for loss of profits from land. The compensation value will be capable of being enhanced when evidence is produced that the status of the land warrants it. I have already covered that provision. That is certainly a critical factor. I mention again that 10 per cent is compulsory. Terms of compensation agreements are to form part of the conditions of a lease or claim, and non-adherence to terms or non-payment of amounts will lead to cancellation of the mining title. That provision is very important to the rural sector. Under this legislation, if a miner does the wrong thing, quite frankly he is going to be out of business. That is certainly a very important factor.

This is good legislation. I again compliment both Ministers, particularly Mr Tenni, for the effort that he put into having this legislation introduced. As I said at the outset, one only has to be involved in the negotiation process, talk to the miners and talk to the people involved in the pastoral industry to understand just what a difficult task it would have been to draft this complex legislation.

I also compliment Mr Wolff and his officers for the superb job that they have done. I support the legislation.

Mr EATON (Mourilyan) (12.06 a.m.): I will not speak for very long because I feel that the Opposition spokesman, Mr Vaughan, has covered the legislation fairly well, as have other honourable members. He will also raise a couple of issues at the Committee stage.

As I represent a fairly large mining sector, I am aware of the problems that can arise in this industry. The Government can introduce laws; but, as everyone is aware, although it is against the law to rob a bank, that does not stop people from robbing banks. The human element will always be a factor. The Government may legislate in regard to machinery and all sorts of other things, but I do not think we will ever get rid of the odd cases that involve the human element.

I am pleased that the Government has made an effort in this legislation. The mining industry creates a lot of employment. The big mining companies spend a tremendous amount of money developing mines, and they want continuity. I have always advocated that Queensland adopt a system similar to that in the coal-mining industry in New South Wales. That State has a system that is restrictive in one way but protective in another way, and it provides continuity. Companies in that State, in consultation with the Government and the unions, work out how long a mine has left and they start planning for another area.

In the past there have been rows between the little miners, the big miners and the companies. They have all been trying to get the jump on the other fellow. In my opinion, the greatest abomination in the mining industry was the ATPs. They were good for some people, but they let in a lot of the fast-buck merchants and shoddy fellows. They had no knowledge of mining but they were fairly smart legal men and they took out ATPs over areas where they knew there were minerals. Mining boomed in that area a few years ago and people were going out hell, west and crooked pegging claims. I know of a couple of cases in which an ATP was granted after some miners had lodged applications for a claim and a lease. Two years later, when one of them got sick of trying to find out what the hold-up was, he flew to Brisbane to meet the department, only to be told that he would not be getting a claim and lease because there was an ATP on the land and that, if he wanted to peg a claim or a lease, he would have to negotiate with the holder of the ATP.

He took a week to track down the owner who was living in comfort in the city and knew nothing about mining. It was the standard thing. He said anyone could go

and peg a claim in that area, but he wanted 30 per cent. These people were not getting 30 per cent return from the mine in any case. This happened in the Ingham area.

What I was crooked about when he brought it to my notice was that the application for the claim and the lease was lodged before the ATP and it was held up along the line somewhere. Many miners came to me in the early days—I am going back eight or nine years—and told me that they had lodged claims. When I went to the local office I was told that they had been referred to Brisbane and were held up down here, and nobody could find out why they were held up. Eventually some claims were granted and some were rejected. The Mines Department will have to look into this problem.

In the old days, the poor old mining warden had to jump on a horse and ride out and settle the dispute on the spot. He would say that he would be out at the Great Stranger or the Red River mine at 10 o'clock on the following Wednesday. He would go out with his sidekick and settle the dispute on the spot. He was a pretty astute sort of fellow himself. He knew the sharks and the claim-jumpers in the mining industry. He could read the scene and make an assessment. Some time after he came into the area he became respected by the people, including the cunning fellows, and everybody abided by his decision. Now we can be inundated by bureaucrats and involved with all of the regulations. Tonight the Parliament is trying to do something about the problem.

In regard to the prospecting permits, we are doing away with the miner's right. I am pleased that attention is being given to families. Many people like to give their family an outing as gem-hunters or fossickers. Some of my friends have metal-detectors to find gold and minerals. They do not find much but they have a very good time.

The permit is only good for three months. I would like to see the period increased to 12 months because it is taking the place of a miner's right. A person who is genuinely interested in looking for minerals has to go out as soon as the roads are open after the wet season. It is not difficult to spend three months looking for minerals. He might go out there for six weeks and then come back in for months and have to apply for another permit. I do not know whether it could be done by regulation, but I think the period should be extended to 12 months.

The exploration permits will take the place of the ATPs. I know the abuses of these well-intentioned regulations by a lot of the smart alecs. The department will have to keep its finger on the pulse, because although we continually make laws, they are continually being broken or exploited. I know the problems between the miners and the graziers or land-holders over the years because I have worked in mining country for both of them.

The law was that a gate must be left as it was found. That is the old bush law. I can remember going to look at a contract and the boundary gate of the property was open. Actually it was lying on the road as if it had been knocked down, and I wanted to shut it. The old fellow with me said that I should leave it. I said, "Well, we'll call in and tell the owner, because it is a boundary gate." I told the owner that the boundary gate was down and that, if he wanted us to, we would go back and shut it. He said, "Oh, no, I left it like that. I want a kill on Friday." So it can be a two-way thing. The old bushies are survivors and we could learn from some of their tricks. The miner is just as cunning and that is why he is a survivor. I could relate some stories about the miners and how they shifted datum pegs and the other tricks they used to get up to. That is what makes it hard for the people in the department to administer the law.

The legislation refers to the seabeds and the subsoil. That is always a controversial area, particularly in Commonwealth waters. I imagine that permission would be needed from the Federal Government, even if the claim is within the three-mile limit.

Mr Katter: It is generally considered at the State and Federal Government level. Technically the Commonwealth certainly has the overriding power.

Mr EATON: I am also pleased that local government has a say.

As it is well after midnight and honourable members want to get this over and done with, I will conclude.

Mr ELLIOTT (Cunningham) (12.14 a.m.): I am pleased to take part in this debate. I pay tribute, as other people have done, to the work done in the negotiations. It certainly would not have been an easy exercise because the two groups involved in mining would have had divergent opinions. I refer to the land-holders, be they cattlemen or farmers, and the miners who will be tearing up their country.

I do not wish to go over old ground. Honourable members have covered a lot of ground tonight. As someone who lives on the Darling Downs and represents some of the more expensive farming country in this nation, it is important that I go on record as sounding a note of caution in respect of all of that country, particularly as most of it is high-value freehold country. Also, it has a long history. Many of the properties there have been held by one family for 150 years. When one starts talking about tearing up properties such as that, not only must one negotiate with the owner of the property but also one must satisfy the National Trust as to the buildings that might be affected.

I realise that I am looking down the track a fair way, but it is not going to be an easy exercise. It is essential that all of the factors are taken on board. Honourable members should not be surprised if, in the future, land-owners are not terribly enamoured of the compensation packages that are negotiated for the mining of their properties. I realise that the federation has taken part in negotiations. As I said, I take off my hat to all of those people who have been involved in those negotiations, but I sound that note of caution. In fact, I am surprised that everyone has been prepared to accept the situation.

Because I come from the Darling Downs, I believe that, in the future, discussions should be held with the various producer bodies to ensure that their points of view are kept in mind. I do not believe that some of the issues that were suggested by the Cattlemen's Union but which were not acceded to would have concerned the mining companies. They were quite simple suggestions. In fact, I doubt whether any concern would have been expressed about those suggestions if they had been made a couple of years ago.

I appreciate that some ground has been given since the original negotiations, particularly in relation to the 10 per cent factor and the 50-metre buffer for principal stock yards and watering places. We must give credit where credit is due.

Mr Vaughan: You've won Beryce.

Mr ELLIOTT: Yes, I had noticed.

Settlements that were well and truly above what one would regard as the normal market value for coal mines were negotiated in central Queensland. If coal-mining is commenced on some of those properties on the Darling Downs, large settlements will be negotiated.

I place on record my concern that, in two years' time or in 10 years' time, people might say to us, "You blokes really did not represent us properly in respect of this matter." In the past the Government has been prepared to accept what the various producer bodies have said. After all, the members of those organisations have been prepared to stand up and be counted. The federation of the producer bodies has taken part in the negotiations, but I am surprised that they did not take a harder line.

Because of the lateness of the hour, I will allow other members to take part in this debate.

Mr WARBURTON (Sandgate) (12.20 a.m.): It is not commonly known that probably one of the most interesting miners in our State was none other than the former Premier Sir Johannes Bjelke-Petersen. He was a miner of some repute.

Mr Elliott: He still is, isn't he?

Mr WARBURTON: Yes, he still is.

Kaolin is a very important product. During early 1986, Kokan—a Japanese company—supposedly wanted to purchase the kaolin mine on the Bjelke-Petersen property. It is interesting to note that that company paid \$150,000 up front and, within six months, Kokan was to make up its mind about the eventual sale.

Petersen claims that, after six months, Kokan asked for a three-months extension, which was agreed to. Believe it or not, in about October of 1986 Kokan paid a further \$500,000 up front, which was supposedly for options over the kaolin mine. It was claimed that, in early 1987, Kokan wanted more time for the option. Petersen claims that, in June 1987, Kokan paid a further \$300,000 up front, supposedly to keep the option for purchase open. That was big money to that Japanese company.

In all, Kokan's payments in respect of the option over that mine amounted to a massive \$950,000. Believe it or not, that money went into the account of Ciasom Pty Ltd—the Ten Mile property account. Some of the Kokan money that was deposited with Ciasom was used to pay Ciasom's debts to the European Asian bank. A Fitzgerald inquiry document showed that the \$150,000 payment was for Kokan's rights to inspect, search and drill.

In March 1986, Ciasom was being pressed for payment of a top-up sum under the loan that had been taken out from the bank—about \$450,000. The reason for that was that the bottom dropped out of the Australian dollar and it was very, very difficult to make the payments on the original \$3.5m-odd negotiated by Petersen and Sir Edward Lyons with the European Asian Bank.

This is very important. A letter from that bank dated 7 November 1986, shows that, on that particular day, Ciasom paid about \$130,000 in respect of the loan. But by a letter of 24 December 1976 from Kokan to a company named Flower and Hart—does that name ring a bell for National Party members—advice was given, believe it or not, that \$500,000 was paid into Ciasom's account at Kingaroy. In other words, Kokan had paid \$500,000 into Ciasom's account at Kingaroy.

Now listen to this. A letter dated 29 December 1986, which was only five days later, from Ciasom to the European Asian bank, shows—and Fitzgerald inquiry evidence shows—that \$500,000 was paid by Ciasom to the bank that day. In December of that year, as part of an option payment, a Japanese company paid \$500,000 into Ciasom, which was the Bjelke-Petersen family company. Five days later, exactly that amount, or exactly that particular money, was paid by the family company of Petersen to the European Asian bank in respect of top-up money and interest payments.

The inference to be drawn from this whole story is that some bad business was going on. In fact, obviously the Premier at the time and other people were involved in some dastardly deeds. However, I want to make the announcement now, if I may, that that very same person, who for quite some time graced the seat in which Mr Katter is sitting now, and who was the subject of quite a deal of inquiry at the Fitzgerald inquiry, is about to be charged for the deeds that he participated in on behalf of the National Party during the years that he was the Premier of this State.

Mr TENNI (Barron River) (12.26 a.m.): It is a great pleasure for me to speak on this Bill. I thank the Honourable Minister for successfully introducing the legislation into the House. Hopefully it will be passed tonight. Because of the lateness of the hour I will be as brief as I can.

This Mineral Resources Bill is designed to improve service to the mining industry and improve miner/land-holder relationships. That is the important issue. It is also designed to encourage multiple land use and to provide an acceptable climate for the acceleration of mining development, while ensuring adequate protection for land-holders' rights and, of course, the environment.

A number of strategically located district offices will have mining registrars, field officers and other support staff under the control of the Mines Department. There will also be provided a Statewide computerised mining tenures database which will include both graphical and non-graphical data which is so urgently required by the mining

industry. Miners need very prompt service to be able to get on with the job of mining. That is what this Bill will provide.

The Bill itself has been over two and a-half years in the making. I do not think I have ever seen a Bill pass through so many hands. First of all, a Green Paper was issued. Then the Bill itself was sent to all the organisations as a working paper, with all the organisations being invited to the Mines Department to debate it and to overcome most of the problems that arose at that time.

I must say quite clearly that I was very, very disappointed with Mr Des Whittle who, of course, is the President of the Cattlemen's Union. On many occasions agreement had been reached to the extent that he said he wanted the Bill to go ahead. Although he was not happy with a couple of points, he was sure that the department would work in closely with him and at a later date, if any alterations were necessary, these would be made. I must admit that I took the man's word the first time and the second time. After that, I gave him away. I was very surprised to think that one person in the whole of a primary industry would adopt the attitude of trying to drag the last drop out of every miner in this State for his own personal gain. I was terribly disappointed at his attitude.

However, Mr Whittle can be pleased, I suppose, that the Bill was altered on many occasions to suit his personal requirements. There was no possibility of any further changes to the Bill that we have before us tonight. Otherwise, it would have been better to leave the original Bill as it was and the miners would have been much better off without having to put up with any more funny business from Des Whittle and those of his ilk.

Very few people oppose this Bill. I know of only three people. I will not name all of them. I think that in a State the size of Queensland, which has industries such as the mining industry and other primary industries, three people are not very many to be concerned about.

I wanted to make many points dealing with the benefits of this Bill both to the mining industry and to the primary industries of this State. I will not read them out because they have already been stated by other members. However, suffice to say that people in the grazing industry and the grain-growers have done extremely well out of this Bill.

If Des Whittle cools his heels for a while and starts to work with other people who helped to create this State and who also pay large taxes, there would be total co-operation. Primary producers are not the only people who pay taxes.

The comment was made earlier that some people in the mining industry have a habit of destroying the countryside. Let me say that although that has happened in the past, I could take people to cattle properties in this State that are an absolute disgrace. They are covered with noxious weeds such as rubber vine, noogoora burr and sensitive plants. Those people also destroy the land by not looking after it. When their leases expire, I hope that the Lands Department will take the leases off them so that somebody else can look after the land. The miners will also have to look after the land, otherwise they will be blacklisted and will not be allowed to mine in the future. It is great that the environment is being protected while at the same time tax-payers of this State derive benefit from royalties and leases as a result of mineral wealth being extracted from the land.

I pay tribute to the Chamber of Mines. In all my days, I have never worked with a greater organisation. I pay tribute to Michael Pinnock, Graham Tucker, Bill Siller, Barry Mathias and Tony White. There are too many other people to mention individually. Those people are doing a great job—not only for the mining industry but also in protecting graziers and grain-growers. It would have been nice if Des Whittle had followed the example of this organisation and engaged in co-operation.

I pay tribute also to Don McKechnie who is Chairman of the Queensland Producers Federation. He came out strongly in support of this Bill on behalf of the federation. I thank him for his support and for the support of his organisation.

Because of the lateness of the hour, I must quickly complete a task that I was unable to carry out in a previous debate. I wish to publicly thank my personal staff. I have already thanked Kevin Wolff and the other fellows in the Mines Department. I thank my former private secretary, Miss Bev Paton. She was with me for three and a-half years. The Minister for Works and Housing is very fortunate to have her working for him as his private secretary. She is a very capable woman. She protected me and made sure that I was going in the right direction all the time. I have the greatest admiration for her ability and for the work she did over a period of three and a-half years.

Although my former press secretary, Mr Alan Murray, was with me for only 12 months, I realise that he is a very capable person and a great guy. He is still working in the Mines Department and doing a good job. I offer my personal thanks to him. I was fortunate also that, because Alan was a member of my staff, I also met his wife. She is a wonderful person. Rowan Hindley was my special duties officer. He did a wonderful job and is still working in the department. I thank him for the work he did for me. My liaison officer was Donna McGregor. She is a very capable person and is working for the current Minister for Mines and Energy. Jenny Kindt was my stenosecretary and played a very important role. Together with Donna, she sometimes stayed late at work when it was necessary but she never complained. My secretary was Kerrie Day, and I thank her for her assistance. Michael Lloyd was my chauffeur and he did an extremely good job. He is a very capable driver. Sandy Worden was my assistant public relations officer. I was very fortunate to have those people as members of my personal staff. I publicly thank them for the service they rendered to me. I wish them well in their future careers.

Hon. R. C. KATTER (Flinders—Minister for Mines and Energy and Minister for Northern and Regional Development) (12.36 a.m.), in reply: I will comment on the contributions made to this debate in the order in which they were made. Mr Vaughan said that the prospecting permits were very restrictive. I point out that I did not have a great deal of involvement in the preparation of this Bill. The previous Minister, Martin Tenni, put an awful lot of time into its preparation. I must confess that I do not understand some of the logic behind some of its provisions, but it seems to me that although it is restrictive, something can be done to loosen up the provisions slightly. I will most certainly look into those matters.

The honourable member for Mourilyan and the honourable member for Nudgee mentioned the surrender of exploration permits. Those who have lived in mining areas all their lives, as I have, would know that authorities to prospect have always been dirty words. The cooling-off period has been extended by one year. The provisions are not quite as bad as the honourable member for Nudgee, the honourable member for Mourilyan and some Government members thought they might be.

After the surrender of the exploration permit occurs, it is then a matter for the Minister to decide whether or not it is renewed. I find it very difficult to accept that a renewal should be granted after a period of two years has elapsed. Together with other honourable members, I am worried about the extension of the period. However, as a back-bencher I was responsible for having the cooling-off period included. The idea was that, when the exploration permits, or authorities to prospect as they were called, expired, another authority to prospect came into effect and the miner was never given the opportunity to take up a mining lease and actually dig something out of the ground that was of value to the country. A cooling-off period was put in a couple of months after the authority to prospect expired and miners could go into the area, take up a mining lease and work that lease. It looks worrying on its face; but, when one understands the system, it is not nearly so worrying.

The exploration permit covers no maximum area, and this is something that my department will also consider. Some of the definitions are a little equivocal and my understanding is that an airstrip could come under one of those definitions, but it is a matter that I will attempt to do something about. When a Mining Wardens Court issues an exploration permit or mining licence, one of the conditions of the mining lease would be that the airstrip not be tampered with in any way. The matter can be handled at that level.

I agree that resumptions should be at market price plus. I am pleased that the Opposition is in agreement with the Bill, but I was disappointed in the comments made by the Opposition spokesman about gold tax. I cannot repeat often enough that this country was earning \$400m from the gold-mining industry. When the Federal Government started to talk about a gold tax the figure was about \$340m, but in four years the figure rose from \$340m to approximately \$440m. Those figures are roughly correct. In the four years after Mr Hawke said he would not implement the gold tax, there was very little rise in the price of gold, but there was a spectacular increase in annual income from \$400m to almost \$4 billion. Clearly the gold tax had an enormous effect upon the mining operations in this country. Mr Vaughan said that he strongly endorsed the gold tax.

Mr Beard covered many matters in his speech and made several generalisations, but one point he raised concerned MHPLs. The honourable member for Gympie and I are very pleased that MHPLs can now be freeholded. All honourable members who have lived in mining areas all of their lives—and the honourable member for Tablelands would be in this position—will be very pleased that MHPLs can be freeholded. For the information of honourable members, I point out that houses or buildings in places such as Mareeba are completely protected under this Bill. There is no way a mining company can take anyone's house out from underneath him. A house in Gympie, Charters Towers or Mareeba can be freeholded and will be fully protected under this Bill. It cannot be tampered with in any way.

Mention has been made of the Queensland Chamber of Mines and AMIC. I thank the Chamber of Mines and its Federal body that I had dealings with as the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs for their assistance. That body has fought courageously and tenaciously with few supporters to keep areas of Australia open for prospecting, exploration and development of mining. As a young person I can remember the tremendous thrill I had when I took my first job working for MIM and was paid money that I could only dream of in any other job. I was very pleased for the blokes who had gone out in the wilderness and fought and lived a hard life to establish Mount Isa Mines in the early days. Today people are continuing the fight, although it has not been very popular because of the media's infatuation with conservation interests. Last month \$2.58 billion more went out of the country than came into the country. It disappoints me greatly to hear people talking about gold tax, but it gives me great satisfaction to see groups courageously fighting to keep that land open. Over the years the Queensland Government has endeavoured to do this and is doing so tonight under this legislation.

Mrs McCauley spoke strongly this evening about the work that has gone into the Bill. She spoke with some pride about the input that she and a number of other hard-working members have put into this legislation. She takes pride in the increases and improvements that have been achieved under this legislation.

Everyone who knows the honourable member for Broadsound, Mr Hinton, would agree that he is a fearless fighter for justice and this House witnessed that sort of performance this evening. This is a very high badge of commendation to be given in this House. He mentioned the necessity of having a say in the terms of an exploration lease. I agree that the matter needs to be investigated. I give the honourable member my assurance that I will do something about it. It can be done by regulation or by administrative fiat and I am sure that things can be done that will not in any way disrupt the operations of mining companies.

I assure the mining companies and the miners that this legislation is not intended to hold them up. I am sure that there could be a marriage between the two, thereby

allowing the land-holder to have some say in the exploration permits. It is important that this be done. Because I am very familiar with mining and cattle, I can assure the miners that the two interests will be married without any difficulty.

The honourable member also argued for greater distance from and protection for watering points, which was one of the issues raised by the Cattlemen's Union. The mining companies have a very good point on small holdings, but on large holdings there would be no difficulty in allowing greater tolerance. Those changes could be granted without creating any difficulty for mining interests. Again, that can be done by regulation, administrative fiat, etc.

The honourable member for Mourilyan spoke about the authority-to-prospect shysters. Most of us who have mining areas in our electorates have had experiences with the authority-to-prospect shysters. All I can say is: remember Tom Coolan. Those honourable members who are not familiar with the story should familiarise themselves with it.

Mr McElligott: It's a great song.

Mr KATTER: Yes, it is a great song. The Moranbah miners wrote that beautiful song about a very interesting piece of Australian history, about how people took the law into their own hands to deal with people like the authority-to-prospect shysters, about whom the honourable member spoke.

In answer to the honourable member for Mourilyan, I must say that the regional offices, the field officers and the \$2m computer hardware that will be installed will all be utilised to try to overcome those problems that have existed in the past. I must pay a great compliment to all the members of Parliament who worked on the committee and also to the former Minister. Keeping that vast fund of knowledge regionally at places such as Mareeba, Charters Towers, Mount Isa and Cloncurry is what should happen. That is where the knowledge should be, because that is where it is needed; that is where the action is occurring. The concept of the regional offices is very, very important.

Mr Eaton: You shouldn't have closed the Herberton office. That was central to the field there. It was very handy.

Mr KATTER: It is one of those things that we might look at, but I cannot make any promises. We have great stringencies on the number of people who may be employed. However, I note the honourable member's point.

The honourable member for Cunningham was one of the most sparkling Ministers this House has ever seen. He is also arguably the Parliament's brightest and soundest legislator.

Honourable members: Who?

Mr KATTER: The member for Cunningham.

The theme of what he was saying is that the review of the Act should be a continuing process. He said that there were some problems and that they should be looked at. I do not think that legislation should ever be set in concrete; it should be a living article. As the Minister, that is most certainly the way I look at it. He also said that there were conflicting interests, those of the farmers and those of the miners. In the past and recent history of this State I have been amazed at how we have been able to marry up the two competing interests so well. I think that part of the reason for that is that at one stage or another so many of us have been cattlemen as well as miners.

The honourable member for Cunningham also said that we would abide by the umpire's decision. That is an important point to make to the House: the Government has abided by the umpire's decision. There have been two teams out there; they have come to certain agreements and the Government has accepted them.

I turn to the contribution of the member for Sandgate, Mr Warburton. I have never gained any joy in this place from seeing a person denigrated. I would like to think that in my 15 years here I have never denigrated anybody personally.

Mr Comben: Oh, come on!

Mr KATTER: At times, one may lose one's temper.

The honourable member for Sandgate came in here and during his speech cold-bloodedly made a lot less of a person. I do not think that Mr Warburton would be very pleased with himself. I am sure that he is a nice man who does not really derive joy and pleasure from someone else's hurt and destruction.

Mr Comben: A crim!

Mr KATTER: The same sorts of comments are being made now. Honourable members opposite may get joy out of kicking an 80-year-old man when he is down; I am afraid that I do not.

I turn to the contribution of the former Minister, Mr Martin Tenni. I had some kind things to say about him earlier on. He was a fearless fighter for development in this State. He made many, many enemies in doing that. Down through the years some of those enemies may have damaged him, but I think it is important to applaud people who have had the courage to stand and be counted when it comes to fighting for development in Queensland. That should be praised here this evening. He praised the Chamber of Mines; it fits into the same category as being fearless fighters for the development of this nation. The fact that those people have been disparaged by society today is clearly reflected in last month's current account deficit figures. That is the price that is paid for walking over the pioneers and the others who have created the wealth of this nation, those who have been denigrated continually in the media and, unfortunately, to some degree in our education systems as well.

Like Mr Tenni did, I must say that one gets the feeling of being between a rock and a hard place when one is negotiating with the Chamber of Mines. I say to honourable members that if at any time they want any negotiators, Michael Pinnock is one of the best. He has done a marvellous job here and should be applauded for it.

The Cattlemen's Union has been a very, very tough negotiator that should be praised for fighting for what it sees as its rights and for standing its ground. Other people, such as Mr McKechnie, who represented the farmers, have been very, very reasonable and have done excellent work to put together legislation that will improve all aspects of the mining industry throughout Queensland.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Question—That the Bill be now read a second time—put; and the House divided—

AYES, 53

NOES, 26

Alison	Lee
Beanland	Lickiss
Beard	McCauley
Berghofer	McKechnie
Booth	McPhie
Borbidge	Menzel
Burreket	Muntz
Chapman	Neal
Clauson	Nelson
Cooper	Newton
Elliott	Perrett
FitzGerald	Randell
Fraser	Row
Gamin	Santoro
Gately	Schuntner
Gibbs, I. J.	Sherlock
Gilmore	Sherrin
Glasson	Simpson
Gunn	Slack
Gygar	Stoneman
Harper	Tenni
Harvey	Veivers
Henderson	White
Hinton	
Hobbs	
Innes	<i>Tellers:</i>
Katter	Stephan
Knox	Hynd

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

Tellers:
Davis
Prest

Resolved in the affirmative.

Committee

Hon. R. C. Katter (Flinders—Minister for Mines and Energy and Minister for Northern and Regional Development) in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1.1 to 5.9, as read, agreed to.

Clause 5.10—

Mr VAUGHAN (1.02 a.m.): The Minister responded to my remarks on this clause during the second-reading debate. The clause is titled “No application for exploration permit within two months of land ceasing to be subject to exploration permit.”, and provides—

“(1) Upon land, for whatever reason, ceasing to be the subject of an exploration permit, a person is not competent to apply for an exploration permit in respect of any mineral specified in the firstmentioned exploration permit in respect of any of that land until the expiration of two calendar months following the end of the month in which that cessation occurs.”

It goes on to refer to a situation in which the holder of an exploration permit decides to surrender the permit. If he surrenders it before the expiration of the permit, he can make application to have the permit regranted to him.

The Minister said that he has a discretion to grant the renewal of the permit. As the member for Mourilyan said, and as I said on the last occasion we debated major amendments to the Mining Act, authorities to prospect are like musical chairs. The areas are tied up. The Government went to all the trouble of providing this cooling-off period of three months, which has now been reduced to two months. However, a person who chooses to surrender can still go ahead and by-pass the system.

The Minister has a discretion. However, I do not believe that it will always come to the Minister's notice to the extent that it should. There will still be people who will sit on authorities to prospect, which defeats the whole purpose of the provision.

People have approached me and said, “I want to take out an authority to prospect over this particular area but there is an ATP over it already. However, that is going to expire at a certain date and I want to go in there and lodge my application.” If people are going to be able to get around it by virtue of this surrender provision, I think that is wrong.

Mr KATTER: I think that the honourable member's point is very valid and I give him and the Committee an undertaking that unless there are very exceptional circumstances or unless the Governor in Council or my party room takes a different view—and I doubt that that would be the case—that will not occur. The Government will not be agreeing to an automatic application for another exploration permit.

We have the situation in which there is no window of opportunity for people who actually want to dig something out of the ground and sell it and make wealth for the nation instead of playing paper-tiger games in stock exchange board rooms.

As I say, I think the point that the honourable member makes is very valid. I do not think I need to add anything to that. There is a slight extension of one year, but there is a pretty strong case for making that extension of one year over the period in which the 50 per cent reduction would normally be made.

There is a change, albeit a small change. I had my misgivings about the change, as I think most people who know the industry would. However, we will give it a go. If it does not work well, we will give further consideration to it. The cooling-off period is there, and unless a Minister automatically grants another authority to prospect after surrender takes place, there is no great problem. I give the honourable member those assurances.

Clause 5.10, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 5.11 to 5.18, as read, agreed to.

Clause 5.19—

Mr VAUGHAN (1.06 a.m.): I also touched on this clause during the second-reading debate. However, I want to clarify the area of land that is going to be contained in an exploration permit in relation to renewal. Clause 5.14 allows for periodic reduction. Clause 5.19 is headed, "Renewal of exploration permit". It states—

"(1) Upon application in writing by the holder of an exploration permit in the prescribed manner and form to the Director-General made at least 28 days (or such shorter period as the Minister in the particular case allows) and not more than 3 months prior to the expiration of the current term of the permit accompanied by the prescribed application fee, the Minister may from time to time renew the exploration permit for a term such that the sum of the term of the original grant and all subsequent terms does not exceed 5 years unless the Minister in a particular case otherwise determines . . ."

What I want to know is: if the Minister is going to renew the exploration permit, what is going to be the area covered by the exploration permit, having regard to the fact that, if one has an exploration permit that has been in operation for two years, it is being cut back after two years to 50 per cent? Is the renewal for only 50 per cent of the original permit or the whole of the area covered by the original permit?

Mr KATTER: I have been advised that it is the reduced area. There is a reducing effect occurring every year and, at the end of five years, the entire area is extinguished. If a person takes an exploration permit over an area, the maximum length of time he can have any of the land is five years. After that, he has to go to a mining lease or get off the land.

Mr VAUGHAN: If I take out an exploration permit and, at the end of two and a-half years, I have been reduced to 50 per cent of the exploration permit, and I apply for a renewal of that exploration permit, all I am renewing is the 50 per cent remaining?

Mr KATTER: That is correct.

Clause 5.19, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 5.20 to 5.38, as read, agreed to.

Clause 5.39—

Mr VAUGHAN: (1.09 a.m.): Clause 5.39 reads—

"5.39 Report to mining registrar by owner of land. (1) Where a person purports to enter or be upon land under the authority of an exploration permit, the owner of the land who considers that that person is not authorized to enter or be upon that land or is not complying with any condition of the exploration permit or of any provision of this Act may report accordingly to the mining registrar of the mining district in which is situated the land."

I refer specifically to the opening words of the clause. As I understand it, copies of exploration permits, mining leases, prospecting permits and mining claims are not made available to anyone except the Mines Department and the holder of the permit.

My question is this: how in the name of heaven will a land-holder know that the holder of one of these permits, leases or claims is not complying with the provisions of the exploration permit if he does not have a copy of it?

I have been through this exercise with the Minister's predecessor concerning alluvial mining at Bouldercombe where it was suspected that the mining company was not complying with the terms of the lease. I asked a question in this Parliament on this matter and I was told that the conditions applying to those leases were confidential and were a matter between the mining company and the Mines Department.

The legislation contains a provision that, if a land-holder suspects that a person is not complying with the conditions of the exploration permit, he takes the matter up

with the mining registrar. The land-holders want to be supplied with a copy of the permit so that they know what the person to whom the permit has been granted has to do and whether or not he is complying with the conditions.

Mr KATTER: It is departmental policy for the land-owner to be able to access that information. If that policy has not been honoured in the past, it will be in the future.

Clause 5.39, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 5.40 to 7.6, as read, agreed to.

Clause 7.7—

Mr VAUGHAN (1.12 a.m.): Clause 7.7 reads—

“Restriction on mining leases where land freed from exploration permit. (1) Upon an area of land, for whatever reason, ceasing to be the subject of an exploration permit, then, for a period of 2 calendar months following the end of the month in which that cessation occurs—

- (a) any application for a mining lease in respect of land within that area that exceeds 50 hectares shall be rejected.”

Can the Minister tell me why there is a limit of 50 hectares? Why was that area chosen?

Mr KATTER: The basic reason is to stop someone coming in and taking up, under a mining lease, a huge area that was previously held under an authority to prospect. It is a lot more expensive to hold a mining lease than an authority to prospect. A big company could take up a huge area and freeze out people who would like to get into a small ore body and could work it efficiently and successfully. It is to enable the small operator to take up an area and not be frozen out by a big operator taking up a huge area and using the cooling-off period to freeze a huge area of land. The cooling-off period is to allow a little bloke to go in on a little show. A little bloke can work a small ore body efficiently whereas a big mining company cannot. The clause is tailor-made to suit the small person and to enable the State of Queensland to exploit the small ore bodies which could not otherwise be exploited.

Clause 7.7, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 7.8 to 11.32 and first and second schedules, as read, agreed to.

Bill reported, without amendment.

Third Reading

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

MINES REGULATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from 7 September (see p. 543).

Mr VAUGHAN (Nudgee) (1.17 a.m.): As the Minister indicated in his second-reading speech, this Bill clearly defines the role and areas of responsibility of the Department of Mines with regard to mine safety and health legislation in all mines in the State other than coal mines. It distinguishes between the responsibilities of the Department of Mines and the Department of Industrial Affairs and eliminates any overlapping functions.

The Bill extends the provisions of the Mines Regulation Act to cover exploration and prospecting for minerals which are certainly an integral part of the mining process.

As was pointed out in April last when the Workplace Health and Safety Bill was debated in this House, that legislation which repealed the Construction Safety Act does not apply to persons, plant or substances in or about a mine to which the Mines

Regulation Act applies. Hence the reason why construction work is now covered by this Act. It is timely that there will now be provision in the Act requiring the manager of a mine to ensure that every person who is employed in or about the mine has been properly instructed to safely perform his duties. That should have been a requirement long before this.

One of the most important provisions in the Bill and another one which should have been in the legislation long ago is the provision which requires the manager of a mine to notify the mines-inspector or, if he is not available, the warden of any spill or discharge of a cyanide compound which could cause death or serious bodily injury or damage to property. The insertion of this provision in the Act obviously has been brought about by the increase in gold-mining throughout the State. As honourable members are all aware, cyanide is used in the gold-mining process. Unfortunately, many gold mines are located in remote or isolated areas which are not readily accessible by mines-inspectors.

Although guide-lines have been developed to promote the safe use of cyanide at mines and although the provisions of this Bill require any spillage or discharge of a cyanide compound under certain circumstances to be reported, the fact is that there is no guarantee that this will be done.

While the Act provides that notice of any spillage or discharge shall be given whether or not any bodily injury to any person or damage to property had occurred, I doubt that in a lot of cases, particularly in regard to small mining operations, a notice would be given if it was considered that evidence of a spillage or discharge could be destroyed or covered up. Therefore, the best way of preventing or reducing the occurrence of spillage or discharge is by regular monitoring of mining operations where cyanide is being used and by applying the provisions of the Act where breaches occur.

The 1987-88 annual report of the Department of Mines states that the high level of gold-mining activity placed considerable pressure on staff of the mining safety and technology subprogram.

The report further states—

“Thirteen significant gold mines were in the course of construction or came on stream during the year. Several of these, including two in environmentally sensitive areas, required the review of complex descriptions of operations to ensure that adequate precautions were taken to prevent the loss of cyanide to the environment.

Inspectors and inspection officers carried out 2 172 inspections during the year. Totals for each division were: Brisbane 516, Rockhampton 336, Cairns 900 and Mount Isa 420.”

Although 2 172 inspections were carried out in 1987-88, I cannot see anywhere in the annual report any evidence of income from fines. Unless I am wrong, it appears that either no breaches of the Act occurred or no prosecutions were made.

The Bill provides for the regulations to include provisions for the training of persons employed in or about a mine and the issuing or cancellation of certificates of competency.

As the remainder of the Bill is straightforward. I have no further comments, particularly as it is 1.20 a.m.

Mr BEARD (Mount Isa—Deputy Leader of the Liberal Party) (1.21 a.m.): The Liberal Party is happy to support the Bill. Any Bill that rationalises and clearly delineates areas of responsibility and removes any possibility of ambiguity or overlapping has to be a good Bill. This Bill does that.

Clause 4 of the Bill states—

“The manager—

- (a) shall ensure that every person subordinate to him in a position of authority in or about the mine is competent in the performance of his duties;

(b) shall ensure that every person employed in or about the mine has been properly instructed to safely perform his duties.”

I would have thought that that would be done at any rate. I agree with the honourable member for Nudgee that it is about time that that provision was included in the legislation. It happens in any well-managed company, and that is one of the reasons why I am not terribly keen on the Federal Government imposing tax surcharges to provide for training in organisations. Most well-run companies spend a large portion of their budget on training, and to carry the extra load is just another hidden cost.

Mr Vaughan interjected.

Mr BEARD: I was going to say: as long as it can be administered so that they can demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Commonwealth Government that they are, in fact, spending a certain percentage of their budget on training.

Mr Hamill: That was always the intention.

Mr BEARD: Let us see it on paper. I will wait until it happens.

I am against the bludgers who do not carry their weight. For example, I am against those organisations that do not train apprentices but hire other people's apprentices as soon as they are qualified. They should pay the bill. Most of the organisations that I am aware of spend much of their budget on training.

It is interesting that the amendments to the legislation provide for the Act to be extended to places or premises which do not fall within the definition of a mine but which are an integral part of a mining complex. This amendment will ensure that similar standards are maintained and will obviate the need for monitoring activities by another group of inspectors.

At my previous place of employment is a power station which is owned by the mine. It is about 8 kilometres away from the mine site and it is operated by the staff. At present it is operated under the Workplace Health and Safety Act, whereas the rest of the mine is operated under the Mines Regulation Act. That causes problems. For example, even a truck-driver who may be delivering supplies from the store to the power station crosses an invisible barrier and passes from the jurisdiction of one set of industrial laws to those of another when he reports to the power station. That is also the case with maintenance fitters and clerks or anyone doing duties in the two places. It is a nonsense for such a situation to exist. I hope that I am reading this Bill correctly when I believe that the Mica Creek power station at Mount Isa Mines Ltd will be subject to the laws of the Mines Regulation Act rather than those of the Workplace Health and Safety Act. If it is, and I hope it is, it is a rationalisation that makes a lot of sense.

Finally, and I do not want to spend too much time on it, the legislation talks about ensuring that accidents involving injuries so defined will be reported to an inspector of mines for investigation. It is critical that accidents are promptly and fully reported with all details required so that appropriate investigations can be carried out and preventive and contingent actions organised.

One thing that I have mentioned in this House before, and I will mention it again, is that foremen and supervisors on the job will not properly report accidents and put all the details down if the documents they complete to describe the accidents are subpoenaed and the foreman or supervisor finds himself in a dock in court defending what he has written down. It will soon happen that they will not report accidents fully; they will leave the detail out. There is always a danger of that happening when documents are discoverable and able to be subpoenaed into a court of law. People tend to stop reporting the accidents fully, or the shredding machine will work overtime, or people will duck away.

Those documents that report accidents and investigations and the results of them are critically important in industrial organisations. In my opinion, it is far more important that they continue to be completed properly but confidentially within the company so

that appropriate action can be taken rather than a subpoena being issued, for example, in a case in which civil damages are claimed against the employer. I think there should be other means of devising the quantum of such damages. That is something about which care should be taken. Very often, actions that seem very appropriate and very good on the surface have unforeseen consequences which destroy a lot of good that has been built up.

Having made those points, I point out that we in the Liberal Party are perfectly happy to support what is a good Bill.

Hon. R. C. KATTER (Flinders—Minister for Mines and Energy and Minister for Northern and Regional Development) (1.25 a.m.), in reply: I am afraid that I cannot agree with the Opposition spokesman at all. The proposition that he put forward was that if no fines were being levied, then the safety regulations were not being enforced.

Mr Vaughan: I said either no breaches were occurring——

Mr KATTER: That was the implication of what the honourable member was saying.

Mr Vaughan: You weren't listening. I said either there were no breaches occurring or you weren't enforcing the regulations. I gave you an out.

Mr KATTER: The honourable member is saying that no breaches are occurring. In a properly run operation punishment does not have to be imposed upon people. But prevention can be ensured. I think that prevention has been ensured because in recent years not a single case has come to my knowledge in which some incident has indicated that the Government and Government instrumentalities have not been doing their jobs.

In that regard, I really think that the Government can walk with a great deal of pride. I pay a tribute to my colleague the Honourable Vince Lester. In sharp comparison to what is happening in this State, Victoria has suffered a spectacular rise in the cost of Workcare. It is crippling a State that has a debt of \$5 billion. This year alone the costs have risen by 50 per cent.

In addition to that, Queensland has the Industrial (Commercial Practices) Act, which today resulted in an injunction preventing a Statewide stoppage by the Australasian Meat Industry Employees Union.

In all industrial areas, the regulations and the legislation of this Government have provided not only safe work practices but also efficient work practices when compared with the Workcare schemes in Victoria and, I might add, New South Wales. Today we saw the prevention of a massive Statewide strike in the meat-processing industry as well.

I most certainly commend the Bill to the House.

Motion agreed to.

Committee

Clauses 1 to 10, as read, agreed to.

Bill reported, without amendment.

Third Reading

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

STATUTE LAW (MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS) BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from 28 September (see p. 967).

Mr WELLS (Murrumba) (1.30 a.m.): The Opposition supports this Bill. It is something for which the Opposition has been calling for a long time. The Statute Law

(Miscellaneous Provisions) Bill is a vehicle by which the Government is able to introduce minor amendments without any controversy. Therefore, this is a very useful instrument that is available to Governments. It is used by Governments throughout Australia.

Unfortunately, this Government has not got it quite right yet. I expect that it may do so a little further down the track. The report of the Subordinate Legislation Committee related to the question of amendment of Acts by subordinate legislation. This refers to the so-called Henry VIII clauses. Mr Speaker, as you would know, Henry VIII clauses are those that manifest a propensity that Henry VIII used to frequently demonstrate, that is, to arrange matters so that statutes could be constructed to enable them to be amended by delegated legislation, such as Orders in Council. This Government has a very serious and dubious propensity to amend legislation by means of subordinate legislation.

Mr De Lacy: I do not think that they are all following you on the Government side of the Chamber.

Mr Hamill: They all follow the *Courier-Mail* leaders.

Mr WELLS: Yes. Henry VIII was someone else who should have been charged under sections 87, 88 and 89 of the Criminal Code. However, in those days the Criminal Code did not exist.

The sixteenth report of the Committee of Subordinate Legislation states—

“The Committee is now attacking the problem by seeking the adoption of the procedure followed in New South Wales of using an omnibus miscellaneous provisions bill to effect minor and technical changes to legislation. The bill, entitled the ‘Statute Law (Miscellaneous Provisions) Bill’, is introduced into the New South Wales Parliament twice each year and provides an effective vehicle for amendments that do not warrant the preparation of separate amending Bills.”

In New South Wales the Statute Laws (Miscellaneous Provisions) Bill is used to make amendments to Acts that are similar to those made by Orders in Council in Queensland. I recognise—and I am sure that the Leader of the House would rapidly point this out—that it is sometimes necessary to make frequent and quick amendments to legislation. For example, it may be necessary to alter a schedule or an amount. A Statute Law (Miscellaneous Provisions) Bill can be used as a vehicle to make minor amendments.

The Minister has made a good beginning by bringing into the House a Bill that makes a number of amendments to Acts. The amendments include matters that were omitted in the original draft and can usefully be added to the legislation. For example, in the Liquor Act 1912-1989, the proposed statute bids honourable members to omit the expression “:” at the end of the subsection and substitute the expression “.”. Subsequently honourable members are also bid to omit the word “on” where it secondly occurs and substitute the word “of”, and in the Mortgages (Secondary Market) Act 1984-1985 insert the word “sections” after the word “of” where it first occurs. In the Motor Vehicles Act, honourable members are asked to omit the word “part” and substitute the word “Part”. The Opposition does not doubt that this work needs to be done; indeed, the Labor Party congratulates the Minister and his departmental officials for finally coming up with a Statute Law (Miscellaneous Provisions) Bill. However, the Opposition believes that this legislation could have been put to better purpose.

On the very day that morning newspapers scream that a former Premier will be charged in the courts, honourable members are sitting in this Chamber at 1.35 in the morning after a series of late nights in the Parliament. After 32 years of corruption, this Government is concerned with dotting its i’s and crossing its t’s. If only members of this Government had thought to mind their p’s and q’s, they would have never reached this unfortunate pass.

The Opposition supports the legislation. Members of the Labor Party believe that the Government could have used this legislation to fulfil a better purpose, in much the

same way as the legislation in New South Wales is used. We also believe that the timing is unfortunate. The Government's bringing legislation of this magnitude at such a late hour at night is remarkable. National Party members have an incredible sensitivity to the political climate of the day. Nevertheless, their misjudgments that follow one another with great rapidity do not leave the Opposition feeling dizzy. Members of the Labor Party are used to them; we can sort out the good from the bad, the wheat from the chaff.

It is with great pleasure that I advise the House that the Opposition supports this legislation.

Mr INNES (Sherwood—Leader of the Liberal Party) (1.36 a.m.): The Liberal Party supports the legislation.

Hon. N. J. HARPER (Auburn—Leader of the House) (1.36 a.m.), in reply: I appreciate the support expressed by the Liberal Party. I also appreciate the support demonstrated by the Opposition. However, as I suggested earlier, the honourable member pontificated, which is not his uncustomary practice.

Motion agreed to.

Committee

Hon. N. J. Harper (Auburn—Leader of the House) in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—

Mr WELLS (1.37 a.m.): I ask the Minister whether he will take on board the suggestion I made and use this legislation as a vehicle for the type of amendments that are made in New South Wales, thereby avoiding the constant use of regulations as a means of amending Acts of Parliament.

Mr HARPER: The intention of the Government is to facilitate the working of this Parliament and to provide a smoother method by which to amend legislation, as appropriate. The honourable member may be assured that the Government will do so.

Mr WELLS: With respect to the Minister, I am asking him about a number of statutes, particularly those statutes concerning the Minister's previous portfolio, Primary Industries. In those areas it is frequently necessary to make rapid amendments to statutes. The Minister and his colleagues have been doing that by using the vehicle of Orders in Council, regulations and various forms of subordinate legislation as a means of amending Acts by including in Bills—the Government Whip knows all about this, because he is the chairman of the Subordinate Legislation Committee—clauses which give power to the Governor in Council, or some other body, to amend effectively the Act or the schedule of the Act.

I ask the Minister if he will take my suggestion on board and go down the track that is being taken in New South Wales of using frequent miscellaneous provisions Bills to amend the Acts, so that we do not have the anti-democratic system—at least in theory—of delegates amending legislation.

Mr HARPER: The matters to which the honourable member has referred have already been considered by the Government and we have adopted a policy of endeavouring to refrain from amendment by regulation. I assure the honourable member that the matters to which he has referred have been and will continue to be considered by the Government and exercised as appropriate.

Clause 1, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 2 and 3 and schedule, as read, agreed to.

Bill reported, without amendment.

Third Reading

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

ACTING CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES

Nomination of Mr D. J. Booth

Mr SPEAKER: Honourable members, I inform the House of the pending absence of the Chairman of Committees, Mr E. C. Row, MLA, who will be attending the 35th Commonwealth Parliamentary Conference in Barbados. During his absence I nominate Mr Desmond James Booth to act as Chairman of Committees.

SPECIAL ADJOURNMENT

Hon. N. J. HARPER (Auburn—Leader of the House) (1.42 a.m.): I move—

“That the House, at its rising, do adjourn until Tuesday, 17 October 1989.”

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 1.43 a.m. (Friday).