

**NOTE: There could be differences between this document and the official printed *Hansard*, Vol. 314**

**TUESDAY, 20 MARCH 1990**

Mr SPEAKER (Hon. J. Fouras, Ashgrove) read prayers and took the chair at 10 a.m.

**PAPERS PRINTED DURING RECESS**

**Mr SPEAKER:** I have to report that the following papers were ordered to be printed and circulated in accordance with section 29A of the Acts Interpretation Act 1954-1989—

Annual Report of the Queensland Art Gallery 1988-89

Annual Report of the Board of Architects—Queensland 1988-89

Auditor-General's Report on Audits completed as at 27 October 1989

Auditor-General's Report on the Books and Accounts of the Brisbane City Council and Associated Bodies 1988-89

Annual Report of the Rockhampton Port Authority 1988-89

Annual Report of the Mackay Port Authority 1988-89.

**OVERTIME PAID IN GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS**

**Return to Order**

The following paper was laid on the table—

Return to an Order made by the House, showing the amount of overtime paid in each Government department (all funds) in 1988-89.

**FEES PAID BY CROWN TO BARRISTERS AND SOLICITORS**

**Return to Order**

The following paper was laid on the table—

Return to an Order made by the House, showing all payments by the Government to barristers and solicitors for the year ended 30 June 1989, stating the names of the recipients and the amounts received separately.

**PAPERS**

The following papers were laid on the table—

Orders in Council under--

Harbours Act 1955-1989

Canals Act 1958-1989

Law Courts and State Buildings Protective Security Act 1983-1989

Brisbane and Area Water Board Act 1979-1989 and the Statutory Bodies

Financial Arrangements Act 1982-1989

City of Brisbane (Flood Mitigation Works Approval) Act 1952-1988

City of Brisbane Market Act 1960-1985 and the Statutory Bodies Financial Arrangements Act 1982-1989

Forestry Act 1959-1987

Primary Producers' Organisation and Marketing Act 1926-1989

River Improvement Trust Act 1940-1985 and the Statutory Bodies Financial Arrangements Act 1982-1989  
Water Act 1926-1987 and the Statutory Bodies Financial Arrangements Act 1982-1989  
Auctioneers and Agents Act 1971-1988  
Regulations under--  
    Fisheries Act 1976-1989  
    Childrens's Services Act 1965-1989  
    The Criminal Code  
Reports--  
    Mortgage Secondary Market Board for the year ended 30 June 1989  
    Accounting Standards Review Board for the year ended 30 June 1989  
    Companies and Securities Law Review Committee for the year ended 30 June 1989  
Report and Financial Statements of the National Companies and Securities Commission for the year ended 30 June 1989  
Proclamations under the Forestry Act 1959-1987.

### MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

#### Death of Mr R. C. Katter, Snr

**Hon. W. K. GOSS** (Logan—Premier, Minister for Economic and Trade Development and Minister for the Arts) (10.05 a.m.), by leave: I rise to acknowledge the service given to this State by Mr Bob Katter, Snr. He served for a long time as a member of the Federal Parliament. He was the member for the seat of Kennedy from 1966 to 1990.

Mr Katter grew up in Cloncurry. He was educated at the Mount Carmel College in Charters Towers. He was an infantry captain during World War II. He was also a former member of the Australian Labor Party and, for a time, worked as a union delegate on Brisbane wharves. He was a Cloncurry shire councillor and a Cloncurry Shire Council chairman for two separate periods.

Mr Katter won the seat of Kennedy in 1966. As honourable members would know, Kennedy is a vast electorate covering some 770 000 square kilometres. Mr Katter was re-elected nine times and was truly a veteran of the Federal Parliament. In 1972, he was Minister for the Army. He was a vocal, hard-working and active member of the Federal Parliament and a vocal and active representative of his constituents. He served on numerous parliamentary committees.

On behalf of the Government and the Queensland Parliament, I record our regret at his passing and extend the condolences and sympathy of the Government to his family and, in particular, to his son, Bob, who is a member of this Parliament.

In conclusion, so that the Leader of the Opposition might have equal time to respond, under Standing Order 108A I move—

"That the House take note of the statement."

**Mr COOPER** (Roma—Leader of the Opposition) (10.07 a.m.): I acknowledge the gesture by the Premier. While it is not customary for condolence motions of a Federal nature to be moved in this House, I welcome the opportunity to pay tribute to a man who was certainly a great Queenslander and to acknowledge the life and work of Robert Cummin Katter.

As the Premier said, Bob Katter, Snr, served as a member from 1966 to 1990. In 1966, Kennedy was a very safe Labor seat. Bob Katter, Snr, was a very good mixer. He mixed well with all people right across the

spectrum and, as such, he merited the support of the people. No electorate could have wished for a more determined and dedicated fighter.

Although he became Minister for the Army, his great cause was road safety. He served on the National Road Safety Committee. He was also interested in local government.

Bob Katter, Snr, had a very colourful sense of humour. He was a colourful man who represented a colourful and remote electorate. He was born and raised in the Mount Isa area. He lived, worked and even spent his holidays in Mount Isa. He represented a historic part of Queensland, including Winton, Cloncurry and Longreach, and many other places which a large number of people have never seen. He played a major role in the history of Queensland. He was a very personable man.

As I said, he was very humorous. One joke about him concerns a day when he was travelling between Charters Towers and Mount Isa. All members know that, because there are many pigs and kangaroos in that area, most cars are fitted with roo bars. As many of us in this place know, politicians are not necessarily held in high regard; some people regard them as being one rung above child-molesters. Bob was travelling along at a fair pace and the female driver of a car approaching him wound the window down, put her head out and yelled, "Pig." He wound his window down and said, "Bitch." It was just then that he hit the pig.

Anyone who had the pleasure of knowing this great Queenslander knew that he studied law at the University of Queensland. He gave distinguished military service. He enlisted in 1936 and rose to the rank of captain in 1942, when he was invalided out of the army. He became Minister for the Army. So he served his State and nation well.

He was distinguished in local government circles. He was a member of the Cloncurry Shire Council from 1946 to 1967 and, during part of that period, he served as deputy chairman and chairman. He was an executive member of the Local Government Association of Queensland. He was expert in local government problems confronting western and northern Queensland. He was an executive member of the Western Queensland Local Government Association. He promoted local government when he was in Canberra and he was chairman of the Local Government Association Canberra Committee.

He set an example in the way he served the National Party. He was the supreme constituency nurse for what was a very rugged and very remote region. He served his constituency well. His personal following was enormous.

He is survived by his wife and five children, including the honourable member for Flinders, Bob Katter, Jnr, who is with his family at this time. Bob Katter, Snr, was one of those rare individuals who become a legend in their life-time. On behalf of us all, I say to his widow and family that we will miss him, and we thank him for the memory, his public service and the time he gave us.

**Mr INNES** (Sherwood—Leader of the Liberal Party) (10.12 a.m.), by leave: I associate the Liberal Party with the statements of condolence extended to the Katter family. Bob Katter, Snr, was liked by everybody. He was a hale and bluff person who was always a pleasure to see. I do not think that that characteristic was confined to members of any particular party. He had that hale-fellow, straightforward appearance of a man from the bush. He made his mark not only in the west but across the whole of Queensland and the whole of Australia.

Many of us will recall the consistency with which he was able to give publicity to problems of road safety, which was a matter of particular relevance to somebody who had to travel as many miles as he did in the sorts of conditions that exist west of the Great Divide.

We express our gratitude to him for a life of service to the community. We express our gratitude to him for his likeable personality. Our condolences go out to the members of his two families who must mourn his passing greatly. We pay a tribute to the service he gave to the State when he was a member of the Federal Parliament.

Motion agreed to, honourable members standing in silence.

### MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

#### Housing Initiatives under Goss Government

**Hon. T. J. BURNS** (Lytton—Deputy Premier, Minister for Housing and Local Government) (10.13 a.m.), by leave: Because it is important that the House should be kept up to date with new initiatives in housing under the Goss Government, and as this is the eve of the debate on the Commonwealth and State Housing Agreement Bill and the signing of the new Commonwealth and State Housing Agreement, I have sought leave to make this statement.

The House should know of the very sad state that the previous Government allowed to occur in the Queensland Housing Commission. The QHC was allowed to run down to the extent that staff had to work in overcrowded circumstances, which were totally unacceptable. In many sections, workers were two to a desk and were sharing telephones.

A combination of staff shortages and outdated equipment meant that clients telephoning the QHC were kept hanging on for hours. They were probably telephoning because they could not find the offices of the commission.

**Mr Gunn** interjected.

**Mr BURNS:** The honourable member should not interject, because he was the Minister.

**Mr LITTLEPROUD:** I rise to a point of order. It was the practice of the previous Government that lengthy statements such as this were tabled for incorporation. Mr Speaker, I ask that you request the Minister to table this statement so that we can have more questions.

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

**Mr BURNS:** The honourable member only raised a point of order because I was going to give Bill Gunn a bucket.

Down at that building there is a 6-inch square piece of paper with an arrow and the letters "QHC" written on it. Every other department in the place has a major sign, but there is simply a piece of paper stuck on the wall with durex tape. That happened when Mr Gunn was the Minister. It is no wonder that people who rang up had to wait in a queue. I invite honourable members to go down Adelaide Street to the entrance to the commission and look for the sign. I have left it there for them to see. There are proper signs for the other Government agencies in the Anzac Square building, but the largest organisation inside it only has envelope-sized pieces of paper fixed with sticky tape high over the doorway saying "Housing Commission".

**Mr Gunn** interjected.

**Mr BURNS:** Since 2 December we have set about rebuilding the organisation. We have rented three floors of an adjoining building to relieve the overcrowded conditions for hard-working staff. Mr Gunn would not do that for them. We have started the process of identifying the training needs of all the workers in the organisation and have provided more staff to answer client telephone calls.

**Mr Gunn** interjected.

**Mr BURNS:** We have begun the process of identifying the staffing needs of the department to enable it to do the job that the people of Queensland need. We are moving to decentralise the commission's operations in order to take the service to the people rather than hide it, which is what Mr Gunn did.

Honourable members will recall that the Government presented a well-developed set of housing policies designed to provide mortgage relief, increase home-ownership and public housing, and make housing policies and programs more flexible and responsive to people with special needs. One of the first initiatives of the new Ministry for Housing and Local Government was to take a submission to Cabinet to establish the family housing package to provide much-needed mortgage relief to low and moderate income families. The scheme was launched on 1 February and applications are currently being forwarded to my department. To date, 1 221 applications have been received and new applications are being received daily. First payments under the scheme will be made at the end of April.

In relation to implementing our other major initiatives, I should advise the House that, on obtaining Government, we were shocked at the state of the Queensland Housing Commission's policy resources. Like most sections of the organisation, they were woefully inadequate. Under the previous Government, policy resources had not been provided in line with the need to respond to changing times. It was no wonder that the QHC has not kept pace with the innovation of the other State housing authorities. To give honourable members some indication of the extent of the problem the Labor Government inherited, I will compare the QHC with the housing authorities in other States. Victoria has a policy section with 15 policy officers. In Western Australia, the number is 12, plus consultants, and in South Australia it is 10. At the QHC, until six months ago it was one, and now it is a paltry two. We had to look to other State housing authorities for assistance.

In relation to implementing the new home ownership made easier scheme, my acting director-general has been able to obtain the services of Ms Jennifer Clark, who is the manager of the home lending program in the New South Wales Department of Housing. Ms Clark is on maternity leave but has agreed to move to Queensland and work four days per week for my department to implement our policies.

**Mr Gunn** interjected.

**Mr BURNS:** We are extremely fortunate to obtain her services as she has extensive experience in off-budget financing of home lending programs, as well as the development and implementation of low-start and shared ownership home loan schemes—experience which is not available at the present time inside the QHC. Mr Gunn failed to put the people there to do these jobs.

Discussions with private sector fund-raisers and lenders are well under way and I am hopeful of introducing a new low-start, fixed-interest, low-deposit loan in July. Ms Clark is putting together a small team of three QHC officers to help implement the new schemes. These officers will be trained in areas of housing finance from which they had otherwise been excluded.

In terms of Labor's pre-election policy commitment to carrying out an independent review of QHC policies to make them more flexible and responsible to people's needs, I am pleased to inform the House that Ms Vivienne Milligan has been appointed to direct the housing policy review. Ms Milligan was previously employed by the Commonwealth on its housing policy review. She is a former academic who has undisputed qualifications and experience in the area of developing and implementing new housing policies and programs. Ms Milligan's family commitments in Sydney mean that she is unable to move to Queensland, but she has agreed to travel to Brisbane on a regular basis until she completes the review and until she establishes a decent QHC policy capacity and trains staff. This review will be the most far-reaching and comprehensive ever carried out by a State housing authority. It will involve every aspect of policy, including rent policy, eligibility, maintenance, allocations and transfers. It will include an overhaul of existing schemes and will develop new policies and programs for people with disabilities, pensioners, families in crisis, homeless youth, Aborigines and single people. As with Ms Clark, a major part of Ms Milligan's job will be to build an appropriate policy division for an organisation with the responsibilities and functions of the QHC.

My acting director-general and I have held many meetings with representatives of special needs groups, including Aboriginal groups, disability groups, pensioner groups and emergency housing groups, all of whom have welcomed the Labor Government's commitments to open up the organisation and to consult about policy changes. In terms of pensioner housing, we have stopped the further construction of bed-sitters and replaced them with one-bedroom designs. As well, all future pensioner units at ground level will be designed for wheelchair access so that as our pensioners become frail they will not have to leave their homes so quickly.

I hope to arrange for staff exchanges so that our staff will be able to exchange with interstate and Commonwealth staff for the benefit of all Australian housing authorities. Over the last few weeks housing experts from South Australia, Western Australia and the ACT have travelled to Brisbane to help in this rebuilding process. All have been saddened at the run-down state of our housing authority, but all have been only too happy to contribute to the challenge of making it work for the people of Queensland who need the best housing policies and programs possible.

### **MINISTERIAL STATEMENT**

#### **Chemical Spraying Complaints in Emerald**

**Hon. E. D. CASEY** (Mackay—Minister for Primary Industries) (10.21 a.m.), by leave: On 6 March there was a drift of insecticide spray from a cotton crop into the town of Emerald. The insecticide was Heliotion, which is widely used in the cotton industry to control insect pests. It has an unpleasant but non-toxic pungent smell caused by the presence of minute amounts of mercaptans. Mercaptan smells are produced naturally in decaying organic matter.

The cotton crop was 6 kilometres west of Emerald. There was a light wind—2 to 3 knots—from the south east that would not have allowed spray to drift towards the town. However, during the spraying, there was a sudden shift to light westerly winds—1 knot—which took the odour and traces of chemical into the town. Samples of foliage were taken by the Department of Primary Industries spray monitor at four locations in Emerald and analysed by our agricultural chemistry branch. The analyses disclosed the following levels of Heliotion in the foliage—

- 1.3 parts per million;
- 0.15 parts per million;
- 0.11 parts per million; and
- 0.07 parts per million.

The highest level of chemical detected—1.3 parts per million—was on the western side of the town, closest to the spray application area. Because the cause of the incident was the sudden change in wind direction, there can be no suggestion that the spray pilot was acting irresponsibly.

Heliotion is listed in schedule 6 of the Uniform Poisons Standards published by the National Health and Medical Research Council. Schedule 6 includes things such as pure eucalyptus oil and anti-freeze, which are regarded as poisons but not poisons of exceptional danger. Heliotion has an acute oral lethal dose level of 304 milligrams per kilogram of body weight. To help put this in a human health perspective, if the highest level found—1.3 parts per million—had occurred in an edible crop, the average person would need to eat 14 tonnes of the crop to get a lethal dose of Heliotion. At the lowest level found—0.07 parts per million—285 tonnes would need to be eaten.

Residents of Emerald can be assured that the incident is not serious from the point of view of human health. Nevertheless, it is the type of event that must be avoided as much as possible. Although the cotton industry is reliant on the use of chemicals to control pests, the occasional drift of chemicals into Emerald cannot be tolerated. Drift

can be minimised by the adoption of appropriate aerial spraying practices and by such other measures as growing a buffer zone of trees around the town.

A departmental spray monitor was appointed to Emerald this season. This was the first appointment of this type in Queensland, and possibly Australia. The spray monitoring officer has done an excellent job and, with the experience gained this year, I believe that next year the department will be in a better position to monitor and control spraying operations. By that time, continuous automatic air sampling equipment will be in place to detect atmospheric levels of pesticides in the town. My department is also carrying out extensive research into integrated pest management, which would reduce the quantity of chemicals used for pest control. It is important for all people who are worried about the possible effects of chemical residue to be aware of the extraordinarily detailed processes of testing and evaluating which now precede the release of all agricultural chemicals.

If it is thought necessary, I will endeavour to arrange for a visit to Emerald by specialists in health and chemical toxicology who are involved with the clearance of agricultural chemicals in Australia. Last week, Emerald was visited by a senior officer of my department. This officer met with a cross-section of concerned parties, including cotton-growers and the Concerned Citizens Group. I will be following up his recommendations.

#### **LEAVE TO MOVE MOTION WITHOUT NOTICE**

**Mr COOPER** (Roma—Leader of the Opposition) (10.25 a.m.): I seek leave to move a motion without notice censuring the Government for its attempts to close down the Cooke inquiry.

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

DIVISION

Resolved in the negative.

#### **QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE**

##### **Poker Machine Inspection in United States by Minister for Primary Industries**

**Mr COOPER:** I ask the Minister for Primary Industries: has he, either in his parliamentary capacity or as a private individual, ever visited the United States of America? If so, on any occasion did he make a point of inspecting or noting a particular

brand of poker machine in operation? If so, what was the brand of poker machine that he saw in operation? Who was the manufacturer?

**Mr CASEY:** My answer to the first part of the question is, "Yes." My answer to the second part of the question is, "No."

#### **Alleged Slush Fund Operated by Member for Mackay**

**Mr COOPER:** In directing a question to the Premier, I refer to the secret slush fund known as Caspalp, which was operated by the honourable member for Mackay, to secret donations of \$30,000 paid into that account by the poker machine lobby, and to the fact that, when first confronted by the secret donations during a television interview, the honourable member for Mackay, whom the Premier has promoted to sit in his Cabinet, categorically denied that any donation had been received. In view of the Premier's answer to my question on 7 March, in which he expressed full confidence in the past actions of the member for Mackay, I ask: does a record of making a false and deliberately untrue statement to the media and the public in any way disqualify a member of his parliamentary team from obtaining ministerial rank under the standards that he has set? If not, do his standards mean that any member of caucus may tell a blatant untruth to the media and to the public and expect promotion to Cabinet?

**Mr W. K. GOSS:** The proposition that has been put forward is ludicrous. If the Leader of the Opposition were to suggest that statements of that nature made in the public arena disqualify somebody from being in this Parliament or being in Cabinet, the whole of his front bench would have to vacate.

The core of this issue is whether or not there has been any illegality or, indeed, if not illegality, whether there has been any impropriety or any misappropriation of funds by the member for Mackay. If any of those allegations stood up, there would be something to which the member and the Government would have to respond. But there is not. This is a shallow, superficial, pathetic bit of Inspector Clousseau work by the Leader of the Opposition, who has managed to discover in 1990 that 10 or 11 years ago a campaign donation was made by a particular company to the Labor Party and paid into that account that was established by the then Leader of the Opposition.

At that time, I was not a member of the Parliament or involved with those matters. However, many people would be aware that at that time the Labor Party was involved in some of the difficult internal problems that it occasionally has.

**Opposition members** interjected.

**Mr W. K. GOSS:** In a spirit of amicable internal argument that members of the Labor Party occasionally have.

I return to the question of whether there is any illegality, impropriety or misappropriation. Firstly, it should be remembered by members and recorded in this Parliament that the National Party sent in the police to investigate the matter fully, and that was done. My advice is that Mr Casey was cleared absolutely by the police investigation. Furthermore, I am told that the police referred the question to the Solicitor-General, who also cleared Mr Casey of any illegality, any suggestion of any offence and, indeed, any suggestion of any misappropriation or improper conduct. That is the legal position from the police and the Solicitor-General under the National Party's administration.

However, I go further than that to knock over these pathetic, snide and untrue suggestions of any impropriety. I will quote from a report made some years ago by one of Australia's foremost fund-raisers, which made reference to claims about poker machine lobby donations to political parties. The report stated—

"I must say that I believe that Mr. Ed Casey, Leader of the Labor Party in Queensland, was shamefully treated by the Press for accepting a political gift from Poker Machine Lobbyists. He was clearly entitled to do so as his Party Platform



publicly stated that an A.L.P. Government would introduce Poker Machines and he is owed an apology on the matter."

I agree wholeheartedly with that statement.

**Mr Veivers:** Who wrote it?

**Mr W. K. GOSS:** Mr Veivers asked who wrote the report. I thank him. I am happy to respond.

The report in 1982 stating that Mr Casey had not acted improperly, that he was owed an apology and that he had been shamefully treated was issued by Compton Associates Pty Ltd—the National Party fundraiser!

What a joke! He is the man who helped the National Party to establish the biggest slush fund in the history of the Western World, the biggest collection of brown paper bags seen since Woolworths went into business. What does he say—"Mr Casey is owed an apology on the matter." I again thank Mr Veivers for his interjection.

### **Government Submission to Cooke Inquiry into Trade Unions**

**Mr PREST:** I refer the Premier to a report in today's *Australian* claiming that he had backed down on plans to end the Cooke inquiry into trade unions, and I ask: is that report an accurate assessment of the Government's submission to yesterday's hearing?

**Mr W. K. GOSS:** I thank the member for Port Curtis for the question. I must confess that I did not think he would have to ask it, because the Leader of the Opposition moved to have a debate about the Cooke inquiry and I thought that he was so genuinely concerned that he would have followed up with a question; but, no, he did not. One can only presume that his seeking leave to move a motion without notice was a stunt—nothing more than a stunt.

I turn to the report in this morning's *Australian*. It is false. The journalist should have known that it was false because he spoke to my officers last night. As I understand it, he was at the inquiry, and no reasonable person could have interpreted the Government's submission in the way that he did.

I am going to respond to the issues. I ask leave of the House to have incorporated in *Hansard* the submission of the Crown to the Cooke inquiry.

Leave granted.

**Mr W. K. GOSS:** I will not read the submission because we are looking forward to some more questions from the other side of the Chamber. However, I will refer to some of the key parts in order to demonstrate the fact that the Government has no such plans, that it never had any such plans, that that was a complete fiction and that the submission bears that out.

This Government is committed to the proper and honest administration of trade unions for the benefit of trade union members. It is also committed to moving against corruption wherever it occurs, whether it be amongst the ranks of the former Government, trade union officials or anywhere else. Corruption should be dealt with to the full force of the law, and so it will be.

I will refer to a couple of sections of the submission. Page 1 of the Crown's submission to the Cooke inquiry states—

"The evidence that has emerged in the Inquiry so far would suggest very clearly that an unacceptable state of affairs has arisen in at least one instance, and that changes to the applicable laws may well be necessary to ensure that such conduct is not continued or repeated."

In another section, it states—

" . . . The Government is committed to the notion that all possible steps should be taken to ensure that persons who are placed in positions of trust, particularly involving money and property, are prevented from taking unfair or illegal advantage of that trust for personal gain or otherwise."

The submission goes on—

"The Government believes that the Commission's own opinions will be a valuable contribution to the advice which the Government must consider."

It goes on to say—

"Such recommendations will then provide the Government with a further opportunity to continue its campaign of industrial legislation reform."

It goes on further—

"The Government views the work of this Commission as being complementary to that of the Hanger Committee, and it is submitted that the Commission should formulate its recommendations against that background."

The submission states also—

"Finally, it is submitted that the Commission should continue its work with the maximum of expedition."

That is only reasonable in terms of the public interest in having any inquiry come to a conclusion at the earliest possible opportunity and, furthermore, it is only reasonable in terms of minimising the very heavy cost burden that is flowing to the public from a range of inquiries, and action following upon those inquiries. A very substantial cost to the public would never have been necessary either in respect of the Fitzgerald or Cooke inquiries if the former Government had honestly and competently administered the relevant laws.

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

COOKE COMMISSION of INQUIRY  
SUBMISSION BY THE CROWN IN RIGHT OF  
THE STATE OF QUEENSLAND

Clause 7 of the Terms of Reference requires this Commission to report to the Government on issues identified by the Commission as requiring reform of the laws of Queensland.

The Commission has indicated a general view that there is a need for law reform in the areas touched by the Inquiry. The evidence that has emerged in the Inquiry so far would suggest very clearly that an unacceptable state of affairs has arisen in at least one instance, and that changes to the applicable laws may well be necessary to ensure that such conduct is not continued or repeated.

In the statement by the Commission on 6th March, specific issues were identified as warranting particular examination. The Queensland Government supports the process of identification of such issues as a step in the reform programme.

The overwhelming majority of participants in the industrial system of Queensland desire the establishment of a framework, either legislatively or administratively, that permits and encourages honest, open and accountable administration of the organizations and institutions that are the major players in the industrial field. The unfortunate instances of the conduct of individuals that have been the subject of this part of the Inquiry are aberrations in any system, and should not be treated as the general standard of conduct. However, the Government is committed to the notion that all possible steps should be taken to ensure that persons who are placed in positions of trust, particularly involving money and property, are prevented from taking unfair or illegal advantage of that trust for personal gain or otherwise.

It is submitted that in this context, the users of the system, other than Government, should assume a large part of the burden in putting forward suggestions for reform of their system, so that the Commission may have the benefit of their experience as to what measures are practical and sensible to operate, and yet give members of unions the security they require. The Government hopes that submissions will be put forward for the assistance of the Inquiry by those who have an interest in the outcome of legislative reform.

As the Government has the ultimate responsibility to formulate such legislation as it thinks appropriate, it is not proposed to suggest to the Commission the form or content of any opinion or advice which the Commission should give to the Government. Accordingly, I do not propose to make substantive submissions as to whether, or in what respects, the law should be reformed in this area. The Government believes that the Commission's own opinions will be a valuable contribution to the advice which the Government must consider.

With the benefit of such submissions as may be made by other parties, and the factual material that has emerged from the evidence, the Commission is in a unique position to make informed recommendations for change. Such recommendations will then provide the Government with a further opportunity to continue its campaign of industrial legislation reform. Recent evidence of the Government commitment in this direction is its decision to embrace the Hanger Committee proposals.

The Commission should be made aware at this point that the Government proposes to introduce legislation at an early date to change existing legislation including certain aspects of registration and control of registered industrial organizations in Queensland. Accordingly, the Commission should look to the recommendations of the Hanger Committee relating to registered industrial organizations as the starting point of any further reform proposals, rather than the existing legislation.

The Government views the work of this Commission as being complementary to that of the Hanger Committee, and it is submitted that the Commission should formulate its recommendations against that background.

As is clear from the evidence before the Commission, and as has been submitted earlier, there appear to be aspects of the conduct of individuals in this case, which, if proven, cannot be condoned in any organization. However, that is not to say that, in the absence of evidence of widespread abuses of this nature, the legislature is necessarily required to intervene to an unwarranted extent in the internal affairs of all industrial organizations. The necessary consequence of legislative intervention of this kind is usually increased cost to the organization concerned and a decreased ability to service the membership. It is submitted that the proper role of the legislature must be to walk the fine line between protecting the interests of the members of unions from dishonesty, whilst not unduly hindering responsible unions and union officials from carrying out their important work.

Finally, it is submitted that the Commission should continue its work with the maximum of expedition.

Apart from the cost of the conduct of Inquiries such as the present one, there are a number of other considerations:-

1. There is a foreshadowed possibility of adverse findings against individuals in relation to conduct which may be criminal in nature. Of course, criminal proceedings must await the conclusion of Inquiry proceedings, and it is essential in the interests of the public and any individuals concerned, that the possibility of such proceedings be disposed of either way as quickly as possible.
2. Legislative reform should not, as a general principle, be undertaken in a piecemeal manner. The Commission has already expressed the view that prompt action is required in some of the identified areas where law reform is said to be warranted. Whilst the Government does not disagree with the expressed view that prompt action is required, and the Government remains committed to the process of reform where necessary, it may not be possible to incorporate individual reports or recommendations in legislation until all of the Commission's findings and reports are available.

Of course, the Government will give very careful consideration to each report as it is delivered, and will give particular weight to any specific recommendation for interim change, however it should not be expected that the Government will necessarily react immediately to each report as it comes to hand. The Government at this time sees most value in the cumulative effect of such reports, so that any consequential changes are made with the benefit of the widest possible base of evidence, submissions and deliberation.

Accordingly, the pace of legislative reform may well be governed by the speed with which the whole work of the Commission is concluded and the final report is available. The Commission will therefore assist that process by providing such final report at the earliest possible date.

The Commission's experience to date will have provided you with ample opportunity to assess the utility of the approach provided for in the Terms of Reference, and their appropriateness of those terms of reference for the future conduct of this Commission.

Generally there are two broad areas dealt with in the Terms of Reference:

1. Possible contraventions of the law of the State;
2. Possible law reform to prevent any contravention of the law, or other misconduct.

On the basis of proceedings to date the Commission might like to consider, and express a view on, the question as to whether or not this Commission is the appropriate forum to deal, in the first instance, with matters which may give rise to criminal charges.

If the Commission comes to the view that another forum might be more appropriate to deal with such matters, the question arises as to whether or not it is likely that any further subject of possible law reform, other than those so far identified, is likely to be revealed by the examination of the affairs of other unions.

A continuation of the law reform component of the Terms of Reference in such circumstances may only result in a reiteration of the areas of concern which the Commission has already highlighted.

Given that there is now a body of experience in the conduct of the Inquiry the Government is of the view that this is a appropriate time to assess the aptness of the Terms of Reference. The views of the Commission would be welcomed.

### **Importance of Advertising Industry to Queensland Tourism**

**Mr PREST:** I ask the Minister for Tourism, Sport and Racing: is the advertising industry important to the future of Queensland tourism? Is the Minister aware of any problems in the Queensland advertising industry? What impact might any such problems have on Queensland tourism?

**Mr GIBBS:** The advertising industry, of course, plays a vital role in the future of Queensland tourism. I might say that it is my intention in the not too distant future to ensure that the advertising accounts which have always been held exclusively by the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation will in fact be put out in the marketplace so that a broader range of expertise can be obtained and more professionals can contribute to and further advantage the tourist industry in Queensland. However, it was with a good deal of concern that I saw on the front page of this morning's *Sun* the words "Lib debt". The accompanying article states—

"Massive debts owed by Queensland's embattled Liberal Party contributed to the collapse of one of Brisbane's leading advertising agencies."

The Liberal Party owes more than \$100,000. It has forced that agency to the wall—it has sent it broke. Last week, a very well-respected person around town, Mr Lloyd Graham, had to shut his advertising agency. Those Liberal Party paragons of free enterprise were responsible for 18 people losing their jobs.

All honourable members could feel sorry about the parlous state of the Liberal Party. As well, only a couple of days ago that very same newspaper reported how the Leader of the Liberal Party, the member for Sherwood, also was going broke. Mr Innes advised the people of Queensland that he could not live on \$55,000 per year.

**Mr INNES:** I rise to a point of order. Those words are untrue. I find them offensive. I did not say at any time that I was going broke. I find those words offensive and I ask that they be withdrawn.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! The member has asked for a withdrawal of the words. The Minister will withdraw the words and return to his answer.

**Mr GIBBS:** If the member is upset, I will withdraw the words.

It is sad that the Liberal Party, which was once a great party in this State, has now been reduced to the parlous state of having nine members in this Parliament, owing \$100,000 and having driven to the wall one of Queensland's leading advertising agencies. It makes one wonder how the Leader of the Liberal Party could ever again travel round this State supposedly championing the cause of free enterprise and talking about what

he would do in Government when his administration is responsible for that dreadful debacle.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! I call the member for Sherwood.

**Mr LINGARD:** I rise to a point of order. Mr Speaker, during the past three or four days of this session you have changed quite dramatically some of the practices of this House. One of the practices that you are now changing is the order of questions for the Opposition. Members of this Parliament must wonder what would have happened in the past if, on any particular day, the member for Lytton had not got the third call for questions. There would have been an absolute riot.

Mr Speaker, last Thursday in this House you changed the practice of this House when you gave another interpretation of Standing Order 123A. Recently, Mr Speaker, you gave another interpretation of Standing Order 137. You also called the Premier on one occasion when *Hansard* shows quite clearly that the Leader of the Opposition stood first.

My point of order is this, Mr Speaker: on page 58 of *Hansard* you stated that you are the voice of the House but you are also the servant of the House. In the past, Mr Speaker, you have hidden behind Standing Orders and——

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! I have listened to the member's point of order. The honourable member for Fassifern is not entitled to lecture this Chamber. His point of order related to the order in which questions are asked. I have noted his point of order. I have been very tolerant in letting the honourable member speak for longer than he ought to have been able to speak. There is no point of order. I call the member for Sherwood.

### PRIVILEGE

#### Determination of Order of Opposition Questions

**Mr LINGARD** (Fassifern) (10.50 am): I rise on a point of privilege. Mr Speaker, I ask: under what Standing Orders are you allowed to determine the order of questions for the Opposition?

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! No Standing Order relates to question-time. I call the order of members as I see fit. There are some conventions about that, but there are no Standing Orders. The honourable member ought to know that.

**Mr Lingard:** That's right.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! I warn the member for Fassifern under Standing Order 123A. I will not have my authority questioned like that. I now call the member for Sherwood.

### QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

#### Introduction of Poker Machines

**Mr INNES:** There was a time when the Government Whip and Deputy Whip did not get the first calls, but that was changed by the National Party. I direct a question to the Premier. One noted the announcement yesterday of the poker machine initiatives. In view of the sort of advice that was contained in the Fitzgerald report relating to the Government's staying out of decisions between one person and another—decisions on which strong economic benefits were swinging—I ask: why did this Government decide that it would buy the poker machines from the suppliers as opposed to having a licensing system and allowing suppliers to make their own arrangements with the clubs and the hotels?

**Mr W. K. GOSS:** The situation in relation to the alternatives between purchasing and licensing of poker machines was considered long and hard by a special Cabinet subcommittee after extensive advice from and investigation by the Treasury and the Casino Control Division. The very strong advice that came to the Government from that subcommittee—and that advice has been accepted—is that the alternative system to that which the Government has decided on contains fertile ground for corruption—for kick-backs from companies to individuals in certain clubs. My Government is anxious to avoid that. That is why we took the best of advice on how we might ensure that corruption was not involved in the introduction of poker machines. Everybody should share our concern about the potential for corruption that exists under such a licensing system.

On an associated matter which has been adverted to by other members of this Parliament in relation to the role of the Criminal Justice Commission, let me say that at the very outset Sir Max Bingham was consulted in relation to the Government's plan. In fact, he was asked to attend—and did attend—the very first meeting of that Cabinet subcommittee. Furthermore, Sir Max Bingham suggested to me—and I have accepted his advice, not out of any particular concern but, I suppose, out of an excess of caution or double caution—that I ask the Minister, Mr Gibbs, to double-check with the New South Wales authority, the Premier's Department in that State and the gaming squad in relation to the process that this Government is following. The Minister will be doing that, although some contact has already been made.

Because of this Government's determination to ensure that there are no problems of the kind that have been referred to, when the quite complex legislation is finalised and drafted it will be submitted to Sir Max Bingham.

This is a very complex area, but we are pursuing a course of action that we are very confident will eliminate any possibility of corruption, will ensure strict control and will enable the clubs and certain individuals to avoid being faced with pressure or temptation.

This careful and very studied approach that we are adopting is in stark contrast to the irresponsible and illegal actions of the previous Government—illegal under the Liquor Act. Last year, in the run-up to the election, against the advice of Treasury and against the advice of the Casino Control Division to allow the introduction of poker machines without proper protection and without proper security, the National Party Government, in a panic, put through an illegal Order in Council. As I said, that was done against the warnings and the advice of that Government's own officers. The measure undertaken by that Government by way of Order in Council involved no legislative control, proper testing or security. I understand that certain officers of the Casino Control Division were horrified.

The route that we are taking is much more studied and much more strict. We believe that it is the one that will be most likely to ensure in overall terms the best possible result for Queensland in respect of the introduction of poker machines to this State.

### **Cyclone Ivor**

**Mr PALASZCZUK:** I ask the Minister for Police and Emergency Services: what is the current position of tropical cyclone Ivor? What damage has been sustained in towns in its path? Is cyclone Ivor any further threat to north Queensland?

**Opposition members** interjected.

**Mr MACKENROTH:** I am certain that the people of north Queensland would be most interested to know what the situation is in relation to cyclone Ivor, even if National Party members are not concerned.

Cyclone Ivor crossed the north Queensland coast between Lockhart River and Cooktown about midnight last night. Communities within 200 kilometres of the eye, including Cooktown, Coen, Cairns—

**Mr Borbidge** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Surfers Paradise will cease interjecting.

**Mr MACKENROTH:** As I was saying, communities within 200 kilometres of the eye, including Cooktown, Coen, Cairns and Lizard Island sustained minor damage but there were no injuries reported in any centres. There has been torrential rain in the area and the Bruce Highway at Gordonvale is cut by flooding. Last night, about 100 people sheltered in public buildings in Cooktown, but all returned to their homes this morning. Power has been cut in the town but I have been assured by the SES that it will be restored shortly. The SES helicopter will also check Princess Charlotte Bay to ensure the safety of the fishing fleet there. Despite the severity of the cyclone, all communities have fared well. There is a slim chance that it could continue across the cape to the Gulf of Carpentaria, where it could regenerate.

**Mr Lingard** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Fassifern will cease interjecting. He has been warned already under Standing Order 123A. I warn him again under that Standing Order. He will cease interjecting.

**Mr MACKENROTH:** The SES has advised that the cyclone could cross the gulf and regenerate, posing a threat to the gulf communities of Aurukun and Edward River. The Bureau of Meteorology and the State Emergency Service are monitoring the situation.

I really felt that someone in the Opposition would be concerned about north Queensland and would have asked a question about it today. It is quite obvious that the National Party is not concerned about issues in Queensland.

**Mr FitzGerald:** You're worried about what's in here—that's what you're worried about.

**Mr MACKENROTH:** I am concerned about what?

**Mr FitzGerald** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Lockyer will cease interjecting.

**Mr MACKENROTH:** I have been sitting here for three hours waiting for Opposition members to ask me a question, but they have not.

When Opposition members complain about not having the opportunity to ask questions, I think we all need to reflect on the fact that, although this is an allotted day, earlier the Opposition wanted to have a debate rather than question-time. To give the Opposition an opportunity to raise questions, the Government voted against that debate being allowed to proceed. That point should be considered by all honourable members.

### **Queensland's Exports and Overseas Trade**

**Mr PALASZCZUK:** I ask the Premier and Minister for Economic and Trade Development: given the underlying strengths of the Queensland economy in the areas of primary industries, the resource sector and tourism, will he outline to the House initiatives being taken by the Government to improve Queensland's performance in expanding exports and overseas trade?

**Mr W. K. GOSS:** This is a very important area, probably the most important area that Queensland should be concerned about in the years ahead. I regret that we have only two minutes to deal with it.

As members should be aware, in recent times tremendous growth has occurred in the economy of north-east Asia but, unfortunately, this country and in particular this

State have failed, I believe, to capitalise on the trade opportunities that exist. We propose, as we have been arguing for a good year now, to adopt a more planned and more aggressive approach in terms of trying to gain Queensland companies and Queensland producers access to those markets of north-east Asia identified in the Garnaut report.

For that reason, the Government was delighted to have the opportunity yesterday to have Professor Garnaut brief the Cabinet on his report and to answer questions and propositions put by relevant Ministers in a range of areas, in particular education, transport and primary industries. We believe that there is a tremendous potential in north-east Asia for the sorts of goods that Queensland produces and also for the sorts of services that we can provide.

To follow up on this, at my request the Deputy Premier will be leading a delegation organised by the Queensland-China Council on a trip to Shanghai and Beijing in the first week of May this year to try to restart and to revitalise the sister-State relationship entered into by the previous Government under Mr Ahern between Queensland and Shanghai. It is a very worthwhile relationship but one which unfortunately has fallen by the wayside because of the troubles——

**Mr FitzGerald:** In the last three months.

**Mr W. K. GOSS:** If the member for Lockyer is not aware, I point out that it has fallen by the wayside because of the troubles in China.

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

#### **MATTERS OF PUBLIC INTEREST**

##### **Poker Machines**

**Mr COOPER** (Roma—Leader of the Opposition) (11 a.m.): Today I rise on a matter of vital interest to the people of Queensland—the impending introduction of poker machines to this State.

Because of the limited time available, I must leave aside the adverse social effects of this decision, which have been enunciated by church groups and welfare agencies. Those concerns are serious enough and will be brought forward in their rightful place on another day. For now it is necessary to raise the proven connection between secret donations from the powerful poker machine lobby and the ALP.

Queensland is about to witness the biggest political pay-off in its history. The ALP has moved to corner the poker machine market. It will have a monopoly in the purchase of all machines to ensure that a sizeable share of the purchase contracts go to its favoured manufacturer as the pay-off for past political and financial support.

The poker machine lobby has hit the jackpot in Queensland. For a secret outlay of \$30,000, it will collect \$100m in contracts for the purchase of poker machines. The decision on which machines to purchase will be made by the new Queensland Cabinet which contains, as one of its most senior and influential members, the honourable member for Mackay who received the \$30,000 donation from the poker machine lobby and deposited it into a secret political slush fund and then lied about its existence. I have copies of the three cheques, each for \$10,000, made out in the name of Caspalp.

As I was saying, the decision on which machines to purchase will be made by the new Queensland Cabinet, the donation was paid into a secret political slush fund and there were lies about its existence.

**Government members** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! There is much too much audible conversation in the Chamber. I cannot hear the member speak.



**Mr COOPER:** Queenslanders will soon see for themselves the hypocrisy and double standards of this new Labor Government—standards which make a total mockery of the rules of parliamentary and Cabinet conduct, which it pretends to uphold.

If ever there was a matter that should be referred to the Criminal Justice Commission for investigation, it is the introduction of the one-armed bandits, which have attracted the attention of criminal elements in New South Wales and drawn serious adverse references from the Wilcox and Moffat inquiries.

Until now, Australia was a closed market for the poker machine lobbyists. Only New South Wales and the ACT have allowed the introduction of poker machines. Because of their proven past connections with the rorts and the figures associated with the criminal elements and organised crime, no other State in the nation wants poker machines.

Why the haste to open the floodgates in Queensland? When this Government hesitates to do anything other than form committees and employ consultants to tell it what to do, why is it rushing headlong to approve the introduction of poker machines and ignoring the findings of previous inquiries and not receiving the considered advice of the Criminal Justice Commission. The answer is simple—the poker machine lobby is on a promise. There is a corrupt pay-off for services rendered and money received. Nothing can be allowed to interfere with the deals that were done behind closed doors over the past decade to allow the introduction of poker machines in return for secret payments to the Labor Party.

The actions of the honourable member for Mackay have facilitated the introduction of poker machines every step of the way. For years, he has been the secret agent of the poker machine lobby in Queensland. He has done the lobby's every bidding. He has acted in concert with its members. He has consulted them on political and parliamentary tactics in return for payments received.

The honourable member for Mackay got the sack as the Leader of the Opposition when his colleagues found him with his hands in the till accepting a donation of \$30,000 from the poker machine lobby and placing it in a secret bank account named Caspalp. All the money that went into that account has not been publicly accounted for.

**A Government member** interjected.

**Mr COOPER:** There is more.

At the time there was an investigation but it reached no final conclusion because the honourable member who is now a Minister in this so-called accountable and honest Government, refused to fully cooperate with the efforts of the inquiry into the matter to establish the truth. A question mark remains over some of the funds.

When first confronted in a television interview with the allegation about secret donations, the honourable member for Mackay lied. He told a bare-faced lie to the media and to the people of Queensland. Let him deny the allegations. He denied it this morning, and I believe that he has misled the House. He has received his reward. Someone who operated a secret political slush fund to advance the cause of the poker machine lobby in Queensland has been promoted to Cabinet.

Because of the secret donation and his close ties with the poker machine lobby, this Cabinet Minister has a clear conflict of interest on poker machine matters.

The matter goes further. At the time when the donations were being negotiated, the honourable member held discussions with the poker machine lobby on how to disguise the donations. Together they came up with the idea of laundering the money to the secret bank account by the issue of false invoices for advertising. The money came from Ainsworth Consolidated Industries to the Caspalp fund in three different instalments of \$10,000 each for advertising; but the advertising did not exist. The invoices were fabricated at the direction of the honourable member for Mackay. He was part of the fraud and he is now a member of the "honest" Goss Cabinet and sits in judgment on all poker machine matters.

Despite this fraud, the false invoices, the laundered money, the public lies and the secret bank account established without the knowledge or approval of the party organisation, the Premier has the effrontery to say that such behaviour does not impinge on his code of parliamentary conduct. So much for the code!

In recent days the matter has been taken further by the head of Ainsworth Consolidated Industries, Mr Len Ainsworth, who admitted during a television interview on the ABC that he was requested to make the donation. The Premier or Mr Casey has a clear responsibility to say who demanded the donation, particularly as it has also been revealed that Ainsworth Consolidated Industries is advertising for staff to man a new factory which it is building in Brisbane to manufacture gaming machines. How is it that that one company can take that risk with capital outlay when the Government is not supposed to have made any decision yet on which firm will supply poker machines to the Queensland market?

A donation of \$30,000 was made to Mr Casey's secret bank account and a factory is being built in Brisbane which will employ 200 people, all on the off-chance that there may be a contract in the future for the supply of poker machines. That is a great coincidence—perhaps.

To see the connection, we must look further back to some of the other activities of the honourable member for Mackay, in particular, a visit to the United States, where he noted a particular brand of poker machine in operation—not poker machines in general, but a particular brand. What sort of a machine was it? We have already heard the response this morning. Was it the Aristocrat machine which is manufactured by Ainsworth—the same brand name of the gaming machines now to be made in Queensland, even though tenders for poker machines have not been called?

**Mr R. J. Gibbs:** Your Government approved them.

**Mr COOPER:** I am talking about poker machines.

I ask now whether the Minister can deny the allegation. If he fails to act on these matters, the Premier will have failed his first test in the application of the code of conduct that he laid down for members of his Government. The member has lied. He has falsified documents. He has hidden secret donations in a political slush fund. He has laundered money and has allowed a lobby group to unduly influence his actions as a member of Parliament. If there really is any code of conduct, he should be sacked or stood down, and an open Fitzgerald-type of inquiry should be held into the past and ongoing financial connections between the Labor Party and the poker machine lobby. Unless those connections are exposed, poker machines in this State will become nothing more than mechanical collection agencies for ALP campaign funds.

I have just been handed some papers. As I said before, I firmly believe that the honourable member for Mackay has misled the House. This morning, I asked the Honourable the Minister whether he had, either as a member of Parliament or as a private individual, visited the United States of America on any occasion, and, if he had, whether he had made a point of inspecting or noting a particular brand of machine in operation. Mr Casey told the House that he had been to the United States, but his answer to the remainder of the question was, "No." As I said, I believe that he has misled the House.

I seek leave to table a copy of a letter dated 31 March 1981 from Mr Casey to Mr Ted Vibert of the Australian Club Development Association. In the letter Mr Casey indicates that, during his trip, he sought to make contact with representatives of poker machine companies in Los Angeles and that he had visited Las Vegas where he saw the Aristocrat machine featured prominently.

Leave granted.

*Whereupon the honourable member laid the document on the table.*

### Federal Election

**Mr McGRADY** (Mount Isa) (11.09 a.m.): Firstly, I pay tribute to the late Mr Bob Katter who represented the Federal seat of Kennedy which, as all honourable members know, takes in the city of Mount Isa. I record my sympathy to his widow and family and inform the House that, despite our political differences, we were certainly good friends for many years.

My main reason for speaking today is to express my concerns about what could occur next Saturday. The people of this country will have the opportunity to re-elect a Hawke Labor Government or return to the days of a Federal coalition Government. I am concerned about the effect that such a Government would have on the people living in the country and the remote parts of this nation.

Many years ago, the Country Party was seen as the friend of those people who lived in the bush and, despite people's political differences, we all realised that the main interest of that party was to secure a better deal for the people who lived outside the capital cities. Those days have long gone. Today, the National Party is losing members in droves. People who have been long-time members of the National Party are offering themselves as candidates for other parties. In particular, I mention Mr Fred Tritton, who was a lifelong member of the National Party and who, at the forthcoming Federal election will contest the seat of Kennedy on behalf of another party.

It would do us well to realise why this drift from the National Party is taking place. In the years that I have lived in Mount Isa I have seen the decline in the standard of living of people who live in such centres. People are leaving Cloncurry, Julia Creek, Richmond and Hughenden in droves. The reason for this is that they have been totally and utterly neglected by the National Party both in the State of Queensland and throughout Australia.

Certain questions have to be answered. My main concern today is that the promise by the coalition parties to reduce Government spending will have a detrimental effect on the people whom I represent and the people who live in electorates such as Kennedy. Last week, I had the privilege of entertaining in Mount Isa the Queensland Minister for Housing. In all the years that I have been involved in public life, it is the first time that a Queensland Minister for Housing has come to the city and, on the same day, solved some of the problems of the people who have no houses at all. It was the first time in 17 years that such a visit had been made. If the coalition parties have their way and make this massive cut in Government spending, there will be a further drift from the country to the cities because people simply will not be able to secure houses.

Another major concern that I have is that a reduction in Government spending by the coalition parties could have a dramatic effect on the education of the people in the bush and, in particular, result in a reduction in the number of teacher aides, who are so important.

I now come to a question which has been raised many times by members of the Opposition, and that is roads. Last week the Prime Minister came to Mount Isa and promised to spend \$24m on the road from Mount Isa to Camooweal. For the last 15 years the people have been crying out that something should be done about that road. Again I have no doubt at all that, if the coalition wins the election on Saturday, that money will disappear and the roads program in this State will go backwards. I can recall quite clearly that the previous administration took road funds from the outback and spent them on the Bruce Highway. And members of the Coalition talk about being interested in the welfare of the people who live in the remote parts of the State!

Another concern is that, if the coalition parties have their way, they will abolish Medicare, and again that will have a dramatic effect on people who live outside the capital cities.

I honestly believe that the people of Kennedy realise the effect that the coalition's policies will have on them and, for the first time in 24 years, a member of the Australian Labor Party will represent Kennedy in the House of Representatives.

For many years I have been fighting for an increase in zone allowances for people living in the outback. I am delighted that the Federal Government has now set up an inquiry into zone allowances. Once again my concern is that if the coalition takes over the Treasury benches in Canberra, that inquiry will be cancelled. I am also concerned that the Opposition's friends in Canberra will introduce a consumer tax. Such a tax will dramatically increase the cost of living of people who live outside the metropolitan area.

When the old Country Party was part of the Government in this State and of the coalition Government in Canberra, we at least knew that it had some feelings for people who lived outside the metropolitan area. Those days have gone. Today I take this opportunity to appeal to all people who live in the outback parts of this State to give serious consideration to the effect that a coalition Government in Canberra would have on their standard of living.

**Mr Stephan** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member for Gympie will cease interjecting.

**Mr McGRADY:** I came into this Parliament to make a contribution to the conduct of the affairs of this State. I did not come into this Chamber to sit down and witness this bunch of galahs squawking day after day. They do not realise that they are in Opposition. They were defeated at the State election when the people in the cities and the bush voted against them. They have lost their credibility and are not worthy to take a seat in this place. I have a loud voice and in the years ahead Opposition members will hear a lot more of it.

In conclusion, I appeal to the people in Kennedy to follow the lead set in the State election and vote solidly for a colleague of mine at the coming Federal election. This young man is energetic and will bring some fairness into the politics of the Kennedy electorate.

#### **Cooke Inquiry into Trade Unions**

**Mr BORBIDGE** (Surfers Paradise—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (11.19 a.m.): This Government has unmercifully and unashamedly conned the people of Queensland. Last December it won their trust on what is now proved beyond doubt to have been a fraudulent platform of accountability, honesty, integrity and reform. This Government is interested in none of those things. It is interested in continuing to pull the wool over the eyes of the people of Queensland by hiding corruption and deceit, protecting its mates by keeping them out of gaol and on the front bench, and continuing its massive deception and denying its hypocrisy.

Yesterday the Government moved to shut down the Cooke inquiry into union corruption because the blowtorch had reached the belly. This Government cannot stand the heat and does not have the character for Government. It does not have the commitment or the guts to do it tough and face the music. This Government is already a failure and a massive disappointment. Yesterday Government counsel at the inquiry, Mr Andrew Herbert, was almost on his feet to lead off the day's proceedings when a seven-page document was thrust into his hand. That document was a death sentence for the Cooke inquiry. It was a carefully chosen poisoned chalice. It was delivered because the inquiry was hot and was getting hotter for corrupt union officials and Labor Party identities. There is no other viable explanation for Mr Herbert's extraordinary performance at the inquiry yesterday. He delivered a submission that was prepared for him by the Government. I should emphasise that Mr Herbert had no say in it and I understand was visibly distressed at what he was forced to deliver. The message—the Government's intent—was made clear only in the final few paragraphs, which stated—

"On the basis of proceedings to date the Commission might like to consider, and express a view on, the question as to whether or not this Commission is the appropriate forum to deal, in the first instance, with matters which may give rise to criminal charges.

If the Commission comes to the view that another forum might be more appropriate to deal with such matters, the question arises as to whether or not it is likely that any further subject of possible law reform, other than those so far identified, is likely to be revealed by the examination of the affairs of other unions.

A continuation of the law reform component of the terms of reference in such circumstances may only result in a reiteration of the areas of concern which the Commission has already highlighted.

Given that there is now a body of experience in the conduct of the Inquiry, the Government is of the view that this is an appropriate time to assess the aptness of the terms of reference. The view of the Commission would be welcome."

That statement ended this extraordinary document, which I will table at the end of my speech.

It is a poisoned chalice if ever I saw one. The impact of the last few paragraphs is very clear: the Government does not want Mr Cooke to continue his work beyond the inquiry into the Federated Engine Drivers and Firemen's Association and the federated liquor trades employees union, the affairs of which have dominated the inquiry to date. The Government does not want the inquiry to examine the Federated Clerks Union and, most importantly, it is desperate that the inquiry does not get the opportunity to unravel the massive scandals that lurk in the administration of the Australian Workers Union, because there are concerns relating to millions of dollars and to identities who are far too close to the Premier for comfort, which await a public airing.

On the key point—the review of the terms of reference—there is no recourse for the inquiry. I can assure honourable members that, from bitter experience as to what passes for consultation from this Government, the professed welcome mat for views from the commission will be threadbare and pulled out from under it.

Let me examine in very brief detail the reasons why the Labor Party is so determined to ensure that the Cooke inquiry goes no deeper into the tawdry world of union labour than it has gone so far. Because the facts are indeed stark, it will not be necessary to go into too much detail.

Let me look at two identities in particular. The Minister for Tourism, Sport and Racing has been mentioned at the inquiry. His name was mentioned in a very unsavoury light and in relation to some very unsavoury characters—in fact, men who have been convicted in Queensland courts. This Minister sought a donation from the liquor trades union, which he got. He got it because Mr Colin Hardie—who was later convicted of electoral fraud—told a union meeting that he should get it. The very same Mr Hardie is the mate of Brian Elton, who was also convicted of electoral fraud in relation to the rigged 1986 liquor trades union election and who is a personal acquaintance of the Minister. On behalf of his mates, the Minister went public and lobbied for them prior to the election that they were convicted of rigging.

**Mr GIBBS:** I rise to a point of order. I shall not ask the member for a withdrawal at this stage because I am very eager to hear him prove to this House the very serious allegations he has just made.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! The member will state his point of order.

**Mr GIBBS:** My point of order is simply that I hope the honourable member will be gentleman enough, if he does not prove the allegation within the next minute, to have the decency to withdraw it.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! There is no point of order. The Minister will resume his seat.

**Mr BORBIDGE:** The Government knows that the Opposition is aware that the matter does not end there. Readers of the *Sunday Mail*—who were recently treated to the so-called rumour that Mr Gibbs was decidedly much closer to the action in that

1986 election than anyone might ever now know—also know that the Government has decided, in euphemistic terms, to "assess the aptness" of the terms of reference.

The other Labor Party identity to whom I wish to refer is Mr Ken Goodhew, who, although consistently and coyly referred to in one of this State's major media outlets as a "union official", was actually a vice-president of the Queensland branch of the ALP until he was suspended very recently. He has been accused at the Cooke inquiry and before a Federal court of running unaudited, secret, slush funds involving in excess of \$500,000 on which he allegedly drew at will. The sums included \$50,000, which was used to purchase a unit at the Gold Coast.

The bid by the ALP in the lead-up to the last State election to keep the Goodhew revelation under wraps during the election campaign last year was admitted by Goodhew himself, and he is on record as saying that other senior members of the ALP helped him. He has admitted to trying to bring matters before a Federal Court so that they might be suppressed at the inquiry. There is a very serious side issue to that matter because, while the Federal Court was dealing with the FEDFA matters late last year, the allegations against Goodhew surfaced in a Federal Court hearing before Mr Justice Pincus.

A tape-recording of evidence given before the Cooke inquiry, which implicated Goodhew in the running of massive slush funds, was played in open court. In the pre-election atmosphere, it was part of the continuing cover-up, aided and abetted by members of the ALP. The cover-up continued throughout the final days of the campaign and, on Goodhew's own admission, involved other senior ALP figures.

It is impossible to believe that the current Premier knew nothing of this cover-up. He says that he did not know. He also says he was aware of the problems confronting Goodhew but refused to see him. I do not believe that the Premier did not know of the cover-up.

Obviously, the campaign director, Mr Swan must have known, and it must have worried him deeply. Not long after the election, he told the ALP State Council that one slip during the campaign is all it would have taken to derail Labor's campaign. Mr Speaker, he must have been horrified at the potential for the Goodhew story to break before the poll. Does the Premier seriously expect Queenslanders to believe that the campaign director's deep concern was never aired with the him? It is preposterous to suggest he would not have raised the issue and discussed it with the Premier. An informant within the ALP told me that there was actually a meeting of the ALP campaign committee, attended by the Premier, at which the principal topic of conversation was how the Party would deal with Goodhew if the story hit the front-pages and the six o'clock news. I have been told that the result of that meeting was a decision to throw Goodhew to the wolves if the story got out. These are very serious issues. They deal with the abuse of the Federal Court and the possible contempt of that jurisdiction by the ALP in a bid to bury potentially electorally damaging material. That is a most serious matter which lends weight to the argument for the review of the terms of reference to lead to an expansion, and extension, of the Cooke inquiry's terms—not to their watering down to the point where there is no point in proceeding.

The Labor Party is running scared of this inquiry. It has a pretty good idea—in fact, a very good idea—of where the inquiry will lead, so it has got to stop it. Members of the Labor Party know that when Cooke gets to the AWU, he will open a can of worms that will make the issue of ministerial expenses look insignificant by comparison. They also know that the inquiry will get very close to Errol Hodder, who is another ALP vice president and the man who, in political terms, made the Premier. Mr Hodder is running scared and, I am reliably informed, has followed in the footsteps of Mr Goodhew by resigning the vice presidency of the ALP. He is the man who led the charge in assassinating Nev Warburton to make way for the young Turk. For many years he was deeply involved with a union that will be shown by the Cooke inquiry to have run slush funds that will make Goodhew and the FEDFA look like amateurs.

The Labor Party knows that this issue will reflect on the credibility of the Premier—the knight in shining armour of this Government. Members of the Labor Party know that the armour is rusting before their very eyes. When it is gone, what will they be left with? They will be vulnerable. They will be naked before the world. They will not be able to hide their indecisiveness, their bitterness and their instability.

Time expired.

### **Guide-lines for Allocation of Sporting Funds**

**Mr CAMPBELL** (Bundaberg) (11.30 a.m.): On Friday, 23 March, Queensland will chase one of its elusive dreams. On that day, Queensland's Sheffield Shield cricket team will chase the dream of winning the shield. I wish Greg Ritchie and the other boys in the team the best of luck and the best of form. I hope that the team is able to win the shield.

I mention this matter because several months ago Australians cheered Australia's sportsmen and sportswomen when they competed in the Commonwealth Games. It was with a feeling of great excitement that I watched those sportsmen and sportswomen do so well. It was with even greater pride that I saw the Queenslanders in the team perform particularly well.

Today I mention an athlete who participated in the games and also performed very well, namely, Simon Doyle. He was in the Commonwealth Games group that has been described as having made the greatest team effort of any representative team in Australia's sporting history. It is important that we acknowledge the work of all Australia's athletes, whether they won medals or not.

I raise this issue because a disturbing situation has arisen in which the Government has been left with undesirable guidelines to follow in the allocation of funds in the awarding of scholarships to Commonwealth Games participants. Under those guidelines, an anomaly occurred, but it has now been overcome by the Queensland Government. I give great credit to the Sports Minister and the Premier for the way in which they acted to ensure that people who were discriminated against under the old guidelines will now receive their just deserts.

**Mr FitzGerald:** Read the decisions of the previous Cabinet.

**Mr CAMPBELL:** I do not lay any blame at the feet of the National Party. I merely say that the anomalies that occurred would not have been foreseen when the guidelines were brought down. In effect, the Government has acted retrospectively. In this case, I agree with that action.

**Mr FitzGerald:** Go and read some Cabinet decisions that were made by the last Government.

**Mr CAMPBELL:** As the member for Lockyer has interjected, I will now deal with the anomaly that arose.

The National Party guidelines for the awarding of scholarships under the Encouragement to Sport Scheme state—

"The Queensland Sports Scholarship measure of assistance of the Government's Encouragement to Sport Scheme is designed to provide additional financial assistance to this State's high performance athletes who are members of the State Sporting Associations which participate in the sports of the Olympic Games and the Commonwealth Games."

The guidelines state further that they apply to athletes who participate in competitive sports at the Olympic and Commonwealth Games.

**Mr FitzGerald:** There were advertisements in the paper calling for applications.

**Mr CAMPBELL:** For the sake of the honourable member for Lockyer, I will read those guidelines. They state that, to be eligible for a scholarship, an athlete must be a participant in the amateur area of the sport concerned; be ranked nationally in the top five of the sport concerned, or already be selected to be part of the Australian team for the next applicable games; be a resident of and based in Queensland; be a competitor in the open category of the sport concerned; and not be a full scholarship-holder to the Australian Institute of Sport.

That is where the anomaly has occurred. Queenslanders have been discriminated against. Queenslanders who are full scholarship-holders at the Australian Institute of Sport are denied the Queensland sports scholarship. In many cases, those athletes have greater needs than those who do not attend the Australian Institute of Sport.

Simon Doyle comes from a battling farming family in Bundaberg. He is one of five children. The Doyle family went to much expense to ensure that Simon was trained and ready to compete to his fullest potential. For many years, that family has had to raise thousands of dollars. Last year, the family had to raise more than \$10,000.

Prior the Commonwealth Games, Simon Doyle was an athlete at the Australian Institute of Sport for only 14 weeks. He has worn the maroon T-shirt and represented Queensland well, yet he was going to be denied a Queensland sports scholarship. Several other Queensland athletes were in a similar position. I refer to Pat Carroll in athletics; Ken Meredith and Kylie Shadbolt in gymnastics; and Craig Rogerson, April Adams and Simon McCormack in diving. Those athletes won 10 medals between them, yet they were going to be denied the Queensland sports scholarship.

I congratulate the Government on the method that it adopted to overcome that anomaly. The people who will receive those scholarships really appreciate what is being done. When the princess of the pool, Hayley Lewis, was told that she would receive \$5,000, her parents were joyful. A newspaper article stated—

"The parents of Games gold medallist Hayley Lewis last night referred to the \$5000 grant as a 'godsend'—a relief after the financial battle to keep their youngest daughter in the pool.

Mr Greg Lewis said last year was particularly hard, based on the medical costs of a stress fracture to Hayley's left arm, on top of extra costs in the lead-up to the Auckland Games which totalled about \$10,000.

'We've had to make too many sacrifices,' he said.

'This is only a one-income family and I feel bad when our other children are suffering because of the financial strain.'

That was a response from Hayley Lewis' parents. The same response will come from the Doyle family.

The Premier acted responsibly and with compassion in this matter. Last Saturday, when he visited Bundaberg, he knew that I had arranged a meeting for him with Simon Doyle's mother, Mary Doyle, and the president of the Bundaberg Athletics Club, Eric Brown. Prior to the meeting with the Premier, they were very concerned. In a newspaper article, Mr Brown said about Simon Doyle—

"He is the athletic club's hero, the kids adore him, and he has always helped the club with coaching.

He has been a great ambassador for his sport, Bundaberg, Queensland and Australia . . ."  
Simon actually deferred his studies in agricultural science for six months to be able to compete in the Commonwealth Games.

All those costs have been borne by his struggling family. The family understood the position. Mrs Doyle said that they knew that it would be difficult but they could



not understand why the Labor Government was following guidelines put in place by the previous National Party Government.

When the Premier met Eric Brown and Mary Doyle, he said, "We'll treat everyone equally." He stated that an immediate review of the guidelines would take place to correct any anomalies. The Premier stated further—

"There has been a clear anomaly here and I have given an undertaking to review the guidelines

...

Doyle's case alone provides a clear case for a review."

Following that interview, Mrs Doyle said that she was happy with the discussions and was reasonably confident that her son would be awarded a grant. Mr Brown stated—

"I thought he was a reasonable man to talk to. He was honest in his approach to Simon's case. I am very confident about the outcome."

I share Mr Brown's comments about the Premier's being a reasonable man to talk to and about his honesty.

I appreciate the fact that the Premier understood the concerns and the problems that existed. Simon Doyle and the other Queensland athletes have done a great job in representing Australia. I acknowledge that when this anomaly was recognised, a compassionate approach was adopted towards overcoming it.

Justice has been done. Those athletes, who are true Queenslanders, will receive that \$5,000 grant. I am proud to be a part of the Goss Labor Government that has given that grant to those athletes.

#### **Australian Labor Party Policy on Employment and Industrial Relations**

**Mr HARPER** (Auburn) (11.38 am): On behalf of the people of Queensland, I will pose a number of questions to the parliamentary members of the Australia Labor Party, both State and Federal. I am pleased to see that, although there are only two Ministers in the Chamber, there is at least a fair representation of Government backbench members who might have the fortitude to raise the problems in the party room. In short, I ask: what is the employment and industrial relations policy of the Australian Labor Party for Queensland and for Australia?

The ALP is a party of contradictions. At the Federal level it purports to embrace productivity enhancement and the encouragement of entrepreneurial industrial relations. "Enterprise unionism" is perhaps the in phrase in Labor circles for the Labor lackeys. That is what the ALP talks about, but where does it stand? The ALP stands at different ends of the spectrum in the Federal and State Houses of Parliament.

At the State level we hear the trade union mouthpiece in this Chamber proclaiming that the Labor Government will destroy entrepreneurial industrial relations, and that it will abolish the right of individuals or of groups of individuals to enter into agreements between employer and employee and to have those agreements registered with and sanctioned by our industrial courts. In short, this Goss Labor Government will destroy the stable, productive and mutually remunerative working conditions enjoyed by such successful, productive Queensland enterprises as Power Brewing and Metway Bank. The Goss Labor Government is determined not to allow any more of these success stories to be written in Queensland. I ask: why?

**Mr Beattie** interjected.

**Mr HARPER:** And well might Mr Beattie interject. Perhaps he can tell Mr Goss why.

It is the union movement that is behind the whole thing. Let the people of Queensland hear why the Goss Labor Government does not want any more of these success stories in Queensland. There can be only one answer, as Mr Beattie well knows, and that is fear that some union officials, some union power brokers, will more quickly lose that

grip on the nation's economy which they see as essential to their socialistic goals of a single political party domination.

This Government is hell-bent on denying our work force the inherent rights of trade unionism, and it is those inherent rights in trade unionism that have done a lot for the work force in Australia. This Government is hell-bent on denying our work force those inherent rights to progress with changing times and circumstances. That is what the union movement has done over the decades. However, this Government does not want it to change. It will not acknowledge that times change and circumstances change. In achieving and maintaining an economy, it denies the right of employees and employers—the nation—a standard of living attainable only by more than matching our competitors in the field of productivity.

I mention here the Warburton/Dempsey edict to the public service called *Working Together For a Productive Future*. It states—

"Once an understanding is achieved in the workplace, a consultative process with employees and their union representatives will examine job design and methods of organising work to improve efficiency."

What a conundrum! What policy confusion!

Not a lot was said about the pilots dispute. It was mentioned in Western Australia. The trade union movement was upset about it. However, whatever one thinks of the pilots dispute and the damage that it caused—

**Mr Beattie:** We didn't think much of it.

**Mr HARPER:** Where did Mr Beattie and the trade union movement stand when Hawke used the defence forces to break an industrial dispute?

**Mr Beattie:** Only in the interests of the nation.

**Mr HARPER:** What a conundrum! What confusion there is in the Labor Party!

In the area of industrial relations, Labor is totally confused. What blatant disregard for the individual's rights! When I was the Minister for Land Management, I saw this jack boot trade union shop steward intervention surface in the Lands Department three days after the State election. Rule by little Hitlers was the aim, and this Labor Government endorses these Bolsheviks. Where does Labor stand on enterprise agreements, on voluntary employment agreements? That is the question. In the Federal sphere, Labor supports them. Because of union dictates, the Goss Labor Government does not know where it stands. The unions' mouthpiece in this place says that he will do away with them.

The ALP is a party of contradictions. In a truly Gestapo oriented version of Star Chamber tactics orchestrated by imported academics—everyone knows they have been imported from Canberra and hell, west and centre—we have witnessed a three-month, ongoing, purely political purge of the public service. Mind you, nary a word from the media which day after day before the State election blasted the transfer of an officer from one section of the Department of Primary Industries to another.

**Mr Ardill:** That was victimisation.

**Mr HARPER:** What does the honourable member call the victimisation that has been going on in his own party?

The destruction of 40, 50 or 100 careers for unashamedly political gratification—misguided gratification—attracts not a word of censure, no editorials, no sympathy from the political power brokers hiding behind the screen of the media. I will have more to say about that this afternoon.

The ultimate deceit is the claim that those career public servants who have had contracts of employment unilaterally and involuntarily terminated by the Government in fact resigned. Ever since the House resumed I have been trying to ask a question about that, but tacticians have precluded my asking that question in this Chamber.

The Attorney-General, who is the chief law officer of the Crown, has a unique role which, according to Mr Fitzgerald, QC, requires "independence and impartiality and freedom from party political influences". I ask the Attorney-General whether the stance taken by departmental chief executives who have contended, in memoranda to the Government's superannuation board, that permanent public servants whose contracts of employment were involuntarily terminated—that is, terminated unilaterally by the Government—resigned from the positions that they held under those contracts is consistent with the Attorney-General's advice or that of his advisers, particularly the Solicitor-General, the Crown Solicitor or senior counsel who may have been briefed in the matter. If not, on advice available from those sources, what is the Attorney-General's opinion as to the status of such former Crown employees? Will the Attorney-General table or provide a copy of any opinion that is available to him in that regard?

Does the Attorney-General acknowledge that such employees' positions became redundant when the Government advertised similar positions at different levels of classifications and required applicants to have qualifications that were not required of the incumbents of the previous positions? If not, on what advice does the Attorney-General form such contrary opinion and will he table or provide a copy of any opinion that may be available to him in that regard?

Does the Attorney-General agree that former Crown employees whose employment was involuntarily terminated by Government direction were legally and factually retrenched? If not, on what advice or opinion does he base that view? Will he provide or table a copy of any opinion that is available to him in that matter? If the Attorney-General truly fulfils his role as espoused by Mr Fitzgerald, QC, he will do all of those things.

Everybody must ask: how honest is the Goss Government? How honest is Labor in honouring its contractual obligations in dealing with employment and industrial relations and in making an attempt to fulfil its election promises? Actions speak louder than words in politics. How do the Goss Government's actions stand up to its holier-than-thou philosophy?

Time expired.

### **Suburban Crime**

**Mr HEATH** (Nundah) (11.49 a.m.): I wish to return to a subject that I mentioned during the debate on the amendment to the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply. This issue is of great concern to residents in the suburbs of Brisbane. I refer to crime in the suburbs, including break and enter offences, vandalism of property and theft of property. Residents are living in fear for their personal safety. They face monetary and emotional costs and wish for nothing more than to be able to enjoy a quiet, suburban life-style.

In some suburbs within my electorate of Nundah the problem of crime is out of control. I am sure that I can speak for other members who represent city and suburban electorates when I say that, for far too long, crime has been unchecked in many parts of Brisbane.

In a few minutes I will mention how this Government, in a little over three months in office, has put more effort into solving the problems both immediately and in the long term by planning to provide ultimately sustainable solutions than did the previous Government during the three years that residents in those electorates were calling for help.

During the day and at night gangs roam the streets of Wavell Heights. They spend their days casing houses for their night-time raids. Sometimes they do not steal very much—perhaps a little jewellery or a little cash. However, those articles often are irreplaceable because of the sentiment and memories that are embodied in such small, personal items. Many pensioners cannot afford to lose their weekly food money.

Some home-owners have spent nearly \$10,000 on security for their homes. More importantly, many more householders who cannot afford such security depend on the State for their protection. They depend on the police and on the court system.

While I am on the subject of security, I point out that some companies that are doing the rounds of those suburbs are trying to hard-sell their goods and services in the home-security field. They imply to residents that they are sent by or attached to the Neighbourhood Watch scheme or have the Government's approval or contract for the supply of security systems for the area. Firms such as Sentron Security, which are very close to breaking the law in their style of contracting residents, frequently are being referred to the Consumer Affairs Bureau by the residents who abhor that unprincipled approach.

In many cases of theft the property that is stolen is of substantial value. Because most of the offenders seem to be juveniles, the question must be asked: how can a schoolchild off-load video-players, stereos and the like? It is believed that in some cases adults organise the gangs and sell stolen goods through flea markets. I will be seeking to ensure the introduction of regulations that will have real bite in limiting such activities.

Those groups of children in their mid-teenage years are determined and repeating offenders. However, if they are confronted by local residents, the toughness that they think they have extends only to yelling abuse and threats while running away. That is followed by cowardly acts of late-night vandalism on the dwellings or cars of residents. There is no bravery in that sort of action, nor was there any courage in a National Party Government that posed as a Government of law and order. The National Party's commitment to law and order in relation to these issues was as nebulous as its commitment to the Westminster style of Government.

Queensland suffered the worst police-to-per-capita ratio in the country. The only real starting point from which the problems will be eased is the employment of more police and the placement of more officers in suburban police stations. This Government has already begun that process. As well, it will follow the recommendations that are contained in the Fitzgerald report and will revamp the entire system and syllabus under which police officers are trained. We will place an additional 1 200 police into the force. Already, patrols from the local stations have been increased, and the numbers of central mobile patrols through the suburban areas, such as Wavell Heights, where the problems are greatest, have also been increased.

With my colleague Rod Welford, I organised a huge meeting at Wavell Heights at which two Government Ministers, police, community organisations and hundreds of residents talked to each other, and listened to each other. From that central point we took the needs of the residents into the organisational and policy-making areas of the Government. At last, these householders can feel that their concerns are being addressed.

Because of the success of that public meeting, I understand that similar gatherings are being held in other areas of Brisbane. Residents all over the city can now realise that they do not have to battle this suburban disease alone; as a community they can fight it through Neighbourhood Watch. As the changes in the police force take effect, residents will get more police support and they will be listened to by the Government.

I point out that I am in no way being critical of the police or the tremendous effort put in by them over the years. There have simply been too few police available to deal adequately with the problem. The demands of working from suburban police stations with only 50 per cent of the recommended staff have overloaded officers. Their dedication, of course, is unquestioned.

In the longer term, there is a need to alter the sentencing options for dedicated and determined repeat offenders. Simply by looking at the numbers of offences committed each night, the Nundah police can tell to the day when a particular youngster has been released from Westbrook. When this bloke is released, the number of offences leaps. He immediately starts building up his spending money at the expense of law-abiding citizens.

He has been in and out of Westbrook several times on both burglary and assault charges. Home-owners are wondering how many times this same process will occur. The police, of course, are also wondering how many times they have to go through the same difficult task of apprehending and charging the same person for the same type of offence and watch him receive the same type of sentence.

Now, perhaps for this guy the situation is hopeless, but the police and the residents believe that many or most young offenders can be steered away from the type of peer pressure situation which leads to these continual offences if they are served with a tough community service order after about their third offence and not after the fifth, sixth or eighth, or whenever it might happen now, because that is five, six or eight times that citizens suffer financial or personal loss or emotional distress.

A Green Paper on corrective services and sentencing issues is about to be released. Again, this Government is giving individuals a chance to have their input into the changes we will make. This is one of the opportunities we are providing for a long-term lessening of the difficulties being experienced. And believe me, there will be plenty of input from Wavell Heights and from many, many suburbs in which the problem is a major one and where the residents' anger is at a critical point. They have not reached that critical point because of anything that has happened during the last three months; it has been building up over years of neglect and inaction by the former National Party Government, which had no policies to care for city dwellers, and which was rightly voted out of Brisbane and near-Brisbane electorates on 2 December last year by just such disillusioned voters as the residents affected by this crime problem. The National Party does not hold one seat in Brisbane. I am certain that the message from the voters will be rammed home to the Nationals again this coming Saturday.

I am aware of a recent occurrence in Wavell Heights during which several teenagers, who are well known by locals as being involved in the area's crime problem, were assaulted by local residents using a baseball bat and that as a result at least one of the teenagers was hospitalised. This type of ugly street warfare must not be permitted to become prevalent in Brisbane, and I appeal to the residents to hang on. I know, and this Government knows, that the citizens have had enough. But I assure these people that we are working with real speed and with real concern to bring these problems under control. I urge residents not to take the law into their own hands. The police perform a magnificent job and must be kept fully informed at all times of what and where these specific crimes are committed and of what the concerns and even the suspicions of the residents are.

In conclusion, I point out that the broad commitment to social justice embodied by this Government and by every member of this Government includes a commitment to a quality of life able to be enjoyed in safety and in peace. The changes that are necessary to ensure such a life-style are already being made.

#### **Road-funding**

**Mr RANDELL** (Mirani) (11.58 a.m.): This morning we heard the member for Mount Isa speak about the state of roads in Queensland. He said that because he has a booming voice he is entitled to be heard. Let me just say that a booming voice is also indicative of an empty space in the head. As a member of this House, he has a lot to learn.

I bring to his attention some of the comments made by Councillor Pennell, Chairman of the Local Government Association. He said that the Federal Treasury was "copping \$7 billion a year in petrol and fuel taxes but giving only \$1.23 billion back for roads". That is the sort of thing that the honourable member should be talking about: the scandalous deal that Queensland is getting from Canberra. I have not heard one member opposite utter one word in defence of the state of Queensland's roads.

**Mr Beattie:** What have you got at Coppabella?

**Mr RANDELL:** The honourable member does not even get out of Brisbane. He would not know. He came up there once.

Councillor Pennell has put the responsibility for road-funding fairly and squarely on Canberra, which is where it should be.

In 1980-81, the Federal Government provided \$523m for national highways in this State. In 1989-90, that funding fell to \$490m. In 10 years, funding has decreased by \$40m when it should have increased.

In 1980-81, the Federal Government provided \$279m for local roads. In 1989-90, it provided \$276m, a reduction of \$3m. If the member for Mount Isa wants to take on members on this side of the House and call us galahs, he had better look at his facts. An empty head makes the most noise.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! Under the provisions of Standing Order 36A and the Sessional Order, the time allowed for the debate on Matters of Public Interest has now expired.

At 12 noon,

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

### ADDRESS IN REPLY

#### Fifth Allotted Day

Debate resumed from 8 March (see p.353) on Mr McGrady's motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply, to which Mr Cooper had moved an amendment.

**Mr ELDER:** (Manly) (12 noon): I commence my initial speech by congratulating you, Mr Speaker, on your election to that high office. It gives me great pleasure to say that our friendship goes back a long way. You are a man widely known for your warmth, sincerity and compassion. You are a man of dignity with an essential sense of fair play. I have no doubt you will bring all these qualities to your new position and this Parliament will be a richer place for your election.

I stand here today, one of 29 new Labor members, elected in the overwhelming mandate the Queensland people gave last December to elect the first Queensland Labor Government in over three decades. It is with a feeling of great humility that I seek to represent not only the electors of Manly but also the aims and aspirations of the many thousands of working men and women who, by their support of the Australian Labor Party throughout its 32 years in Opposition, fought for economic justice and social equality.

I should now like to speak about my electorate, the State seat of Manly. It was created in the redistribution of 1985, when the growth areas of the old Redlands seat, Alexandra Hills, Capalaba, Birkdale and Thorneside, were added to the thin coastal strip of Manly and Lota, which came from the abolished seat of Wynnum.

It is an electorate dominated by young families. It is an electorate typical of the outer metropolitan areas, where previous National Party Governments allowed the development of vast new suburbs, yet failed to provide the basic support services. I shall list some of those areas of neglect. The education system in Queensland is a classic example of the head-in-the-sand philosophy of the previous administration. In a State rich in natural resources, we have sacrificed and sold out our most valuable resource—our children.

The State school system is overburdened and underfunded. The older schools in my area are in urgent need of upgrading, and those in the newer suburbs are overcrowded and underequipped. While education was becoming increasingly more specialised and complex, the education system in Queensland was becoming more ramshackle and decrepit. Teachers were having to cope with composite classes, overcrowding and lack

of preparation time. The funds raised by parents and citizens organisations were being used for basic maintenance and every year the universities were turning away increasing numbers.

Since 1976, the proportion of the State Budget spent on education has fallen to an appalling 19.3 per cent—that is less than any other State in Australia. It is a scandalous affair. This in turn has meant our children have been disadvantaged because they have lacked the basic skills to compete for jobs in the work force. This in no way implies any criticism of teachers and parents. Indeed, they have done a magnificent job in the most difficult of conditions, and I take this opportunity of congratulating them for their efforts.

The Goss Labor Government has already approved additional expenditure in the 1989-1990 Budget to provide for 200 additional teacher positions and a further 1 500 tertiary places. On this base we will continue to build and, by doing so, determine a brighter future for the children of Queensland.

It would be remiss of me, however, if I did not mention one shining initiative by the previous Government in the field of education. I refer to the Redland senior college, which I am fortunate enough to have situated in my electorate. The Redlands senior college was one of three senior colleges opened in Queensland when senior secondary and modified TAFE pre-vocational courses were combined in one setting. It commenced operations in 1987 on a trial basis offering a full range of full-time Year 11 and 12 courses, a range of advanced certificate and associate diploma courses, and continuing education for mature-age students seeking to gain employment, return to the work force, or for their own personal enrichment.

It was an innovative and an imaginative program that allowed students to select a package of subjects best suited to meet their future employment needs and at the same time develop into independent decision-makers. The community responded overwhelmingly. In 1990 more than 1 300 full-time students are enrolled in Years 11 and 12, adult tertiary preparation and associate diploma courses. In addition to this, there are adult enrichment and adult literacy courses and a range of short-time courses and traineeships. The college has a complement of 110 full-time teachers and 40 support staff.

Regrettably, as with most of the previous National Party Government's innovations, it has not received the continuing support that it deserves. In 1987, the college had an approved capital works program of \$3.7m. However, in December of that same year, this money was reallocated to Government priorities in country areas. It is strange how many of the previous Government's priorities lay in country areas, isn't it?

The principal, Mr David Warner, his staff and the community council have developed a senior college that responds to the needs of the whole community. Its success can be measured by the fact that already the facilities are hopelessly inadequate for its expanding program. It would be a great tragedy if what was started as a creative and innovative new approach to senior education was to falter through lack of funds. It is an area in which I intend to take a close and continuing interest.

Probably no Government department has come under greater criticism in recent times than the Queensland police force. The Fitzgerald inquiry has proved conclusively that this criticism has in fact been justified. I think it is fair to say that at the present time morale throughout the force is at its lowest ebb. But this lack of morale is not only due to the allegations made against members of the Licensing Squad; it is due also in no small part to the policy of the previous National Party Government of allowing police numbers in Queensland to fall far below the national average. My own area is a classic example.

Not only does Queensland have by far the worst State ratio of any State in Australia with one officer for every 527 head of population, but the Wynnum police area, which services my electorate, has over twice the State ratio—that is, one officer for every 1 170 head of population. In the financial year to 1989, the statistics for the Wynnum area were: uniformed police, 81; detectives, 24; and public servants, 9. That is a grand total of 105 officers to serve 122 870 people. If

we were to apply the same ratio to the Wynnum district that applies in South Australia, which has a Labor Government—one of Australia's best examples—we would need to employ immediately an additional 300 police in the Wynnum police district alone.

Another classic example of National Party ineptitude is the Manly Water Police, which services the southern region of Moreton Bay. Recently, while following up a constituent's complaint, I was amazed to learn that the Manly Water Police has only one boat and that when it is in dry dock the officers are obliged to hire a commercial water taxi to follow up complaints on bay islands. That is a ludicrous state of affairs. Imagine a hypothetical situation of an act of piracy out in Moreton Bay and an urgent call for help is made to the Manly Water Police. Unfortunately it is catch-22; the boat is in dry dock. What happens? Does someone have to start ringing around getting urgent quotes to charter a water taxi or do the police send out an advance guard of the fastest swimmers to apprehend the offenders? In those circumstances I would imagine one's chances of being made to walk the plank would be reasonably high.

The point I am trying to make is that it is a basic right of our community to expect the police to provide protection for ourselves, our families and our property. In turn the police have the right to expect that we, the Government, will provide them with the equipment and police numbers to do the job.

I have every confidence that, with the complete restructure of the force by this Goss Labor Government, we will restore independence, integrity and efficiency back into the Queensland police force.

I now move to hospitals. Free hospitals were first introduced in Queensland by the Hanlon Labor Government in the late 1940s. The principle behind their introduction was that hospitalisation was the right of all, not just of those who could afford it, and that all Queenslanders were entitled to quality medical care.

Sadly, the principles behind the Hanlon Government's vision has been devalued by successive National Party Governments. In fact, they have been reduced to a traditional National Party electioneering stunt. If a seat looks vulnerable around election-time, promise a hospital. Do not promise to provide any facilities such as casualty, maternity or outpatients; do not promise any staff; just promise a hospital. Right across Queensland, we have a sad trail of empty beds in empty buildings, while the waiting list for non-urgent operations in public hospitals is now listed in years.

A typical example of the National Party hospital policy is situated in my own electorate of Manly. A 40-bed hospital was first promised by the National Party in Government in 1977. It was a typically desperate attempt to hold onto the seat of Wynnum. Sadly, it turned out to be a futile attempt, but the people of Wynnum did not forget and kept reminding the Government of its election promise.

The hospital was finally constructed in 1981 and began accepting inpatients in January 1981. Since that time, the average daily occupancy rate has been less than 50 per cent of the bed capacity. The hospital has no casualty or outpatient facilities. Its role has been reduced to that of a convalescent home for elderly patients. It is little wonder that the lack of facilities at the Wynnum Hospital has been the subject of numerous complaints from both local residents and parliamentarians, who are outraged by this criminal waste of resources in an area in chronic need of hospital facilities.

I commend Betty Bates, Director of Nursing, and her staff and Mrs Pat Riches and the members of the Wynnum Hospital Auxiliary for the sterling work that they have done over the past few years in this area, and I trust that, under the new proposals listed for the Wynnum Hospital, in the near future they will have a far more fulfilling role to fill.

The emergency fire and ambulance services, like many other State Government services, have been allowed to become antiquated and are no longer responsive to present-day needs. The City Ambulance Transport Brigade formed in 1892 was the first formal ambulance service in Australia. In other words, Queensland led the way. One hundred years later, this is yet another area in which we have been overtaken by every



other State in Australia. The present system of 97 autonomous ambulance committees has led to an inefficient and ineffective system. The resources need to be made available on a basis of need and not determined by the fund-raising talents of officers or benefit committees. The Goss Labor Government intends to set up a committee of review to report and make recommendations on all aspects of ambulance services in Queensland and I look forward with relish to that review.

Similar conditions apply in the Queensland fire service. The system of 81 autonomous boards and 1 400 rural fire brigades has led to a situation in which major parts of the State have little fire service and some areas have none at all. There is little coordination of resources or conformity of standards throughout the State. Although the State's population has been increasing, the State Government funding of the fire service has, in real terms, been decreasing. In an outer metropolitan electorate such as Manly, where we have newly established suburbs backing onto large areas of virgin bushland, a modern, efficient fire service is a vital necessity. Fortunately, the Goss Labor Government, with its reforms, will ensure that Queenslanders receive the fire protection they deserve.

My wife Carol and I came to live in the electorate of Manly some 15 years ago. Like many other young couples, we were prepared to forgo the convenience of inner-city living because we were looking for a quality life-style for our children. The electorate of Manly, situated on the bayside, offered us just that. The suburbs of Alexandra Hills and Capalaba are among the fastest growth areas of the State. As a young community, we have worked hard to develop amenities and foster a community spirit. We have been very successful and I am proud of how the area as a whole has developed.

What we cannot and are no longer prepared to accept is the lack of essential services. Schools, hospitals and fire and ambulance services are not luxuries; they are basic rights. We all acknowledge that Queensland is a vast, decentralised State. But the fact remains that, under the previous Government, it was the people in the outer metropolitan areas of Brisbane and the provincial cities who were the forgotten Queenslanders. It is these people who, under a Goss Labor Government, will finally get their just share.

I believe it is appropriate that I should now mention areas in which I have a particular interest. As we enter the 1990s, Queensland faces an important challenge, that is, to diversify our economic base. As a State rich in natural resources, we have a heavy dependence on the agricultural and mining industries, with coal and cattle being our biggest exports. However, the continuing fluctuations of the world commodities market have demonstrated quite clearly the urgent need to develop further industries, particularly in areas in which we have a natural advantage.

A classic example, of course, is the tourism industry. While the Queensland tourism industry has been expanding at double the national rate, there is clearly room for even further expansion, particularly in the domestic market. At present, it is cheaper for a family to holiday in Fiji or Malaysia than to have a comparable holiday in Australia. The deregulation of the airline industry in November this year will do much to alleviate this problem and create further opportunities.

I see a need to create more resort-style accommodation price-targeted towards the working man and his family for their annual holiday. Let me make it quite clear that I am not talking about lavish resorts funded by overseas capital with most of the profits repatriated overseas and at which the average Australian cannot afford to stay even overnight, I am talking about family-style resorts so that Australians from other States can come to Queensland and enjoy the benefits of our superb climate and diverse natural attractions, which would all be to Queensland's economic benefit.

I would like to make reference to another area in which I have a keen interest, that of occupational health and safety. Prior to my election to Parliament, I was employed as the Queensland manager of Instant Scaffolds, a major aluminium scaffolding and access equipment supplier to the construction industry. Throughout the 18 years that I was employed in the building industry, my overriding concern was work safety and safe work practices.

Until July 1989, the Division of Occupational Safety was the body responsible for the enforcement of the Construction Safety Act. Up to that time, the National Party paid lip-service to that Act by circulating glossy brochures at regular intervals but, in real terms, allowing the number of inspectors in the department to decrease by more than 50 per cent. The introduction of the new Workplace Health and Safety Act with all its fanfare was hastened more as a counter to the serious accidents in Queen Street and the Expo site than to address seriously all the needs of the industry. While the Act has many laudable sections, many anomalies remain. It is of the utmost importance that there are further consultations between Government, business and the unions as more refinements are needed.

I now turn to a subject very dear to my heart. My interest in Rugby League is, of course, well documented. Over the past 14 years I have had a close association with Souths Rugby League Club and, more recently, with the Broncos. A commonly used cliché around the new Parliament is that there are two distinct groups in this place: those who are Souths supporters and those who wish they were. As a life member of Souths, I can assure those who wish they were that the president, Tony Testa, will be happy to provide membership. As team manager of the Brisbane Broncos I wish to extend the Premier's commitment that under a Labor Government Queensland will win the Sheffield Shield, by promising that under a Labor Government the Broncos will win the New South Wales premiership.

While there may not be many Langers or Lewises around Parliament House, I am of the opinion that this Parliament could make up a fairly formidable coalition team of golden oldies; perhaps a combination of old age and experience. Among our more well-known players in the House are the members for Sandgate, Southport, Wolston, Fassifern, Mackay, Gregory, Bundaberg, Bulimba and Cairns. I do not think I have missed any. Most of them have played representative football for their country, State or region.

**Mr McElligott** interjected.

**Mr ELDER:** Maybe one or two!

Then we have a few lesser lights. The member for Peak Downs is a great potential fullback, more due to his natural talent for running backwards than anything else. There is the member for Moggill, whose association with Souths draws a longbow, but as half-back of the Graceville State School he has a latent, though undeveloped, potential. There is the member for Albert, who has already demonstrated his ability for cutting down the bigger opposition, and I will be watching his development closely. Last, but not least, there is you, Mr Speaker, who as a seasoned hooker will have little difficulty hanging between the two major packs in this place.

In a more serious vein, I am pleased to say that in future years sport will be considerably better funded than it has been in the past. The introduction of poker machines into sporting clubs will mean much of the revenue collected from these machines will be poured back into the development of sport in this State. In fact, on projected figures, funding to sport will rise from \$6.2m in the last financial year to a massive \$35m a year by 1992. The establishment of a women's sports unit is another welcome initiative. This unit will not only promote and encourage improvements within coaching and training schemes in women's sport, but also promote and facilitate the coverage of women's sport in the media and advise on the allocation of Government funding. It is long overdue. As a father of three daughters, I commend the Minister for Sport on his initiative. For far too long women's sport has been treated like a poor relation. My own particular interest will centre on two other areas of sport that were likewise ignored by previous National Party Governments: children's sport and sport for the disabled.

Mr Speaker, The Australian Labor Party, despite the richness of its traditions, has always been reformist in its philosophy and policies. I was reminded of one of its great reformers and the vagaries of fate at the recent opening of State Parliament. In 1974, as the senior team administrator of Souths Rugby League Club, I was acting as master

of ceremonies at the club trophy presentation day. Outside a very important function was being held in support of a young Greek candidate trying to gain election to the Queensland Parliament, where the guest of honour was the then Prime Minister of Australia. The heavens opened that day and, when I was approached by the somewhat bedraggled, drenched candidate—who I might say on that particular night, might have looked better for the addition of a dead sheep on his head—I had no hesitation in inviting him and his important guests into the club to share in the presentation. It was a truly wonderful evening. The guest of honour was in magnificent form and his every comment was greeted with great fervour. Had I been able to look into the future that night I would have found it difficult to believe that, 16 years later, I would be sitting at the official opening of Parliament as a newly elected MLA, that in the Speaker's chair would be that same bedraggled candidate, and that through the door would walk our guest of honour from that evening, Mr Gough Whitlam, to the same enthusiastic and spontaneous applause as he had received 16 years previously.

The State of Queensland is of particular historical significance to the Australian Labor Party. In this State is the tree of knowledge at Barcaldine, the spiritual home of the party, and it was in this State that the first ever Labor Government was elected, that of Anderson Dawson in 1899. As a Government it lasted only six days, but I can assure members on the Opposition benches that the Goss Labor Government will last considerably longer. Four years later, in 1903, we saw the election of another unique Government, the only Labor/Liberal coalition ever elected in this State. It could at least be said of the Labor Party that it learnt its lesson about Liberal coalition partners some 90 years ago. However, this coalition did achieve one notable distinction: it passed the Adult Franchise Act, which gave Queensland women the right to vote for the first time. By its election of Anne Warner as the first woman Labor Minister in a Queensland Government and its appointment of Ruth Matchett as the first female head of a department in the Queensland public service, the Goss Labor Government has already demonstrated its determination to ensure that women will no longer be discriminated against in the Queensland work force.

In 1890 the provincial council of the Australian Labor Federation drew up the platform for the Labor Party. It promised—

"In one year a peoples Parliament will give Queensland workers more justice than can be wrung from capitalistic Parliaments in a generation".

One hundred years later, things have not changed. The Bjelke-Petersen Government waged a bitter, intense war against the trade union movement, passing some of the most draconian legislation ever enacted in Queensland Parliament. I am pleased to say that the former Premier and his National Party Government are now but memories growing dimmer, while the trade union movement has survived and endured, as indeed it always will.

As an employer, I found in my business that establishing a good industrial relations policy played a large part in running an efficient, cost-effective and profitable business. It is a simple equation: employers seek to do their best by their companies and trade unions seek to do their best by their members. By working together through a process of consultation and conciliation, as opposed to confrontation, both are best able to achieve their ends. It is appropriate and fitting that, as the centenary of the oldest political party in Australia approaches, in this State, where much of the party's history was created, we once again have a Labor Government.

I should now like to place on record my personal thanks to Mr Con Sciacca, the Federal member for Bowman, for his advice over the years—always, I might add, freely given—but perhaps most importantly for demonstrating by example the importance of being an active member, always prepared to fight for the rights of his constituents. I have no doubt these qualities will stand him in good stead on 24 March.

I also thank the Australian Workers Union, the Shop Distributive and Allied Employees Association and, of course, my own union, the Australian Building Construction Employees and Builders Labourers Federation of Queensland for their support and

encouragement of which I am deeply appreciative. I do not intend to forget either my commitment to the trade union movement or the principles that led to the election of the first Labor members of Parliament.

I extend special thanks to the Manly branch members for their support and hard work throughout my campaign, and for their continuing encouragement and friendship since then. I mention in particular my own branch, Alexandra Hills/Capalaba. It is with some pride I say that not only is it the largest ALP branch in Queensland but that also numbered among its members are a member of the House of Representatives, a Queensland Senator, the State secretary of the Plumbers and Gasfitters Employees Union of Australia, the assistant State secretary of the Amalgamated Metal Workers Union and the first woman ever elected general returning officer of the Queensland Labor Party. I trust that, by my election to this place, I will add to the lustre of my branch.

It is fitting that I should now acknowledge the debt I owe to my family, in particular my mother, Mrs Else Elder. As the eldest of eight children who have grown up in a single-parent family in Inala, my background—although somewhat lacking in material possessions—was rich in warmth and companionship. My mother instilled in us all the belief that to be a member of the Elder family was to be a member of a team. I was always able to rely on that team support—from her and the rest of my family—in any endeavour I undertook. I should like to express my thanks to them now for the support and loyalty they have given so generously over the years.

To my wife, Carol, for her love, support and patience over the years I now offer my thanks. For her sense of humour, her reasoned advice and her ability to share in all things, I am deeply grateful. I thank also our three daughters Jemma, Yvette and Alexandra for the sacrifice that they have made of a normal family life to enable me to enter the political arena. I can only offer as an excuse the following quote from Aristotle: "Man is by nature a political animal".

I wish to acknowledge the presence in the public gallery today of my family and friends. I thank my 11-year-old daughter, Jemma, for her reserved confidence in me. She is currently undertaking a school project on disasters. When she heard I was "doing my maiden" today, she quipped, "I hope it goes better than the Titanic's."

Last, but not least, I should like to pay tribute to the rank-and-file members of the Australian Labor Party in Queensland who, throughout 32 years in opposition, never lost faith and never once gave up the fight. My colleagues and I salute them. Without their constant support and efforts on our behalf, no new Labor members would be in Parliament today.

In conclusion I shall cite the final speech of that great Australian, that Labor Prime Minister Ben Chifley, who said—

"The Labor movement was created by the pioneers—and its objective preached by the disciples of the movement over the years has been—to make the decisions that are best for all the people".

This Government will make the decisions that are best for all the people. This Government will make the decisions that are fair to all the people. The people of Queensland have placed their trust in the Goss Labor Government's proposals to make this State a better and a fairer place for all Queenslanders to live. My colleagues and I are united in our determination not to let them down.

**Mr INNES** (Sherwood—Leader of the Liberal Party) (12.26 p.m.): In rising to speak to the amendment to the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply, I would first of all like to record the loyalty of the people of Sherwood to the Crown and to the institution of Government. A change of Government is a historic occasion and it is appropriate that I should briefly state the implications of that change and refer to the course to be followed in the future.

For the first time in three decades, Queensland has a Labor Government. Two years of Fitzgerald inquiry headlines and revelations led the people to demand change.

They wanted change, and they got change.

However, three decades of Government preceding this change had converted this State from a cinderella State into a State of dynamic economic expansion, dynamic population growth and a State regarded widely, both inside and outside Australia, as the most dynamic State of all those in Australia. Changes based upon a single aspect of Government are dangerous and, through deficiencies in key areas, can lead to a fragility that can jeopardise the whole fabric of government.

In the rush for votes, the Liberal Party was trampled. Members of the Liberal Party accept that part of the technique of campaigning was successful and that part of that technique utilised by our opponents was not able to be counteracted. The line that was consistently and constantly repeated was that it was mathematically impossible for the Liberal Party to win Government, and that line was effective. Without question, the line that a vote for the Liberal Party was a vote for the National Party undoubtedly bit. It was a successful political tactic, causing the Liberal Party a loss of votes that, on past record, it would have normally expected to win.

Members of the Liberal Party do not deny that the election results were a disappointment; however, the Liberal Party can look to some aspects of the results with some optimism. I am not seeking to convert a loss to a win, I am simply looking at relevant factors with objectivity and hard-headedness.

A line that the Liberal Party proved incorrect was the line that the Liberal Party could win seats in Brisbane only. The Liberal Party won half the number of seats on the Gold Coast and it failed to win all the Gold Coast seats by a total of less than 300 votes. The Liberal Party won the Sunshine Coast seat of Nicklin. It lost the adjoining Cooroora seat by approximately 100 votes and it failed to win a couple of seats in Toowoomba by less than 200 votes. All these factors are indicative of the fact that the Liberal Party broke out of its traditional Brisbane base.

South-east Queensland is the most densely populated area in the State and contains the largest number of electorates. In that area, the Liberal Party is the dominant private-enterprise political party. The Liberal Party has beaten one bogey, that is, that in recent times it was confined to Brisbane and lost other seats in Brisbane by very narrow margins.

The Liberal Party regrets enormously the loss of fine sitting members of Parliament who had served their electorates impeccably. It regrets the inability to get elected other fine candidates. For all the new members of Parliament who proudly and rightly take their places in the new Parliament of Queensland, the lesson of 1989 is an object lesson in the fragility of the calling that they have chosen to enter. In fact, rumour has it that a number of members were astonished by the results of the election and had not prepared themselves for a life that they never expected to enter. However, they are here, and now they have to take part. They must build their futures with an understanding that this is a calling that has some significant pitfalls and some reversals that will not necessarily be of their own making.

In 1957, the Liberal Party, together with the Country Party, came to power promising to abolish the Hanlon-created gerrymander, that is, Queensland's zonal gerrymander. At that time, the words used were that the system was iniquitous, insidious, immoral, corrupt and designed to keep the minority in control of the majority. In addition, it was claimed that the system reinforced the excesses of Government that were in abundance in the Labor Government approaching 1957.

As I told the Young Liberal conference earlier this year, the deficiency of the Liberal Party was that it did not demand the implementation of that pre-election promise for a reform of the zonal gerrymander. Thereafter, the zonal gerrymander suited the Country Party which, with far less popular support than the Liberal Party, gained the majority of seats and thereby gained the benefit of the gerrymander. It was undoubtedly that lopsided balance of power that led to friction between the Liberal Party and what became the National Party and led to the breakdown of the coalition in 1983. Undoubtedly, that breakdown and the lack of the influence of the Liberal Party in controlling the sorts of areas that became of concern in the Fitzgerald inquiry—parliamentary reform,

administrative reform, the old-fashioned call-backs to accountability and to the traditions of Westminster—led to the more intense problems of the 1980s that were revealed in the Fitzgerald inquiry.

The gerrymander has been a particular bugbear for the Liberal Party. Part of the optimism for the future, justifiably, is built not only on the fact that the Liberal Party recorded virtually the same vote as the other private-enterprise party, that it became the dominant private-enterprise party of south-east Queensland—with 51 seats, it is numerically the biggest of the zones, and will be bigger upon any redistribution—but also on the fact that a redistribution will take place. The Liberal Party will support the reform that will involve the abolition of the zonal gerrymander. It will use the beachheads that it established during the 1989 election to take advantage of redistribution and to impose its rightful stamp on the Parliament when for the first time its numbers reflect the actual voting and support. In the 1989 election, having recorded 21 per cent of the vote, the Liberal Party won only nine seats. If Liberal candidates had stood in all seats, a transposition of the comparable vote into the seats in which they did not stand would reveal that the Liberal Party would have received approximately the same vote as the National Party. What is more, the Labor Party vote would have slipped to a little below 50 per cent.

At present, the Liberal Party, having received 21 per cent of the vote, has nine seats, which is one less than for the majority of the past three years. The National Party, having received a little over 23 per cent of the vote, has 26 seats. Those are the balances and the margins that the commentators and the members of this Parliament should bear in mind over the next few years.

I turn now to the media. It is important that the media thinks about its importance and role as the fourth estate in the whole operations of democracy. With the advent of the electronic media, we have developed a tendency to decrease the time for the debate, discussion and examination of any issue. It is human tendency to assume that there are two sides to any story. Balance involves obtaining another view, and another view which is opposite. That does not relate to a three-party system, whether it be the Queensland Parliament or whether it be the unusual role that is taking place on the Federal scene where the Australian Democrats appear to be gaining and harbouring far more votes than that party has been used to. It is part of the operations of democracy that three-party systems occur. It is part of the obligations on the media, particularly the parliamentary press gallery, to understand that under our system three-party situations can occur and that they should be recognised, and that balance is not obtained by going merely to the official Opposition. Balance is obtained by looking to the diversity of viewpoints that may be found.

Because of the geography of Queensland, any professional political commentator would know of the consequence of the provincial media situation. Many provincial cities have a daily newspaper, a local radio station, a local ABC outlet and sometimes a television station. That scenario, together with provincialism, leads to a captive audience for whoever happens to be the incumbent in town. If there is a local political member or two, they have a virtual monopoly because they are there on the spot and they report the local political situation.

In the south-east corner, media distribution is far more diffuse and diverse. Irrespective of party, suburban Brisbane members often find themselves fighting for what is seen to be, and what is believed by members of the media themselves to be, Statewide media. The reality is that the claimed Statewide media is very seldom Statewide media. The *Courier-Mail* has no significant distribution in north Queensland, central Queensland or western Queensland. It is essentially a media outlet for the south-east corner, in particular the Brisbane area. The same applies to three out of four of our television stations. They actually have a local obligation because they have to serve a localised market and, as in the case of the provincial media, which seems to have no problem in allowing the purely local viewpoint to dominate, it is not enough for the Brisbane-based media to allow only the views of the Government or the official Opposition. The reason is that,

despite the problems that one has with the media adjusting to a three-party system or to the breakdown of a coalition situation, the Liberal Party represents the majority of non-Labor voters in the south-east corner of this State.

Members of the Liberal Party have an obligation to make relevant, topical, contemporary comments about contemporary, topical things happening in the public arena. We have a responsibility to update and make contemporary our policies. We have a responsibility to initiate proposals for the improvement of government and the improvement of our way of life. However, having done that, we should not be cut out—and no third party or alternative view should be cut out—merely because of an obsession with the Government and the official Opposition—or one side and one other side—being a balanced story. If the fourth estate is to be worth a bumper—and that that be so is vital to the good functioning of democracy—then the press have to come to grips with the realities of the situation as they find it.

In some interviews conducted in recent weeks I have noticed that even well-credentialed commentators have put propositions such as, "It must be difficult to adjust to being in opposition." The parliamentary Liberal Party has not been in Government in this State since 1983. The situation in which we now find ourselves is nothing new, nor are the positions that we will take, which will essentially relate to the good government of this State as we see it.

It is increasingly frequently said that the conservatives lost Government in Queensland in 1989. That is wrong. The National Party lost Government in Queensland in 1989. There is an obligation on members of the press, particularly members of the parliamentary press gallery, to understand and remind themselves of the situation that actually exists in this Chamber and to remind themselves of the democratic consequence and significance of the representation that the Liberal Party affords in this Chamber. Our numbers might be low but the population base behind us is high and significant, and that population base is entitled to have its views reflected and it is entitled to have informed comment addressed to it.

The Goss Labor Government came to power on a tidal wave of concern about matters relating to corruption and the proper, efficient and fair despatch of general Government functions—almost a civil liberties band wagon. It rightly—as we did—condemned corruption. It rightly condemned abuses of power and inefficiencies in the system. What it is not right to do is to falsely condemn those parts of the previous system that were effective, that were functioning well or that were for the benefit of the State. Not all parts of any system are rotten. Not all public servants were corrupt; not all members of Parliament were corrupt. It is therefore necessary, in charting the course for the new Queensland, that the Government preserves the best of the old and changes and reforms what is wrong. It is about those areas that I wish to take up the time of honourable members for a few more minutes.

The economic area is the one that I believe will bring the Labor Party undone. It is the economic area in which the Labor Party is weak; and its relationship with the union movement is a source of potential embarrassment and disaster. The extraordinary presentation to Parliament last week by the Treasurer of this State was the culmination of a beat-up economic crisis. I ask the new members on the Government side to reflect on the background and the content of that economic statement. They should not allow themselves to be deluded by the spoon-fed propaganda and build false hopes and a false idea of how long they will remain in Parliament.

If the Government was going to produce a modern economic statement and tell the people where Queensland stands, then at the least one would expect that it would deal with the financial implications, the financial position in which the Government actually found itself and the financial consequences of what it proposed to do about it—the financial consequences of the promised reforms. What we had was an attempt to create a total red herring, although it had the political purpose of appearing to discredit the former Government for its economic performance.

It was unacceptable for the Treasurer to claim in this House that there was a secret, previously unrevealed, carefully hidden \$13 billion debt. As was amply demonstrated by the former Premier, Mr Ahern, that debt was revealed in last year's Budget documents and, over a period of several years, had been referred to in other Budget documents—publicly available documents. Although the question of how one quantifies and allocates some components of that debt is a matter for debate, it does nothing to alter the fact that a total public sector debt of \$13 billion had been revealed previously.

I remind honourable members that we are operating in a climate in which the Federal Opposition, without the resources of Treasury, is being taken to task for not costing programs three years into potential Government. The document that was produced last week by Mr de Lacy enumerated 15 different spending programs in 13 paragraphs that were referred to as his summary of expenditure for the balance of the 1989-90 period. Not one of those programs was costed. Three months after the Labor Party took the reins of Government and three months after Mr de Lacy has had available to him the full resources of Treasury, he is talking about initiatives—all of which contain the financial implication of additional spending—without providing a single concrete figure for those programs.

Today in this House I tabled a question asking Mr de Lacy to descend from political beat-up, falsehood and misrepresentation to the hard, straightforward yakka of responsibility and to tell us what Labor Party programs will cost. We are told—and clearly it is intended that we believe it—that we are facing some financial trouble.

Four weeks before Mr de Lacy's statement he did a beat-up with the figures of approximately \$114m or \$118m. Perhaps that occurred because of the change of ministerial staff after the previous staff were ejected. Clearly, the ministerial staff do not trust their present Treasury officers, who could have stopped them from making fools of themselves. That sum of \$114m or \$118m of beat-up, secret expenditure by the former Government was intended to soften us into believing that we have a financial crisis on our hands. Perhaps it gave some comfort to the Honourable the Minister for Transport, who attempted to claim some extraordinary consequence of taking Government which indicates that if the projected cost of construction of a toll-road increases from \$78m to \$82m, that is so far off budget as to cause the cancellation of Labor's promised abolition of the tolls on the threat of the effect that it would have had on the entire spending program for roads in this State.

The Labor Party in Opposition waved around a piece of paper which has since disappeared. The Liberal Party has been unable to locate a copy of that document relating to the pre-Budget costing of all the Labor Party's promises, which was independently verified and tabulated by an international accountancy firm. If the Labor Party was at all competent it would have included in that document a provision for the toll-road. Nobody can tell me that the Labor Party did not include provision for costing the 15 spending programs that were mentioned in the Treasurer's speech during the debate on the amendment to the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply. If one could find that document it could be examined to ascertain precisely what was in the minds of Labor Party members before they came to office. By falsehood and misrepresentation, there has been a careful build-up of the probability of difficult economic times in key areas.

As well, the sum of \$50m has been mentioned as the cost of implementing the Fitzgerald reforms. In July of last year Mr Ahern said that the implementation of the Fitzgerald reforms would cost between \$85m and \$100m. This year's figure is, surprisingly, half of the upper range indicated last year by Mr Ahern. Rather than Mr Ahern's prediction of \$85m to \$100m, the implementation of the Fitzgerald reforms will cost—shock, horror and surprise—\$50m.

**Mr Coomber:** Don't forget the pokies.

**Mr INNES:** Poker machines will be a great, new source of income.



I am told that Ms Warner's department is already considering the employment of staff to deal with those people who will become chronic poker machine users—in other words, the human consequences of introducing that bold, new program. That extra expenditure will be paid for by the revenue from poker machines. I suppose that the circular logic is superficially attractive.

The point is that there has been a careful creation by misrepresentation of a financial crisis into which have been injected spending programs that were always on the cards and for which the costings should have already existed. In fact, there has been an exaggeration of the spending programs.

The Fitzgerald-recommended reforms have been altered in a very significant way. The Fitzgerald recommendations did not specify that local authority boundaries and electoral system should be considered. I have checked the Fitzgerald report carefully and those words are just not there. Certainly by the time the legislation is introduced the EARC will have the power to consider local government matters. However, in no sense was that made a priority and in no sense was it specified—and for good reason: there was no proof, demonstration or finding of corruption at the local authority level. Even if there had been a finding about local authorities, the overriding of local authority decisions was apparently associated with allegations of corruption or abuse of power. No-one can point to a word or a sentence in the recommendations of the Fitzgerald report that calls for an examination of the local authority electoral system.

Nobody is saying that that should not happen in due course. The EARC is already faced with a full deck of responsibilities and priorities—it will have to look at freedom of information, administrative law reform, donations to political parties and electoral reform. With all of those priorities, there is suddenly this carefully beat-up pre-occupation with the local government electoral system and the possible redrawing of local authority electoral boundaries.

**Mr Beattie:** What's wrong with that? Why are you objecting to that?

**Mr INNES:** The simple thing is this: Mr Beattie's Government is carefully orchestrating a blow-out of costs relating to the implementation of Fitzgerald's recommendations. I understand that an extra unit will have to be added to the EARC staff to look at the problem of local authority boundaries, a problem which was not addressed as a priority anywhere in the Fitzgerald report. That is the Government's political priority that it is prepared to add to the cost problem, which it claims is of some urgency and of some unanticipated magnitude. As soon as politics becomes involved, as soon as the Labor Party sees the possibility of increasing its political influence by changing local authority electoral systems or boundaries, concern about costs goes out the window and the money is found for what has been determined by the Government as being a political and administrative priority.

Now we read of suggestions of looking at the voting systems themselves. I have no doubt that the Government will play around with the voting systems and, if there is a capacity to rig and rort the system, the Government will be into it, as Ned Hanlon was.

**Mr Beattie:** You know those boundaries are a rort at the local level. We aren't seeking to rort any damned thing.

**Mr INNES:** The Government is seeking to play around with an area of priority which was not in Fitzgerald's recommendations and is distorting priorities and redirecting resources for political purposes. Thank God that the EARC is independent, because I will guarantee that computers are working overtime looking at the possibility of loading the dice with regard to electoral reform at the State level. It is the State level which is important because it is the State level that controls local government in this State. This is the level of Government responsible for local authority administration; this is the level of Government that should be cleaned up first, and this is where the resources and the priorities should go.

We in the Liberal Party believe also that the thrust of the Fitzgerald report relating to parliamentary reform should be observed. Indeed, it was the Liberal Party's famous pursuit of the Public Accounts Committee that led to its vacating the coalition Government in 1983.

**Mr Welford** interjected.

**Mr INNES:** The honourable member was not here at the time. Today I have heard a variety of revelations. The member for Fassifern made a comment about question-time. He was not a member of this House before 1983; he knows only about National Party question-time. The tradition of the Government Whip and the Government Deputy Whip each asking two of the first four Government questions in question-time started in 1983; the practice did not exist before then. So if we are to look at question-time, let us go back through a course of history and let us not deal with just one administration.

Let me refer to the question of parliamentary reform, to which we in the Liberal Party have been committed consistently and relentlessly. We have not seen the reforms in the procedures of this House except that initiated by Mr Speaker. In deference to him, Mr Speaker has played around slightly with the order in which questions are asked at question-time to make sure that the three parties and almost the quarter of Queensland that the Liberal Party represents—

**Mr Beattie:** You are a fair man, Angus.

**Mr INNES:** I have never objected to fairness being applied in this House, including when it comes my way.

The Liberal Party represents almost as many Queenslanders as the National Party does, and it is entitled to take some part in question-time each day. Last year, there were frequently days and days when the Liberal Party was unable to ask a question. More power to the Speaker for making sure that that does not happen now. We will take our turn later down the list.

We noted that on the first day of the new Parliament, to the cries of, "We have got the numbers now"—and we know the system—there was refused a debate on urgent topical matters, one initiated by the National Party and one initiated by the Liberal Party. Thoroughgoing parliamentary reform involves the proper allocation of time in the weekly routine of Parliament for topical, urgent matters and involves the allocation of more time for debate of matters initiated by private members and even in some cases for private members' Bills. No such opportunities have been allowed in the Queensland Parliament for donkey's years. Time must be set aside not just for debates on Matters of Public Interest and the Adjournment but also for motions, legislation or topics initiated by private members. We know that that should be introduced, even on a regulated basis. Many of the busy days of the Federal Parliament start by some debate, limited in time as it might be, allocated to urgent and genuinely topical matters.

Sitting suspended from 1 to 2.30 p.m.

**Mr INNES:** Before the luncheon break I was talking of the need for parliamentary reform. The Liberal Party hopes that need, in due course, will be addressed by the Standing Orders Committee because the Government has made commitments that have to be kept.

I express a personal point of view on the electoral system, although I suppose that it is unusual for a parliamentary leader to express a personal point of view.

I suggest that two broad electoral reforms are necessary for the welfare of this State and this nation. The first reform is the introduction of four-year terms at all levels of Government except the Senate, which should have a longer term. Fewer elections would have the consequence of more measured judgments, more tough answers for tough times, and more respect for the democratic process.

Four-year terms are essential if Governments are to be allowed to make long-term decisions in the public, State or national interest. No longer are there short-term answers for the sort of problems that Australia currently faces. People are rapidly growing tired of the incessant election merry-go-round. The hype and extremism of electioneering turns people off and makes them exasperated with and cynical of the entire political process.

Elections are becoming increasingly expensive. Time and time again political parties must go back to the same financial wells. That is not good for the democratic process and in time can lead to the danger of corruption of the type which can cause the downfall of Governments. Political parties need to put themselves out of the reach of vested interests who might expect returns for their financial donations. The more often one has to go back, the more likely are there to be strings attached as distinct from people supporting long-term broader philosophical viewpoints.

Four-year terms will go some of the way towards achieving the goal of making Governments think in the longer term, making people less cynical of the entire process, and making Governments less beholden to vested and selfish interests.

Another reform that should be closely examined and implemented is the end of compulsory voting. Australia is one of the few democratic nations in the Western World that still has compulsory voting. It is clear from the current Federal election campaign that there are people who greatly resent having to vote—they do not want to make a choice; they do not want to vote. However, because of compulsory voting, all political parties concentrate on wooing the 20 per cent of disinterested and often ill-informed voters who hold the key to most elections. They are not just my words; they are the words of Rod Cameron, the ALP pollster, on radio two days ago.

Although compulsory voting was introduced because of the abysmally low voter turnouts early this century, I believe that the time is right for the return of freedom of choice. Nowadays, everybody receives enough impulses from enough sources to form a view, if they want to have a view, and to make a choice, if they want to do so. The great liberties of mankind cannot be invoked to get one's own way and then be abandoned. The right to vote must include the freedom not to vote.

It is also instructive to reflect that party political organisations are stronger in countries with non-compulsory voting than they are in countries such as Australia. Parties in those countries have to mobilise and get people involved. In Australia, there is a fundamental natural resentment against having compulsorily to do anything. It is that which causes and compounds this cynicism about the political process.

That is a personal viewpoint. Those are the two reforms that I consider necessary for the democratic good health of this State and this nation.

I will deal briefly with some economic matters. Previously, I stated that the economy of this State was in good shape, irrespective of the other administrative problems that this Government inherited and cashed in on. The darkest clouds on the Queensland economic horizon are created by the smoke from the fire sale of Queensland assets by companies burnt by Federal Labor's high interest rate policies. A feature article in one of today's newspapers lists 16 companies with major Queensland operations that are involved in fire sales. The only people who can afford to buy those often very expensive assets are the people from countries with low interest rates and more stable and firmer currencies than Australia's—in other words, overseas ownership. The Labor Party's FIRB does nothing to stop foreign ownership because it knows the penalty of stopping foreign sales now. That would mean the collapse of more Australian and more Queensland-based companies and therefore more hurt. The FIRB is not stopping those sales because it is desperation that is forcing them.

The reality is that the economy of this State can be jeopardised by what I believe will be the consequences of the election of this Government and that is starting to emerge from its modus operandi. This House has heard before the recitation of all the evils—corruption, prostitution, illegal financial transactions by elected persons and

electoral malpractices. That is not just what was revealed at the Fitzgerald inquiry; that is what has been revealed at the Cooke inquiry to date. All of those evils have been revealed at the Cooke inquiry.

Yet Queensland has a Government that now wishes to extend and increase the influence of the trade union movement in this State. It does so because it has received the brown-paper bags from the trade union movement. Even the Premier owes his leadership to the influence of the Federal President of the Australian Workers Union, Mr Hodder. The trade union link is undeniable. The corruption that has infected a significant part of the trade union movement is undeniable. It has been revealed, and will be revealed further, by the Cooke inquiry.

The penalty for the closed-shop and the expansion of union influence is not just the retardation of the economic growth of this State, but the entrenchment of the corruption and abuses of power that led to the collapse of a Government, from which the Labor Party has benefited but which will be its undoing in the months to come.

Time expired.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Mr Campbell): I now call the honourable member for Toowoomba North. This is the honourable member's maiden speech and I ask that it be heard in silence.

**Dr FLYNN** (Toowoomba North) (2.37 p.m.): I will begin my first address in this Chamber by placing on the public record my sense of pride in being here as the Labor Party representative for the seat of Toowoomba North. I am deeply honoured to be the Garden City's representative in Government and will, of course, follow the tradition of providing non-partisan representation to any individual or group in Toowoomba with a problem. But I am especially proud to represent those people who put me here—those Labor supporters who have not had a voice in Government since the days of Jack Duggan and Les Wood in 1957 or, indeed, in Opposition since 1974.

It has been a long time between drinks for us in Toowoomba. Because it has been such a long time since we have had an opportunity to express our point of view, I expect that, during the life of this Parliament, I will have a lot to say. For me, for Labor Party workers and for Labor Party supporters in Toowoomba, a veil has been lifted. Thirty-two years of unfailing work and commitment have finally been rewarded, and we look forward with confidence to our opportunity in Government.

Although I joined the ALP when I was 20 years of age, I am relatively new to the ALP in Toowoomba so, at the outset of this speech, I would like to pay tribute to all of those who have gone before me, especially those who are no longer with us. I would specifically mention Mr Henry Fay, Mrs Amy Savage and Mr Frank Leach, all of whom died during our campaign year.

I would also like to mention devoted long-time workers Tom Baker, Pat Prasser, Max Ward, Stephanie Duff, Bill Thorpe and John Pearen and to thank some of the capable and energetic new members who ensured our success, specifically Alan Reading, Sharon Fletcher and Isis Morrissey, and especially Marie Klajn and Barrie Ryan, who ably represented the Labor Party in the seats of Lockyer and Balonne respectively while still helping with my campaign.

As I stand here, I am also acutely aware of the responsibility that I carry. The Labor Party has a proud history of political representation in Toowoomba, so a lot will be expected of me. Until last December, Toowoomba had a reputation for being a conservative place, but that is not the lesson of history. Toowoomba was largely represented by the Labor Party for most of this century until 1974, that black year for Labor when Ray Bousen and Peter Wood were both defeated. Before them, we had several other high-achieving Labor representatives.

The most famous, of course, is Jack Duggan. Jack will be remembered in this place for his long service which spanned 34 years from 1935 to 1969. He will also be remembered for his 10 years between 1947 and 1957 as Minister for Transport, for his loyalty to the

ALP which was exhibited by his being the only Minister to resign from the Gair Government and for his eight years as Leader of the Opposition during the difficult years from 1958 to 1966. Jack Duggan should also be remembered for his wise counsel at the time of the 1957 split in the Labor Party. That eminent historian, the late Dr Denis Murphy, said in his work *Labor in Power* that—

" . . . only Duggan and Devereaux seemed determined to avoid open conflict at all costs and to hold the Labor Party together by tact, common-sense and normal political compromise."

Few politicians from any party could have a more distinguished career. I am conscious of the responsibility in following in his footsteps. Jack is now 79 years of age and still lives in my electorate. He is very alert and capable of giving good advice. His first advice to me was always to be flexible and creative with the use of my time. With the amount of work ahead of us in Toowoomba North, I will need to heed his words.

When speaking about famous Labor names in Toowoomba, it is impossible to ignore the Wood family. After a distinguished teaching career, in 1946 Les Wood was elected as MLA for Toowoomba East. After a brief period out of Parliament, he was re-elected in 1950 as the MLA for North Toowoomba. He will be remembered as Labor's first Leader of the Opposition after our long reign beginning in the 1930s. I am sure that Mr Cooper will empathise with the difficult job he would have had in that first year from 28 March 1957 to 29 March 1958 when, sadly, he died in office aged only 51 years. Les Wood's twin sons, Peter and Bill, will be remembered in this Chamber for their fine service to the Labor Party and to their constituents in representing Toowoomba South and Cook respectively.

Before leaving this brief historical section of my speech, I would like to pay tribute to my immediate Labor predecessor in Toowoomba North, Ray Bousen. Ray won Toowoomba West in 1969, taking over after Jack Duggan's retirement. Ray was 58 years of age at the time and had honourably served the Queensland Railways, the Australian Railways Union and the Toowoomba Trades and Labor Council for most of his life. His activities in the electorate, especially door-knocking and involvement with sporting and community groups, are still remembered. Ray is now a sprightly 79 years of age and was still fit enough to staff a booth for me on polling day. I know that he, more than most, enjoyed that day of triumph.

I have given this brief overview of Labor's heritage in Toowoomba because of the strength of its achievement and because I have a sense of history and look for the lessons that can be learnt from it. I was interested to note the unusual event when Toowoomba produced two successive Leaders of the Opposition in the persons of Les Wood and Jack Duggan. History sometimes repeats itself. But it is comforting to know that, as I stand here today as part of the Goss Labor Government, it will be a long time before Toowoomba needs to produce any more Leaders of the Opposition.

I now turn to the second part of my speech concerning the needs of the Toowoomba North electorate. I am sure that all honourable members will remember the nationwide publicity that Toowoomba received last year when it was described as being the best place in all Australia to live. That claim was based largely on the relatively low cost of real estate, the temperate climate and the competitive price of a basket of groceries surveyed at a Toowoomba supermarket.

It is certainly true that there are still some very good buys on the Toowoomba housing market compared with those in capital cities. It is also true that it is a pleasure to live in a place that has a mild climate and a true definition of the seasons. The classical changes of autumn and spring as seen in Toowoomba do bring out the poetry latent in all our souls and make Toowoomba a special place in Queensland.

But, for many, the bubble has burst. We now have a housing crisis in Toowoomba and the march of the seasons is not as pleasant to view when living in overcrowded accommodation or, as was reported in the *Toowoomba Chronicle* on 12 March this year, from stormwater drains and railway carriages. I do not intend to exaggerate. I doubt

that our housing crisis is worse than it is in other, more rapidly growing parts of the State. But it is especially hard for us to adapt to a crisis which has been thrust upon our community so suddenly and unnecessarily. Housing is the most pressing of our problems at the moment. On average, I receive two or three telephone calls daily from desperate people asking me to perform an instant miracle, wave a magic wand and find a house for them to live in.

The causes of Toowoomba's housing crisis are fourfold:

- (1) the influx of people from interstate and other parts of Queensland attracted by the advantages I have just mentioned;
- (2) the years of National Party neglect which have led to the chronic shortage of low-cost rental housing;
- (3) the expansion of the University College of Southern Queensland, which, of course, I welcome, but which has taken place without proper planning for student accommodation; and
- (4) the long-term effects of past changes in policy at Baillie Henderson Hospital which has led to housing many chronic psychiatric patients in the community, including many from other parts of the State.

I welcome the commitment by our Government to fully shoulder its responsibilities in providing low-cost housing for those in need. I welcome the introduction of the Commonwealth and State Housing Agreement, which will soon result in an extra \$110m of joint Commonwealth/State funds available annually for public housing, for both rental and purchase. I look forward to Toowoomba receiving its share of these funds to help the 500 families currently waiting for shelter from the Department of Housing. I look forward also to proper planning in the allocation of these funds so that future Department of Housing projects are fully integrated into the existing communities, preventing prejudice and the development of stigmas which adversely affect the department's clients.

Like all newly elected Government members, I was engaged in a concerted 12-month campaign to win my seat. We have all worked very hard to promote our party's policies and to identify the particular needs of our electorates. In December 1988, at the very outset of my campaign, I was amazed to find that Toowoomba had one of the worst police-to-population ratios in the State. There is only one police officer for over 1 000 citizens. That is twice the State average and is exceeded only by Logan and Redcliffe. These figures subsequently achieved prominence in the Fitzgerald report. When one considers that until recently we had one mobile car patrolling a city of nearly 80 000 people after 11 o'clock at night, it is no wonder that the issues of personal safety and security of property became very important during the campaign.

Again, this situation arose through National Party neglect and the misguided and outdated belief among those in power that Toowoomba was still a sleepy country town where its citizens were safe in their homes and on the streets. This is not the case. Toowoomba has grabbed more than its share of the crime headlines in the last 12 months. There was the bicycle bandit who struck twice, each time successfully robbing an outer suburban branch of the National Australia Bank and making his getaway on a two-wheeler. We have also had two tragic murders of children. The second one led to a *Sunday Mail* article on 26 November last year, which was headed "Death shows dark side of Toowoomba" and which described some of the less savoury aspects of Toowoomba life. It stated—

"Teenage drinking and early teen shack-ups are rampant. In the past couple of months there have been two murders, three manslaughters, four attempted murders and numerous sexual assaults and a couple of violent robberies. The sweet-smelling garden city image is definitely on the wilt."

Even more important than the headline-grabbing crimes is the relentless increase in break and enters, vandalism, muggings—including one daylight incident on a major inner-city corner late last month—child abuse and sexual assault. In Toowoomba we

need our share of the 1 200 additional police promised by the Goss Labor Government, and we need a greater emphasis on community policing with a more visible police presence in the inner city at night, as well as the establishment of one or two suburban stations. Toowoomba is no longer a town where drivers can leave their cars unlocked while they run errands.

Before leaving the subject of crime in Toowoomba, I would like to add that there is a clear association between excessive alcohol consumption and many crimes, especially vandalism and assault. While I welcome the more mature liquor-licensing laws foreshadowed by Mr Gibbs, I share the concern of the Reverend Noel Park, Director of Darling Downs Lifeline, that extended hotel trading hours could have an adverse effect on the community unless decisions are made very carefully.

I wish to say a few brief words on education. Toowoomba's schools have an impeccable reputation. Private schools, such as Toowoomba Grammar, Downlands, St Mary's, Glennie and Fairholme Colleges, and State schools, such as Toowoomba High School and Toowoomba East State School, have long histories and are well known and regarded beyond Toowoomba. A number of prominent citizens, including His Excellency, Sir Walter Campbell, and Messrs Mike Ahern and Russell Cooper, completed some of their education in Toowoomba.

By and large, our education needs in Toowoomba are less pressing than those in other growth areas of the State, with one notable exception, and that is the need for a fourth high school in the north-west sector. There is only one State high school in my electorate—Toowoomba High School, also known as Mount Lofty. The enrolment is over 1 400 and the stage has been reached where there is insufficient room to build new class rooms and other necessary facilities. The other two high schools in Toowoomba are both quite large, with enrolments close to 1 000. Land was acquired for the fourth high school in 1966—in the days of Jack Duggan—and nothing has happened since. Representations for a fourth high school have been made since the early 1970s and have been answered with the statement, "Other areas have a higher priority." I know that there are other priority areas in Queensland, but a lot of these growth areas did not even exist in the early 1970s when we first needed our new school. Consider, Mr Deputy Speaker, if you had been waiting in a shop to buy a bottle of milk since 1970 and you were still waiting to be served today. I think you would be starting to run out of patience. Despite your placid nature, you might even be starting to get angry. My constituents are starting to become angry; we have been in the queue a long time. I am pleased to report that during the election campaign both the Premier and the Education Minister pledged to build a new high school at Wilsonton as soon as possible, and I look forward to that coming to fruition in our first term.

I now turn to health priorities in Toowoomba. Health issues were not a significant election issue last year, but this does not diminish the importance of providing efficient, cost-effective health services to all Queenslanders. Health is an area in which I have an intense personal and professional interest. There are problems in health-care delivery all over Queensland, but today I will confine my attention to Toowoomba.

Mr Deputy Speaker, the Toowoomba General Hospital is the cheapest hospital in Queensland to run. If a comparison was made of figures showing the cost to taxpayers of a bed per day—compiled from the annual reports of the various hospital boards in Queensland—it would show that in the 1988-89 financial year it cost \$244 per bed per day to run Toowoomba General Hospital. This compares with \$358 for Townsville, \$341 for Rockhampton, \$335 for QEII and \$291 for Ipswich. What do these figures mean? Is it something of which Toowoomba should be proud?

Basically, Mr Deputy Speaker, these figures show that the staff shortages endemic throughout Queensland are worst in Toowoomba. Even more alarming is the fact that this chronic underfunding is now built into the system. Year after year, when the budget for Toowoomba General Hospital is decided upon, we may receive an increased allocation for inflation; but no account is made for the increased utilisation of services or the fact

that we were behind to start with. Somehow, even more distressingly, to achieve greater equity, in my first term I have the task of breaking down the rigid bureaucratic principles which decide funding allocations for hospitals in Queensland. I am not sure how to achieve this, but I have some ideas which I will present to the Minister and to the health committee.

Before I leave health issues, I will just briefly mention problems at Baillie Henderson Hospital, which is one of the State's largest psychiatric institutions with a proud history of service and which this year celebrates its centenary. Baillie Henderson Hospital desperately needs a new medium security facility to accommodate safely the increasing number of aggressive and disturbed patients who have been transferred there since the closure of the security patients hospital at Wacol. There is also an urgent need to revitalise the image and standing of Baillie Henderson Hospital within the framework of mental health treatment in Queensland. For no good reason, it has been allowed to become an isolated backwater—no longer an accredited training centre in psychiatry, despite its 100 years of quality service to the mentally ill in Queensland. I hope to see this change in the near future.

The last topic I would like to mention in relation to Toowoomba is the need for regional development. The Labor Party's carefully prepared regional economic development plan was a major component of our success in the 2 December election. I look forward to its successful implementation with the emphasis on increasing Queensland's production of value-added goods. Toowoomba, as the centre of one of Australia's richest agricultural regions, will obviously benefit from this plan. I would like to point out, however, that our Government can quickly achieve a great deal in the area of regional development, at little or no cost to the taxpayer, by reversing the trend towards centralising Government departments that occurred under the former Government. I will use the railways as an example.

Toowoomba and the south-west region lost its autonomy when the position of general manager in the south-west region was abolished in 1983. Further emasculation of local decision-making occurred with administrative changes in 1988. Now we have the situation in which virtually all decisions regarding the south-west region—even those with minor policy content—are made by the assistant commissioner for traffic operations in Brisbane. As a result, morale has plummeted and the quality of decision-making has deteriorated. Senior and very dedicated local public servants are frustrated with their inability to influence local management practices. It would not cost much, if anything, to reinstate the position—or at least the function—of general manager in Toowoomba. The gains in productivity through both improved morale and decisions made with expert local knowledge would more than compensate.

Most of the centralisation which occurred under the former Government was done in the name of efficiency. In the south-west railway region, staff reductions of nearly 50 per cent have occurred in the past few years, with the total work force cut from nearly 3 000 to approximately 1 500. In the same period, freight tonnages shipped through Toowoomba increased significantly. Certainly, very necessary productivity gains have occurred, but now all the fat has been trimmed and the cannibalism has started. At the same time, the bureaucracy in Brisbane has grown and the normal upward pyramidal structure, typical of most organisations, has become inverted. To put it more simply, there are too many chiefs and not enough indians. I look forward to a more rational and regional approach to the running of Queensland's railways and other Government departments.

Mr Deputy Speaker, in the third part of this address I would like to consider some of my personal pet topics—or philosophies, if you like. All of us in this Parliament can be distinguished by our personal interests, which sometimes make the Parliament more interesting and sometimes cause trouble in the respective party rooms. Firstly, I would like to address the question, "What does it mean to be a Queenslander?" For me it is an insatiable desire to win the Sheffield Shield, a competition which I have followed avidly since I was 10 years old. This will probably happen next week-end, now that a Labor Government is in power. If there is anything that the Labor caucus can do to



ensure victory, it will have my vote. I am also an unashamed zealot in supporting the Broncos or the Queensland side in a State of Origin match—although I have never actually booed a blue, perhaps just a Balmain player on the odd occasion, and always, of course, with justification.

Apart from these important matters, I think that Queensland is a great place in which to live, even though it exists as a separate entity from the rest of Australia, solely because of lines drawn on a map by surveyors during the 1850s and 1860s. The State line is an artificial creation which was requested by inhabitants of the north-east of New South Wales before Australia became a nation. But in the 1990s, we are the nation of Australia, and I look forward in the post-Bjelke-Petersen era—the post brown paper bag era—the Wayne Goss era, to a more sensible, sober and co-operative approach in our dealings with Australians from other parts of the country.

Mr Deputy Speaker, having mentioned one unnecessary cause of division in the State, actively promoted by a former Premier, I would like to turn to another—that between city and country. I live in an in-between place, and so perhaps I am strategically placed to see both sides of the argument and to play an active role in fostering a renewed cooperation between the two. Toowoomba, a city in its own right, lies less than two hours' drive from Brisbane, but our outlook is rural because the farming communities of the Darling Downs provide many of our livelihoods.

I hope to use my abilities as an effective communicator with the skills of compromise in this Parliament, as I have done to some extent in Toowoomba North, to narrow the gulf between city and country people that was created by Bjelke-Petersen for no better reason than his own political advantage.

We are all Queenslanders. We are all Australians. We all love our children. Despite our differences, let us try in this Forty-sixth Parliament to heal some of the past wounds in our community and treat each other with respect, each acknowledging the other's contribution. That respect cannot be accomplished unless individuals in our community are no longer penalised for standing up to be counted for what they believe is right.

Under the previous Government, there were many examples where individuals had their careers disrupted or even destroyed because they spoke out with a differing political viewpoint. The cases of Dan Daly and FIDO's John Sinclair are notorious, but I would like to highlight less well-known examples.

During my election campaign, I had the privilege of working with Mr Peter Nightingale. Peter, a teacher by occupation, had been Labor's unsuccessful candidate for the seat of Maryborough in the 1983 and 1986 elections. After resigning his post with the Education Department in 1986 in order to campaign full-time, having been refused leave, Peter was denied re-employment in the Wide Bay region, even though there was a need for teachers in his subject areas at the time. Peter now teaches at Toowoomba High School. Maryborough's loss has been our gain.

In the 1970s, after he lost his seat in this place, Peter Wood, the former MLA and teacher to whom I have already alluded, was also consistently denied a position in the Toowoomba education region. Despite being offered positions locally by the regional education office, high-level intervention prevented his employment. However, those experiences are in stark contrast to that of Mr Lin Powell, who on losing the seat of Isis was quickly employed as a teacher in the Maryborough area, even though it is Education Department policy that preference for teaching positions should be given to newly graduated teachers over re-entry candidates.

Under the Goss Labor Government, there will be no place for discrimination such as that which was visited upon Peter Nightingale and Peter Wood. There is no place for discrimination such as that in a free society.

I would like to conclude with a thank you and tribute to two special people in my life. Firstly, to my wife Kelyn. We met at a judo club 20 years ago when we were both only 16. We have now been married for 15 years, after a rather protracted courtship. She has supported me through a number of unplanned career changes spanning engineering,

medical research, clinical medicine and now politics. She is, like me, a reformer. During my campaign she supported me not only as my wife and the mother of our four-year-old son, Thomas, but also as my campaign-director. We argued incessantly for 12 months; not about money, or the kids, or the house, or personal habits—the usual subjects of matrimonial dispute—but about campaign tactics. Kelyn's long-standing goal and motive for getting involved was to break the National Party's stranglehold on Toowoomba. Personally, she had, and still has, reservations about my being in Parliament.

After our victory was announced, she expressed concern at the effects it would have on our family. It was with great pleasure that I could say to her, "Well, it's your fault. You were the campaign-director." In the difficult times ahead, I know that I will have her continuing support. I would like to place on the public record that I thank her, and love her for her efforts in all her roles.

Secondly, I would like to pay tribute to my father, John Joseph Flynn, who died in 1980. A considerable number of people have asked me why I, a doctor in private practice, am representing the Labor Party instead of the Liberal Party. I could be flippant and say, "Because I don't want to be part of a minority group all my life." But, Mr Deputy Speaker, if you had met my father, you would understand the true reason. His life was devoted to the service of others. Following service in the army during World War II, he worked as a postman in the Bardon/Ashgrove area for over 25 years. He was a friend of Frank Waters, secretary of the Postal Workers Union and a former member of this place. I was pleased to hear that Mr Waters attended the opening of this Forty-sixth Parliament but regret that I did not meet him.

As a young man, my father was a member of the ALP. He became uninterested for a while but, like me, was inspired by Gough Whitlam to become involved again. When I first joined the Labor Party in 1972, he was very supportive. Above all, he devoted himself to raising me, his only natural child, single-handedly after my mother died when I was 10 years old. He was a single working parent during the Menzies era, when such people were deemed not to exist and did not receive any additional support. He taught me, by example, the meaning of words such as "unselfishness" and "compassion", lessons I still have only half-learned.

Anything I have achieved in my life so far or may achieve in the future has been made possible by my father's self-sacrifice. I would like to record publicly my gratitude for all that he has done.

**Mrs McCAULEY** (Callide) (3.07 p.m.): I desire to pledge my loyalty and that of the people of Callide to Her Most Gracious Majesty Queen Elizabeth II and also to pay tribute to His Excellency, Sir Walter Campbell, and Lady Campbell for their diligent service as representatives of Her Majesty.

I congratulate the Speaker on his election to such a distinguished office, as I congratulate all members on the Government side of the House. As the saying goes, "Every dog has its day." Now it is their's.

I can now say that I have experienced all possible parliamentary roles in this Chamber. In saying that, I count the Liberal Party as part of the conservative opposition forces which will need to be strongly united if we are to regain Government.

To digress briefly—I read with interest an article in today's *Courier-Mail* which referred to the first woman to wear slacks into the Queensland Parliament. I have to tell you, Mr Deputy Speaker, that I did that two years ago. There is a story attached to that which I do not have time to tell at present, but I would merely sound a gentle note of caution at the preoccupation with issues such as trousers and child-care facilities. I have never found any such discrimination, and I believe that discrimination might be created by drawing attention to these minor sorts of issues.

It would be remiss of me not to take this opportunity to thank all those people who worked so hard to help me to retain Callide for the National Party. To my staff Linda, Ros, Lorraine and also Laurine and Fran, I offer my heartfelt thanks for a

dedication and willingness that was well above the call of duty. To the Callide valley women's section, who manned the campaign office and organised functions, and to my campaign committee under chairman John Griffiths and to branches and members throughout the electorate, "thank you" does not adequately convey my feelings. Thanks must also go to my family, who always seem to be there when I need them.

The campaign in Callide was waged over more than 12 months, as it was in October 1988. The local paper in Biloela carried the headline, "Goss tips Labor to win Callide". It did not, however, carry the same size headline or even a front-page article when Labor did not win Callide. Because the campaign was so long and intense, I have kept a careful list of all the Labor Party promises, which I will diligently keep following up in the faint hope that some of them will be kept. Among the largess being offered to my constituents was the promise of a high school for the Boyne/Tannum Sands area. On this matter the Education Minister, Mr Braddy, has not yet deigned to answer my letter. However, there is no doubt that if this school is not in the Budget when it is brought down in the middle of the year, the blame will somehow be laid at the feet of the former Government.

**Mr Smyth:** You weren't on side with the Premier of the day. That's what happened. You weren't on side with the Premier or the faction that he belonged to.

**Mrs McCAULEY:** I hear the honourable member for Bowen—our very own bovver boy. Do the honourable member's boots match his haircut? It is not actually the outside of the honourable member's head that worries me; it is the inside.

Although the building of a high school is a project that I support very much, I was happy for Callide to wait its turn on the list, as I knew that there were other areas in the State in greater need. Fewer than 300 children travelling some 20 kilometres from the Boyne/Tannum Sands area to Gladstone is not undue hardship. The previous National Party Government promised the high school for 1992-93, but Mr Braddy said there was no doubt that the area would have the facility by the start of 1991. He can rest assured that he will not be allowed to forget that promise.

While I am on the subject of the Boyne/Tannum Sands area, I might mention that during the campaign it was visited by another Labor stalwart, Mr Tom Burns. Mr Burns was quoted in an advertisement for the Labor candidate as saying that Labor would not allow Wild Cattle Island to be mined under any circumstances. Unfortunately, someone forgot to tell the Minister for Resource Industries, Mr Vaughan, about this promise and he has confirmed that mineral exploration on the island will proceed. My objections to mining of this island followed a thorough inspection of the island with concerned local residents some 18 months previously. The island is low; it is barely above sea level. It is a completely sand island and is relatively new in ecological terms. Previous mineral exploration of the island found little trace of anything of value, any deposits being fairly deep and of low grade.

I am not against sand-mining. If it comes into certain parts of the Agnes Water area, it will be welcomed not only by me but also by the majority of the locals. However, some areas do not lend themselves to sand-mining, and I believe that Wild Cattle Island is one. Federal member Brian Courtice has also jumped on this particular band wagon and promised that he will not allow Wild Cattle Island to be mined. I suggest that he stop grandstanding and start talking to Mr Vaughan or else keep out of State issues over which he has no jurisdiction or influence.

I could not conclude my comments about this area without a mention of the proposed expansion of the Boyne smelter. This is, of course, dependent on the sale of the Gladstone Power Station to Comalco, a course of action which is rather contrary to Labor philosophy. The doubling of the price, which Comalco has rejected as ludicrous, has been an effective course of action in solving Labor's dilemma. The Government is prepared to sell, but at a price that no-one will pay. Clever, is it not?

Finally, I must mention the Wallumbilla to Gladstone gas pipeline, which I saw in all stages of construction, from the very beginning to the very end. So well has Siapem

carried out its construction work that when one travels from Biloela to Gladstone, as I frequently do, it is now not easy to see where the line was constructed. This project was an initiative of the National Party Government, and I am very proud of it. When the project was first mooted, Labor's contribution was to say that it should not be built by the State Government. Now that it is in office, where the outlook is obviously different, the Goss Government is saying that it will extend the line from Gladstone to Rockhampton—a National Party initiative which has been taken up by Mr Goss. I applaud the Government's change of mind on this issue.

My concern for the environment in Callide centres largely on the coastal areas of the electorate, as this seems to be where the most threat occurs. For example, the Rodds Bay area, which is presently held under a pastoral lease, has long been earmarked as national park when the pastoral lease expires. Now I understand that development plans are under way which will threaten the future national park proposal. I call on the Goss Government not to allow development of this area but instead to follow the recommendation of the Department of Environment and Conservation on this matter.

The Agnes Water/Round Hill area has seen unprecedented development in the last six years, notwithstanding the poor state of the only road into and out of the area. In 1988 my concern for the area led to a National Party natural resources and economic development parliamentary advisory committee, under the chairmanship of Mrs Beryce Nelson, visiting the region to interview groups and file a report with the Premier. One of the most noticeable results of this visit was the declaration last year of the Round Hill headland area as an environmental park. This, together with the declaration of the Deepwater national park the previous year, has to a certain extent satisfied me on the future of this beautiful region.

However, another threat has arisen in the form of mining lease application 166, which has been opposed by both the local council and the 1770 Heritage Group. The area of this lease application abuts the Round Hill environmental park and is an area of steep sand dunes, which are fairly fragile. I will not oppose mining in the springs area of Agnes Water, but I will oppose it on the Round Hill peninsula. Tourist development must also be channelled into the right areas. Noosa has shown the worth of having large areas of land left in their natural state, and Round Hill/Agnes Water must follow that lead, or a special place will become just another coastal urban sprawl.

Marie Mahood used to refer to "blockies" or small lot owners as feral farmers. Although I would not term the Agnes Water settlers as such, it is certainly true that many of them who live on 10, 20 or 40-acre blocks have no houses, no power, no decent roads and no jobs, which will make it very difficult for the area to advance to any degree, even though land prices are still rising. Although an excellent primary school has been built in Agnes Water—due in part to my constant representations to the former Education Minister, Brian Littleproud—there is a very real danger of the region becoming a rural residential slum.

I welcome the arrival of Shire Clerk Eric Thorne to the Miriam Vale Shire. He is a man with immense knowledge of local government, and his enthusiasm and integrity will stand him in good stead as he guides the Miriam Vale council towards the twenty-first century. I know that Eric and I will work for a common goal, namely, the development of a beautiful shire in an ordered and sensible fashion.

I cannot conclude mention of the environment without a reference to some dealings that my electorate office has had in recent times with Mr Comben's department. Last week, during the course of her duties, my secretary rang the Department of Environment and Heritage with a routine inquiry about a permit for a constituent to care for sick and injured koalas. My secretary received quite a blast from the gentleman on the other end of the phone about trying to use political clout. That blast was accompanied by a long lecture. I did not think that I had political clout any more—if I ever had any. I strongly resent any such imputations to my staff, who are acting on my behalf, when they and I are doing our jobs. I have acquainted the gentleman in question with my feelings on the matter. To say the least, such an incident is disturbing.

The other matter relating to Mr Comben was a very terse reply to my request about a kangaroo-processing site that was required by constituents of mine. Mr Comben is obviously not aware that some of the 136 kangaroo-processing sites that are registered in Queensland have not been used for five years. In fact, I am reliably informed that some 22 sites are, in fact, "ghost" sites; they have not been used at all.

I am not asking for the embargo to be lifted; I am simply asking the Minister to put his house in order and to see that the kangaroo-processing industry is not monopolised by the few big dealers to the detriment of those small business people who are trying to obtain two or three sites. They are not being given a fair go by the present system. I would expect the Minister to be more sympathetic to the small dealers. However, perhaps he is like his mate Mr Hawke and is only interested in the Mr Bigs of business.

At the other end of the Callide electorate are Gracemere, Stanwell and other small centres such as Gogango. Stanwell is the site of the State's newest power station, which is presently under construction. During the election campaign, my Labor opponent—who is the not very capable Fitzroy Shire Council representative for Gracemere—promised the residents there an improved infrastructure agreement between the QEC and the Fitzroy Shire Council.

**Mr Prest** interjected.

**Mrs McCAULEY:** If he were so good, he would be here, would he not, keeping Mr Prest company?

The reason why I describe Mr Clair as being incapable is that I have press releases in which he blames the lack of infrastructure funds for Gracemere as the reason for the high rates that are paid by business people in the town when, in fact, it is the unfair system of tying to valuations water and sewerage rates for business premises. That system was introduced during Mr Clair's time on the council. No doubt the people of Gracemere will decide the worth of their council representation at the elections next March.

Labor member Ken Vaughan, who is now the Minister for Resource Industries, visited the area and agreed with Mr Clair about the infrastructure package. He determined that Gracemere had been short-changed by about \$3m. I say to Mr Vaughan: I expect that that \$3m will be forthcoming this year. No doubt he will have problems with the QEC when he tells them about his commitment, but he is the Minister and no doubt he can have the final say. I have to tell him that the people of Gracemere are agog with anticipation.

**Mr Randell:** It was a bit different before the election than after the election.

**Mrs McCAULEY:** Exactly.

**Mr Randell:** Like the toll-road.

**Mrs McCAULEY:** Exactly. That is dead right.

I am very proud of Biloela, which is in the centre of my electorate and is the town in which I have lived for the past 15 years. Because I am a councillor on the Banana Shire Council, which is centred in Biloela, I am involved in the well-being of the area on two levels of government.

**Mr Smyth:** Holding down two jobs.

**Mrs McCAULEY:** Yes, I am holding down two jobs. The honourable member will be happy to hear that my pay from being a Banana Shire councillor goes to the police youth club, which enjoys my support.

**Mr Prest** interjected.

**Mrs McCAULEY:** I have no idea.

Biloela also was promised much by the frantic Labor forces who were trying to buy their way into office. Mr De Lacy said that a business support centre would be established.

That sounds very interesting. According to a newspaper article, that centre would also provide assistance for people to undertake feasibility studies, either directly or by linking them with consultants, research personnel and equity financiers. How about that! I do not know how Biloela has survived for so long without such a centre. I will pursue Mr De Lacy diligently in regard to that matter.

The Callide valley, in which Biloela is situated, is a rich agricultural region that depends in no small way on irrigation from the underground aquifer which is, unfortunately, in crisis mode and has been for some years as the water levels have dropped further and further. The prolonged drought conditions that were experienced this summer have exacerbated the problem.

The proposed Kroombit dam project, which was approved last year by the previous Government and officially launched in September 1989, will improve the availability of water to the area by approximately 15 per cent per year if it rains.

Other measures such as those that were set up in the Lockyer valley by the Lockyer Watershed Management Association need to be implemented so that the long-term viability and stability of agricultural production in the valley is safeguarded. I am counting on Mr Casey to ensure that the \$17m project proceeds as planned, otherwise our valley will face an uncertain future. I will keep praying for rain, which would increase the Callide Dam beyond its present mere 20 per cent of capacity.

The Biloela primary industries exhibition involving the Expo silo was boosted last year by the promise of \$1m over three years from the Cooper Government, the result of much persistence on my part and that of the project committee. This project, now officially named Advance Australia Fair, was boosted when the Goss Government honoured the previous Government's commitment and paid the first instalment of the \$1m earlier this year. The Advance Australia Fair will be central Queensland's answer to the Stockman's Hall of Fame. It is very heartening to see locals totally supporting the project. Some local people have given 100 per cent commitment to the cause. At the end of the day, the success of this project will rest with those dedicated people.

I would be remiss if I let this occasion pass without making reference to local government in Queensland, an area which is about to be subject to Labor Party scrutiny and, no doubt, manipulation. On the Banana Shire Council, of which I am a member, there are 12 councillors. In the rural divisions it takes up to three days to do budget inspections of the roads and facilities, whereas in the town of Biloela it takes about two hours. It is a nonsense to put forward the simplistic view of equal numbers of voters in each division in a shire which covers some 17 000 square kilometres and which has the second greatest length of roads of any shire in Queensland. Biloela residents have easy access to their representatives, who can inspect any problems within 10 minutes, if necessary. People in the Theodore, Cracow, Wowan and Baralaba areas do not have that luxury. Although they do not have the population numbers, they are the people earning our much-needed export income and they are entitled to reasonable representation on their local council, because it is only through reasonable representation that they will maintain, and hopefully upgrade, the standard of roads to their areas. Without decent roads, the beef, wheat and other export-earning produce will be under threat.

Both the Federal member for Capricornia, Keith Wright, and the Federal member for Hinkler, Brian Courtice, say that the Banana Shire Council is gerrymandered. They will no doubt be pushing for the EARC to make changes in this area. Country people will do well to remember that at the forthcoming Federal election. They would also do well to remember that both Mr Wright and Mr Courtice have attacked the previous State Government for cut-backs in allocations to local authorities. So poor is their grasp of these matters that these Federal members do not seem to understand that the Federal Government sets the formula under which grants moneys are allocated, and that the State is forced to follow those guidelines. The guidelines discriminate against the more sparsely populated regions, taking no account of the export-earning capabilities of such areas and hence their need for good roads.

On the State scene on the subject of one vote, one value, I would like to refer to history. When the ALP "suicide squad" voted themselves out of the Queensland Legislative Council in 1922, their party promised that a new system of voting would be introduced into the Legislative Assembly to compensate for the loss of protection afforded distant parts of Queensland by the Upper House. The zonal system, like the six zones, or States, in the Senate, reflects the constitutionally accepted and respected principle of protecting the weaker, more distant, less populous areas from the stronger regions of Queensland.

Queensland does not have an Upper House to act as watchdog. The Legislative Assembly has to reflect the operations of both Federal Houses in a single Chamber. That is why the zonal system exists and that is why it must continue to exist. The ALP was right in 1922; it is wrong today.

On the subject of roads, I found it interesting that in June 1989 the NRMA's *Open Road* magazine noted that, despite increased traffic growth, Federal road funds "have not been at such a low level at any time since the Second World War". The October 1989 issue of *Open Road* found from a survey of New South Wales shire councils that many were being forced to turn bitumen roads back to gravel to reduce maintenance costs. The magazine quoted the secretary of the Local Government and Shires Association, Bill Henningham, as saying—

"Converting bitumen roads into gravel or, even worse, natural surfaces, is inevitable as a result of funding from Canberra."

Apart from contributing to serious accident, death and injury, bad roads have the following indirect cost impacts—

1. They add to food and commodity bills by increasing road freight costs.
2. They contribute to increased delays and traffic jams.
3. They contribute to vehicle maintenance costs.

While Labor cuts road-funding in real terms, the pressure on the road system continues to increase because of the following facts—

1. Seventy per cent of domestic trade is carried out by road.
2. Road cargo haulage increased by 25 per cent between 1982 and 1985 and is expected to double by the year 2000.
3. The number of vehicles on Australian roads will increase by over 60 per cent by the turn of the century.

In a press statement on 17 April 1989, the NRMA's general manager, Mr Richard Cox, summed up the road situation in the following manner—

"Roads are in an appalling condition, and getting worse. Everyone can see that except, for some strange reason, members of the Federal Government; they refuse even to acknowledge there is a problem."

Mr Wright and Mr Courtice are members of that Federal Government. Mr Wright's standard reply to the demand for more road-funding is, "Tell me where we can cut back." I believe it is a matter of political priorities.

On the subject of daylight-saving, I was interested to hear previous speakers saying that their electorates were not in favour of it. I put a very neutral questionnaire in three of my local papers and received many replies from all areas, including Gladstone, Rockhampton, Blackwater, Moura, Theodore and, of course, those towns in the Callide electorate such as Miriam Vale, Biloela and Gracemere. The final result of that poll was that 89 per cent of people were opposed to daylight-saving.

I received from many elderly people letters in shaky handwriting explaining that although they liked to water their garden in the cool of the evening, by doing so they would miss the news. One woman wrote of the humiliation and embarrassment that she felt because she objected to daylight-saving and that the media made her feel foolish

with their talk of curtains fading, etc. So the media have something to be blamed for as well.

The subject of country racing is a matter of concern to me. The trenchant criticism by the Minister for Racing of the principal race club system and his support for only those clubs that generate TAB revenue will adversely affect the race clubs in my area—Thangool, Calliope and other small picnic race clubs, as well as the Gladstone race club, in which I take a great interest. The Minister does not understand that country and city racing are closely intertwined. For example, horses that do well in the country can go on to the city; horses which cannot make the grade in the city can often go to the country and have many years of productive and interesting racing.

Racing is a growth industry. It benefits the farmers who grow the hay, the trainers, the jockeys, the owners of the horses, and even the bookmakers, and all their employees. It is an industry that has been undervalued by the Minister for Racing. I watch with great concern what the Minister does in those areas.

As I am the Opposition spokesman on health issues, I will mention briefly a few pertinent issues that relate to my electorate. Recently the directors of nursing in-service training school was suddenly and without notice scrapped. Replacements had already been organised. In fact, one matron had already left for the coast. The Department of Health has denied it is at fault and blames the hospitals boards. I find that very interesting. I wonder who the department will hide behind and blame when it scraps the hospitals boards.

In-service training is important. It teaches the nursing staff about the latest surgery techniques and allows directors an opportunity to improve administration skills and general nursing awareness. The importance of such in-service training for directors of nursing in country areas cannot be underestimated.

Increases in the cost of surgery fees for minor operations by private doctors using public hospital facilities is another problem. Recently some surgery fees have been raised from \$115 to \$145, an increase of \$30. That is more than the rise in inflation. It clearly reneges on Mr Goss' election undertaking of no new taxes or charges and increases in charges only below the rate of inflation. This new system of charges will take business away from hospitals and back into private surgeries. Surely if the facilities and equipment are available in our hospitals they should be used.

The final concern that I have in the health area in relation to rural areas relates to the rural health division. This National Party initiative has now been put on hold by the Goss Government while it sets up a committee to investigate it—yes, another committee!

Although it was Labor Party policy, the Minister for Health, Mr McElligott, is now saying that the rural health division could be an expensive public relations exercise. This is an important area of country people. City people tend to underestimate the problems associated with living in the country. The rural health division was beginning to come to grips with those problems and rural people held great hope that problems such as staffing in remote areas and other equally important issues would be dealt with by it. I will be watching with great interest the future of that program.

I believe that under the Goss Government the future of rural Queensland—that is, any area outside the south-east corner—is bleak. I hope and pray that I am proved wrong.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Mr Perrett): I call the member for Mount Coot-tha. As this is the member's maiden speech, I ask that she be extended the courtesy of silence.

**Mrs EDMOND** (Mount Coot-tha) (3.35 p.m.): It is with a deep sense of pride, honour and responsibility that I rise to speak on this occasion, my first speech in this House.

I am proud to be here as the very first Labor member for the seat of Mount Coot-tha; proud also to serve in this the first Labor Government for 32 years.



It is with honour that I accept the challenge to serve the people of my electorate of Mount Coot-tha to the utmost of my ability—each man, woman and child, regardless of where their political allegiances may lie. Responsibility goes with that honour, a responsibility to hear and understand the needs and concerns of my constituents.

May I take this opportunity to congratulate you, Mr Deputy Speaker, on your appointment to the panel of Temporary Chairmen. I ask you to pass on to Mr Speaker my congratulations on his election. I know that he will bring democracy, dignity and diligence to his position.

I would also like to congratulate the Premier and the members of his Ministry for providing the leadership and the policies which led us through a long year of campaigning to victory.

It is obviously true that corruption issues dominated the election, but my constituents looked also for strong leadership and good policies as the hallmark of an alternative Government before changing their vote to Labor. I thank the Premier for providing that leadership.

The voters overwhelmingly rejected the propaganda aimed at hiding the squabbling disunity of the sometime coalition parties. The Mount Coot-tha electorate must be one of the most beautiful of the city electorates, stretching as it does from the cosmopolitan diversity of the older suburbs such as Paddington, Rosalie and Red Hill, to the newer dormitory suburbs of Chapel Hill and The Gap. It envelops Mount Coot-tha, from whence it takes its name, and includes the foothill suburbs of Bardon, Rainworth and Ashgrove.

Coming back to Brisbane six years ago, after an absence of 17 years, I made a conscious choice to return to the beautiful hills of this area where the old timber houses offer traditional Queensland streetscapes and everywhere there are vistas—of the near green foothills, the distant ranges and the city. It is an idyllic place to live, close to the city—the furthest point is less than half an hour from here—but mostly forming part of the main western suburbs, with good school facilities and a beautiful family environment.

What concerns could this area possibly have? It is threatened by what we in Queensland have called "progress", although other countries are resisting it as best they can. It is "progress" that has led to the dilemmas that form the main "local" issues in my electorate.

The hills also provide an essential breathing space for the city. They are not just a pretty backdrop. Their treed slopes help the city cope with the carbon emissions of vehicles. Here we are under threat as developers attack the foothills. Many Queenslanders I know will be shocked to learn that these hills are not all forest park, but are largely owned by private investors, waiting until the time is right to convert what is presently a future urban zoning to residential zoning. We could end up with units over almost all of Mount Coot-tha—or should I say "Monte Carlo"!

At a time when we are urging people to plant more trees to help cleanse our environment, here in the city we are fighting to protect our wooded hills from a development-at-any-cost Liberal council. I used to believe that the Liberals would never discover the environment. Now that they have discovered it, they are apparently determined to stamp it out.

For too long the electorate of Mount Coot-tha suffered from a lack of strong representation in Parliament. It had not benefited from having a member of influence with the National Party; nor did it have a true Opposition member who was prepared to speak up for the community. This electorate had been left to rot in a Liberal limbo in which its representatives were too cowed to even criticise the previous Government or the more outrageous undertakings of the Liberal council. Luckily, the people of this electorate have been prepared to collect together and fight for what the community wants and to make up for that lack of leadership.

This situation has led to the Roman-road planning policy of Route 20, where a straight line was drawn between two given points and, regardless of what lay between those points, a road was planned—a policy more in common with a Monty Python

script than sensible town-planning. Called whatever term was considered less emotive at the time, this Route 20 freeway, arterial road or subarterial road would have had a devastating effect on the closely knit communities of Rainworth, Bardon and Ashgrove.

I believe that the initiatives of the new Minister for Transport will obviate the necessity for this major upgrade. The community not only fought hard but also spent many hours researching the alternatives, and came to the conclusion—as had many others before them in Australia and overseas—that increasing road space merely increased road usage without necessarily improving transport efficiency.

The community believed that there was a need for a major regional review of passenger transport to enable constructive measures to be taken to improve public transport and increase its usage to at least the levels of other capitals. The people also believed traffic and transport issues would be better served by an integrated, combined Transport Ministry, with Main Roads fulfilling the role of a road-building facility rather than the roles of transport and traffic planning, and road-building. It was felt that this would mean that transport needs could be examined without bias, while improving efficiency.

I hope that heavy freight will prove to be better served by rail and sea and this, in turn, will reduce the impact of freight transports both on local roads which were not built for their tonnage and on the communities that they thunder past. This integrated structure should lead to improved rail services and also improved roads from the railheads to country areas where the major road needs lie. Formerly, these services competed vigorously against each other for freight and funds, with little regard to cost in terms of efficiency or quality of life. To build a bigger road has been, for too long, a knee-jerk response to any traffic or transport problem.

I believe that we are now on the right path, but I must warn the Minister for Transport that I will also be urging him to restrict, to 40 kilometres an hour, speed limits in school precincts and nearby residential areas. Safe passage to school, I believe, is a right for all children. If the number of children killed and injured each year en route to and from school were killed by a virus, there would be outrage and instant calls for action. Yet, to provide better access for children to walk or ride to school will not only improve their safety but also go some way towards reducing the congestion on roads.

At the Ithaca Creek State School, which my younger children attend, we estimated that 400 trips per day are generated by parents who live within walking distance of the school and want their children to walk to school—in fact bought their homes with that very intention—but who will not risk their children's lives by allowing them to walk under present, unsafe conditions.

Many parents and community groups have already approached the council with plans for local-area-traffic-management schemes or traffic-calming methods for their area. These methods build in physical restraints such as chicanes, necks or small roundabouts to reduce traffic speed. Obviously, it would be wonderful to bring this into all residential and school precincts, but let us start now by reducing the speed, uniformly across the State and around every school, to 40 kilometres per hour. That would be a step in the right direction.

Mount Coot-tha is well served by schools. In recent years, Ithaca Creek and Milton have had their centenaries and enjoy the luxury of large grounds and smaller numbers owing to the reduction in pupils over the years as the population aged. This pattern is starting to change as more families and young people find that they enjoy living close to the city, and I believe that these numbers will continue to rise. It is surely more economically responsible to attract families back to the established suburbs with well-endowed infrastructure than to constantly build new resources in distant new suburbs. To attract more families back, we must address the perennial problems of housing and traffic incursion, and overcommercialisation. I will speak more of that later.

In the past, many of the parents of pupils at the Mount Coot-tha State schools—Payne Road, Rainworth, Bardon, Ithaca Creek and Milton, and also The Gap High School—have written to the Education Department expressing their concern at the poor levels of funding, resources and training. All parents know the constant grind of raising funds for the most basic of school needs—paper and pens for art, lawnmowers for the school oval and even soap for the wash rooms.

I am pleased with the higher priority given to education by this Labor Government. I have already had a very good response to the increased numbers of teachers and resource staff, and even more so to the increased numbers of tertiary places. I know that the parents of children at Stuartholme, St Joseph's, Mater Dei, Sacred Heart and Marist Brothers are pleased with these initiatives, too.

For several years we have heard loud calls about getting back to basics in education, but, while the basics remain essential, they are no longer enough. In this day of technological expansion, where a check-out girl is handling a sophisticated computer and the storeman-packer has computerised inventory, our children need more than the basics. They need to be technologically literate, too, to take their place in society and to have any hope of employment. To skimp on education, as we have done for so many years, makes poor economic sense. This State has relied, for too long, on importing the skills that we need rather than educating or training our children. We could have been providing those skills. Our children could be heading towards the better paid professional jobs, but, instead, we have short-changed our own children with this National Party suspicion of education and the development of skills. If grandad did not need it, why should my children?

This attitude has left us trundling along in the rear of many fields, including my own. In the sixties I trained as a therapy radiographer at the Queensland Radium Institute. My qualifications then enabled me to work throughout the world. They were very highly regarded and I worked in Copenhagen, New York, Montreal and Edinburgh. I might also point out that at the Queensland Radium Institute we then had about the highest pay-rates in Australia, whereas now they are—to put it bluntly—probably the worst pay conditions, creating chronic staff shortages.

The field in which I had been working until the 2 December election was nuclear medicine. One might ask if it is a new field. I suppose it is. It has been around for only 20 or 30 years. In the early 1960s, it took off with rapid expansion, due to the introduction of the gamma camera and low-energy radionuclides. In the 1970s, there was another rapid expansion with the influx of dedicated computer systems and digital cameras. However, Queensland has still not recognised the specialty of nuclear medicine or concerned itself with providing the tertiary education necessary for nuclear medicine technologists. While all other States, except Tasmania, have initiated training and safeguards to ensure high-quality care, standards and subsequently minimum radiation exposure, our public hospitals are forced to use cameras with an average age of 16 years. Are we waiting until they are old enough to vote before we replace them? Our public hospitals have dedicated staff who are unable to get the basic training that they urgently need.

Nuclear medicine plays an important role in cancer diagnosis and also in the analysis of kidney, heart and orthopaedic conditions. Accurate diagnosis can improve treatment success rates and help enormously in patient care and management. For many years, that hotbed of socialist intrigue, South Australia—so often maligned by the National Party—with a much smaller population than Queensland, has managed to train its nuclear medicine technologists at the South Australian Institute of Technology and also maintain high expertise in this field in Adelaide's major hospitals. But then, health and education are priorities for a Labor Government, not a National or Liberal Government.

I became very angry when I heard of the strange non-departmental uses of health funds when I knew that children were waiting for months for operations that could change their entire lives. I look forward to helping my fellow health workers get the

training standards needed to gain accreditation in Australia and worldwide, similar to that available in other States.

Earlier I mentioned the problems of the inner-city areas in the Mount Coot-tha electorate. The Brisbane City Council has claimed that it wants to lure families back to the inner suburbs. I agree with that wholeheartedly. I believe that it is wasteful to turn the agricultural perimeter of our city into yet more residential space and that it is far better to use the existing facilities of the established inner suburbs. Three major concerns are hindering this process. The first is overcommercialisation. In the six years that I have lived in this area I have seen an increase in retail space of 500 per cent, with major shopping centres coming on line at Toowong, The Gap, Paddington and Ashgrove. Major expansions in the form of projects worth \$12m are planned for the near future for Indooroopilly, Newmarket and Brookside. This means that, during a period that shows a 10 per cent increase in catchment population, retail space will increase by about 1 000 per cent! Is it any wonder that shop-keepers are going broke? I do not know anyone who has had a 1 000 per cent increase in spending power in that period. At the same time, we are told that the main reason for the increased commercialisation—especially in the Paddington area—is a push for more retail space. I ask: why then are so many shopfronts in the commercial buildings empty? It is because of oversupply and sloppy planning, and because the shops cannot compete with the businesses along the terraces run illegally without council constraints. The combination of overcommercialisation in Paddington, where long-term residents are left stranded next to a restaurant or a nightclub and the rapid expansion of the six-pack housing unit, has pushed many a "Paddo" family to the outer suburbs, where they then join the queues driving into the city thereby adding to the traffic congestion. Roads and commercialisation have taken their toll on housing in this area at a time of acute housing shortage.

Secondly, speculation has caused enormous house price increases in very modest dwellings especially throughout Paddington and Bardon. The subsequent rate increases have caused hardship for the aged, single and low-income families. There is no publicly owned housing in Mount Coot-tha—none at all—yet there is a need for it. The federally funded HACC scheme has helped many aged people to stay in their homes. The time still comes when some aged people need smaller units, with easier access, and without maintenance problems. They do not want to go to Bribie Island or Maleny to retire. They want to live where they have always lived—near their friends. We desperately need units to help aged people stay in the area that they call home.

I will be urging the Minister for Housing to look closely at the needs of the aged and people who receive low incomes. They have borne the full cost of gentrification and are being squeezed out of the housing race.

Mr Deputy Speaker, it has been obvious to all concerned that the proposed Paddington plan—or, to give its correct title, the Latrobe and Given Terraces development plan—has not considered the long-term residents of Paddington. It has merely looked at ways of increasing commercialisation with no real thought being given to even commercial viability of new or existing businesses in the area.

The Brisbane City Council also instigated a study specifically designed to advise the council on how to attract families back to inner suburbs. This study was deliberately separated from the Paddington plan, as the council held contradictory briefs. One was to increase commercialisation and the other was to attract residents back to the area. I will be calling for the Lord Mayor to combine these studies, to bring common sense into the debate, to review the needs of Paddington as a whole and not remove the heart from the body, as the council is presently doing. As I have said, uncontrolled traffic incursion brings to the inner city its inherent noise, air pollution and danger for the young and aged.

Mr Deputy Speaker, the issues that I raise are not unique to Mount Coot-tha but are a symptom of our life and times and our urbanised society. By making a concerted attack on the problems of the city, we will also be addressing individual and global dilemmas. By increasing public transport usage, we will reduce noise, air pollution and

danger to the individual, and play our part in reducing emissions of the gases causing the greenhouse effect, in line with Australia's international agreements. By applying modern energy efficiencies to our lifestyles, we can reduce the need for coal-fired electricity generators that so burden our atmosphere.

Dr Amory Lovins, Director of Research at the Rocky Mountains Institute, pointed out at a recent Brisbane seminar that, not only do we have the best conditions and technology available to introduce the new energy efficiency measures, but we also have the raw materials that are needed. Presently, we export them to the United States so that we can, in turn, import the finished products. This new technology is where our future lies. We should be exporting those products to the world, but using the raw materials here first. This is, of course, a dramatic change in energy-planning. Queensland has a history of building power stations for purely political reasons—then having to crazily advertise to increase consumption to make them viable. What utter economic and environmental nonsense!

Mr Deputy Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to thank the many people who made it possible for me to be here today. I am sure that any election campaign is arduous and the 1989 campaign lived up to that image. In Mount Coot-tha, we campaigned hard for almost a full year. This placed a huge burden on my husband, David, and our young family, Christian, John and Maura. That they took it in their stride is to their credit, and I thank them from the bottom of my heart. I thank my mother for her patience and for teaching me to stand up for my beliefs, even in the face of opposition.

I must also thank my tireless campaign committee, the many Labor Party members who helped with all facets of the campaign, and those friends and non-party members who also gave their time, money and effort in a wonderful vote of confidence. Most particularly, I must mention the patient assistance and encouragement of Alderman Joe St. Ledger and Barbara and Manfred Cross. I wish Manfred well in his coming retirement and know that he will be sorely missed as the Federal member for Brisbane. I must also thank the members for Ashgrove, Brisbane Central and Windsor for their encouragement and support. More than anything else, I owe my success to my campaign director, Di Glynn, who firstly urged me to stand for election and then worked with great ability and knowledge for the whole campaign. I can only hope to repay her similarly in the future.

That the people of Mount Coot-tha gave me their trust is, I believe, because of my commitment to the quality-of-life issues that also concern them. These concerns are the worldwide concerns of all thinking people. With 80 per cent of Queensland's—and the world's—population now living in an urban environment, how can we best make our cities healthy and sustainable? In 1988, the World Health Organisation formulated the concept of Healthy Cities by 2000. The World Health Organisation looked at concerns that had been raised intuitively by people around the globe, and the effects that they have on the health and well-being of our people and the world in which we live. They noted the increased incidence of asthma and bronchial diseases in our polluted cities—where "clean air" standard means, in actuality, the dirtiest air we can live on over a long time, without obvious, measurable, physical effects. They looked at the effect of stress caused by noise—whether it was caused by the constant whine of a swimming-pool filter, traffic thundering past, loud radios or industry. Each year we spend millions of health dollars treating stress symptoms without looking at how to alleviate these basic causes.

For a healthy city, clean air and water must be maintained and noise pollution reduced. A healthy city is one with pride in its heritage, that protects its heritage, and where our young, our aged and our poor are housed adequately. It is a city that provides educational and job opportunities for our young and also health leisure activities, rather than treats the end results of delinquency and dependency that come from boredom. We must use our new technologies to create a sustainable environment rather than a wasteland.

My colleague the honourable member for Barron River spoke eloquently of the beauty and importance of the tropical wetlands. I know how important these wilderness areas are, but the global environmental damage is being done here, in the cities—in our own back yard, too. We must begin to address these problems. There is no point in waiting until we have measurable changes. The lag in climatic changes precludes procrastination.

I have based my personal aims on internationally recognised goals: the aim of the World Health Organisation to have healthy cities by the year 2000 and the aims of the Toronto Accord to reduce the gases caused by the greenhouse effect by 20 per cent over 15 years. Those two concepts recognise the important role that the environment plays in the health of individuals and in global effects. Both aim to reduce the overall impact of man on his environment to make urban life, therefore, less stressful and consequently more healthy. I bring to those issues the concern of a health-worker, a community individual, a mother and, now, the representative of the electorate of Mount Coot-tha.

In concluding, I make the point that I have heard and noted the concerns of members opposite that we, the Government, have little knowledge or understanding of the needs of country people. Yet, I, like many of those on this side of the House, was born and bred in the bush. But I belong to that forgotten group—the small farmer. As we learned, the former Country Party always looked after the interests of the large land-holder, grazier, big developer or miner. The small, struggling farmers seldom rated its interest.

Farmers in the area from which I came will recall that they waited for years for irrigation from the Monduran Dam. It was built with Federal funds but State funds were needed for channelling. They also remember the arrogance of the then Premier, who told them they "voted the wrong way to get water supplies". And yet, surely, they were country people, too.

The most significant equal opportunity in education occurred when Gough Whitlam introduced the TEAS and later schemes which for the first time gave less affluent country children with ability the chance to be able to accept tertiary places. May I stress that a Labor Federal Government did more for those country children than the previous coalition Government did. My chief regret is that it came too late for me and many of my generation.

To the well-known Liberal lady who proclaimed at the Indooroopilly booth on 2 December that I could not possibly win because no-one had ever heard of me and people did not even know which school I had attended—may I say that I went to the Gin Gin and Bundaberg State High Schools. She has now heard of me and will undoubtedly hear more in the future.

**Mr HARPER** (Auburn) (4.03 p.m.): In opening this Parliament, the Queen's representative referred to his Government's platform of cleaning up corruption in Queensland, encouraging and promoting economic growth, improving our education system and protecting the environment—very worthy objectives. If this Government is as successful in its endeavours in those areas as was the Ahern National Party Government, His Excellency and the State of Queensland will have been well served.

Although the media of today, particularly the print media, refuse to give credit where credit is due, I have no doubt that history will acknowledge that the decision taken by the Government, which was elected in 1986, to appoint Fitzgerald, QC, to inquire into possible illegal activities and associated police misconduct was a resolution—as you well know, Mr Deputy Speaker, it was a resolution—of such magnitude as to surpass anything of its like before, as was the unbending, the unwavering, the dedicated and determined support given at every turn to Fitzgerald in his endeavours to come to grips with the truth and to sift the grain from the chaff. It is unfortunate that the result for such a determined Government has been electorally such an inquiry will probably never again occur.

**Mr Beattie:** Not while we're in Government.

**Mr HARPER:** I agree with the interjection from the Government side of the House that such an inquiry will not occur while the Labor Party is in Government. Only yesterday, we saw that this Government is running away from an inquiry into union activities. I accept the honourable member's commitment. In the near future, when he occupies the Premier's seat, he will make sure that his Government will never open the door.

It will probably never occur again that any Government will open itself to such public scrutiny. I repeat that on Monday we saw proof of the Goss Labor Party's conception of open government.

**Mr Beattie:** The inquiry is still going, isn't it? There are no changes to the inquiry; it's still going.

**Mr HARPER:** Unless the Opposition can shame the Beatties and the Gosses into a change of mind, we are about to witness the Premier and the Premier of the future who is interjecting—I refer to the present term—presiding over a Government that is running away from any risk of disclosure of further corruption by trade union officials, by their cronies. Opposition members remember well that frequently in this Chamber Mr Goss banded about the term "cronies". We have witnessed the cronyism that has developed being put into effect by the trade union movement, yet the Government is running away from further opening the doors to determine to what extent corruption exists in the very worthy trade union movement.

Be that as it may, the National Party Government set about cleaning up corruption in this State in a way that was unprecedented anywhere in Australia and, indeed, in the democratic world.

I do not intend to use this debate to record my own role in bringing about the decisions to establish whether or not claims of improper practices had a factual basis; but with the effluxion of time and the passing on of some of today's media gurus—or individuals who fancy themselves as being such—no doubt credit may be given.

I am certainly proud to have been personally responsible for establishing the Office of Director of Prosecutions in Queensland and for seeking and obtaining the services of Des Sturgess to fill the inaugural role in that position. It was I who agreed that Des Sturgess, a man of very high reputation, a person who has been commended on all sides of the political scene, should set about the task. It was I who agreed that he should undertake an inquiry into claims of offences against children and related matters. I take this opportunity to pay tribute to the responsible role played in that instance by Tony Koch of the parliamentary press gallery.

During its first three years in office the National Party Government achieved a great deal in the area of law reform. It is perhaps arguable, but I believe that that period saw the most progressive legislative reform ever undertaken within the portfolio of Justice and Attorney-General in this State during the life of a Parliament. Initiatives taken and legislation prepared then were still being introduced last year. So it is with pride that I claim that it was the National Party Government that was prepared to bite the bullet, to set the stage for His Excellency's present Government to clean up any remaining corruption.

Let us hope that Mr Goss proceeds to clean up the corruption that remains. Let us hope that he admits that there is corruption among his own supporters and goes about the task of cleaning it up. It is now for the Goss Labor Government to complete the difficult, time-consuming task that the National Party began. Likewise, over a period of 32 years, first the National/Liberal coalition and then the National Party Government turned the Cinderella State of Queensland into the growth State of Queensland.

Let us not forget what we inherited 32 years ago. Maybe members of the Government cannot remember. We hear talk about education and broken down school buildings with broken down equipment. In 32 years the National Party turned this Cinderella State into the leading State—the State of growth in Australia.

It did that by encouraging, providing and promoting development, primary and secondary industry, tourism, adding value to our rural resources, creating job opportunities and creating a work haven to which fellow Australians have migrated from other States in their thousands. They came up here to get away from Cain in Victoria. They got away from New South Wales when it was going bad. They have all come up here to Queensland for the very simple reason that the National Party, firstly in a coalition Government and then in its own right, created the environment which brought about the development of this State. It was an industrial revolution, if ever there was one. It was the National Party's encouragement of development and work opportunities and work practices that made Queensland the envy of the other States, which wanted security for their enterprises and a fair day's work for a fair day's pay.

This Government has made clear its intention to turn back the clock, to reward those who would have turned off the lights, to deny employee and employer the right to agree on a fair day's pay for a fair day's work. This Goss Labor Government's ideas of encouraging and promoting economic growth remain to be tested. Unlike the members of His Excellency's previous Government, those on the Treasury benches today are yet to put any runs on the board. Last week the Treasurer went out for a duck, and what a duck! There will be plenty more of those to come.

**Mr Beattie:** Give us a couple of weeks.

**Mr HARPER:** The honourable member should listen. He will hear his Treasurer make plenty more ducks.

Let us all pray—or at least all members on this side of the House—that Labor in Queensland is more successful than Labor in Canberra and Victoria and Western Australia and South Australia and, indeed, New South Wales. I site the example of the sewage mess that was left behind in New South Wales for the present conservative Government to clean up. It is not surprising, of course. Queensland does not want billion-dollar deficits and the high interest rates of Labor, fail-safe banks such as they have in Victoria, or the Western Australia incorporates. The National Party has left this Government with an economy that is sound——

**Mr Beattie:** You cooked the books.

**Mr HARPER:** There was no cooking of the books.

The National Party has left this Government with a sound economy and one that is the envy of the rest of Australia. We do want continuing improvement to our education system, and there will certainly be support from this side of the House if the present Government is prepared to expand on the sound base that it inherited. In Australia today we lack any incentive to save. The answer to our overseas deficit lies not only in increased productivity, in adding value to our raw products, to our primary industries, but also in the level of our internal savings. That level of internal savings is equally important. Where in the Hawke/Keating economy, the Labor philosophy, is the incentive? Where in a high-tax, high-inflation economy is the incentive to save? What incentive is given to the workers of Australia? I might add that 99 per cent of Australians are workers. What incentive is given to people to provide that other support for our economy—to save, to expand the sound base that this Government has inherited?

With rational and reasoned protection of the environment, the Government has our full support. The former National Party Government took a leading role among the States of Australia in accepting that responsibility. The National Party Government gave Australia a typical lead in developing land-care strategies.

Yesterday, as I was driving down from my electorate, I heard on ABC radio an officer speaking on behalf of the Department of Primary Industries. He claimed that consumer demand for quality produce was a contributing factor to land degradation. Has anyone ever heard such nonsense? I wonder what the Minister thinks about that statement.



The quality of Queensland's primary produce is recognised worldwide. The Goss Labor Government should not be attempting to blame that quality and reputation for land degradation. I trust that, in the interests of the national economy, the Government will follow our lead in attacking land degradation.

His Excellency the Governor referred to a new accounting system for ministerial expenditure. From what I have heard of it, I respectfully suggest that it leaves very much to be desired. Time will tell. Likewise, the Government's three-month record in the conduct and structure of public life in Queensland leaves much to be desired.

It is a pity that there are not a few people in the press gallery. I well recall press coverage in every sector of the media virtually day after day when an officer from the drought secretariat within the Department of Primary Industries was transferred without any loss of pay or status to another position for which he was well qualified.

The people of Queensland should be told these facts and should ask these questions: since 2 December, how much coverage has been given in the media to the vindictive, spiteful treatment that has been afforded many senior departmental executives and ministerial staff through to the lower level of administrative assistants? Day after day and week after week nary a word has been said about that. However, dozens of highly skilled, dedicated public servants, many of whom were quite apolitical, were dispatched to empty rooms to do nothing. I say that with quite a degree of knowledge—more knowledge than those Government members who would snigger at that remark would have. Those people who were dispatched to empty rooms had previously been working for 12, 14 or 16 hours a day. If that is not typical of the tactics that were used by the Gestapo, then my recollection of those post-war stories is quite remiss.

Where have the media been? They like to call themselves the watchdog of fair play. Why have they not criticised those Gestapo-like tactics? Why have they not criticised the wilful waste of taxpayers' dollars? Why has there been such a lack of media integrity?

The Government is supposedly determined to ensure that all appointments to the Queensland public service are based strictly on merit. But what does the record show in regard to ministerial staff appointments? Let me make it unequivocally clear that I am not criticising the opportunities in any way whatsoever. The people who have been appointed and who took that opportunity deserve no criticism. I say good luck to them.

**Mr Beattie:** Hear, hear!

**Mr HARPER:** Let not the people of Queensland be misled into believing that the political records of those appointees did not at least play some part in their selection. That is not to criticise the individuals, but it is certainly to disagree with any claim that this Government has made to His Excellency that all appointments to the Queensland public service have been based strictly on merit, unless "merit" includes political affiliation.

**Mr Beattie:** Name one.

**Mr HARPER:** The honourable member will have an opportunity to debate this at a later stage.

Those appointments make a mockery of the Government's commitment to ensuring equality of opportunity. The Goss Labor Government has been talking about equality of opportunity for all Queenslanders. What a mockery! What a farce, when one considers this Government's three-month record!

**Mr Beattie:** Name one.

**Mr HARPER:** The honourable member knows perfectly well that I have a record of not naming individuals in this House. I am talking about this Government's responsibility and what it has done. I do not cast any aspersions on any individual. I say good luck to them. The honourable member agreed with me and said, "Yes, good luck to them." However, I am concerned about the role that the Goss Labor Government has taken in that regard.

**Mr Littleproud:** In time.

**Mr HARPER:** I agree that time is on the honourable member's side. I wish him good luck, too.

Those appointments make a mockery of this Government's commitment to ensuring equality of opportunity for all Queenslanders when experienced, capable staff are denied even the opportunity to apply for positions for which they are well qualified. I am not talking about the directors-general and deputy directors-general. One deputy director-general recognised me in the street and told me who he was. I said, "Yes, I know you." He said, "I have been a public servant for 27 years. I have always been apolitical. What happened after 2 December? I was put in a room with nothing to do." Where then are the Gestapo tactics?

What about the officer at very nearly equal level who was put in a room that did not even contain a desk, just a seat? Most of the officers were lucky in that they had a desk, but not much else. I am talking not only of senior executives, press secretaries or private secretaries but also of people right down the line to highly skilled, competent staff such as typists and stenographers. They were all treated in that way. Equal opportunity! What mockery! I wonder whether the Bill to ensure equal opportunity, to which His Excellency referred, will include among the range of grounds elimination of political discrimination.

I take this opportunity also to expose some of the false claims which have and will come from the present Government, a Government that, of its own volition, has done nothing constructive in its three months in office; claims that regional executives within the Department of Primary Industries give credit to Labor. This is just an example of what is happening right through the service, right down the line, with every one of the 18 Ministers. An article in the "Rural Mail" section of the *Courier-Mail* stated—

"This will be the first stage in the new policy of decentralisation planned by the Primary Industries Minister, Mr Casey."

It is typical *Courier-Mail* "Rural Mail" nonsense.

What we are talking about is the implementation of a policy determined and begun by the National Party Government during my term as Primary Industries Minister. Naturally enough, I give Mr Casey my support in the reasoned implementation of that policy. But why do the media and this Government not admit that all of these initiatives were in the pipeline and on their way to being implemented?

My loyalty and allegiance to the person of Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II has stood the test of time and, I might say, of action. In politics, action speaks louder than words. It is again my honour to pledge the allegiance of my constituents in the electorate of Auburn to the Throne, to the Crown and to the person of Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Mr Perrett): Before calling the honourable member for Greenslopes, I remind honourable members that this is his maiden speech and I ask that he be heard in silence.

**Mr FENLON** (Greenslopes) (4.26 pm): It is with great pride that I rise for the first time in this House to represent the people of Greenslopes. In doing so, I wish to indicate my concurrence with the motion that was moved by the honourable member for Mount Isa, Mr Tony McGrady, in reply to the Opening Speech of His Excellency the Governor.

Mr Deputy Speaker, I offer you my congratulations on your appointment to the panel of Temporary Chairmen. I also convey my congratulations and those of the electors of Greenslopes to the Speaker on his appointment to that office. The people of Greenslopes share my expectation that he will bring to this House the high standards that that office demands.

Mr Deputy Speaker, 2 December 1989 represents a very significant day in Queensland's history. It marks the day when the people of Queensland made a distinct decision to break from a mode of government that had dominated Queensland for the last 32 years and to move to a new and clearly different mode of government that will take Queensland toward the year 2000. The people of Greenslopes were very much a part of that tidal wave of change that swept the suburbs and provincial towns throughout this great State.

My own purpose in seeking election to the seat of Greenslopes was not only to be part of the actual process of changing the Government of this State but also to be part of the process of bringing about change itself. The change to which I refer is not just a change in the finetuning and the running of this State. For example, it is not just a change in what priority education is given in the overall Budget allocation from Treasury, even though such changes in priority in themselves are important. The change to which I refer is the change which goes to the heart of every public and private institution and affects every individual in this State. It is a change which goes to the heart of the Constitution upon which this Legislative Assembly is founded, for it is that Constitution which I believe has been neglected and violated over the past 32 years.

The Constitution of Queensland empowers this Parliament to make laws for the "peace, welfare and good government" of Queensland. At school I was not told of the existence of this Constitution, let alone these important core principles, and it has equally been the source of mystery to many other generations of Queensland's schoolchildren, because no importance has ever been attached by past Governments in this State to political education in its most basic forms for the benefit of future generations of Queensland voters. To allow children to pass from secondary school without possessing even the rudiments of a political education is an act of gross negligence for any Government. While it is easy to understand that a Government which bases its political practice upon the notions of fear, greed and ignorance would find it desirable to ensure that people are kept ill-informed about such fundamental matters, it is inexcusable that those previous Governments went to such pains to ensure that people were kept in ignorance of these matters.

Such education should not only be available for specialist study for those most interested but also be integral to the general school curriculum so that all students have access to this knowledge.

The Queensland Constitution and those three concepts of peace, welfare and good government embodied within our Constitution are fundamental to the conduct of our daily lives. It is sad to note that the Queensland Constitution is regarded as an obscure thing, rather than something which every schoolchild should know. This has resulted not only from omitting from schools the appropriate curriculum, but also it is due to deliberately banning appropriate material from schools. In March 1985 the National Party Government became the only Australian State Government to ban a 200-page volume designed to teach children about the High Court and the Australian Constitution. The curriculum was developed by the Commonwealth Schools Commission.

The Queensland Constitution consists of a series of Acts, Orders in Council and Letters Patent, which apply to the establishment of this State, its boundaries and a range of other matters. Since the abolition of the Legislative Council, the Constitution confers on the Queen, with the advice of the Legislative Assembly, sovereign power to make laws, including the power to amend the Constitution itself. As it stands today, the only guidance given as to the manner in which the powers of the Legislative Assembly may be exercised is contained within those words "peace, welfare and good government".

It is also significant that the interpretation and consideration of the weight of those words is not a matter for the courts but for the Legislative Assembly itself. This fact only adds to the onerous responsibility that members of this Legislative Assembly carry. While this House may indeed change the content of this Constitution, I believe that today greater acknowledgment must be given to its composition and to the standards which I hope that it sets for the making of laws and the conduct of Government generally.

The importance of the powers held by the Legislative Assembly must not be discounted and underplayed. They are substantial powers and have great potential, particularly in the sphere of social policy. While the Commonwealth Constitution contains specific heads of power, the States have sovereign law-making power and thus shape our lives in those areas not dealt with by the Commonwealth Constitution.

It is hoped that those words contained within the Constitution, which I interpret as sound standards to which legislators should adhere, should provide real guidance not only for legislators but also for the public in forming expectations and making legislators accountable. The Constitution itself, which I now hold, should be a document which is largely owned by and understood by the people to whom it applies. This is our Constitution.

It is the third of those standards under our Constitution that I now turn to, that is "good government". Good government in this sense must mean not only provision of good policies that are appropriate to the specific needs of the people and appropriate to the historical and economic circumstances; good government must mean the maintenance and health of the principal institutions which ensure that the principles of democracy in general and, the Westminster system of democracy in particular, are promulgated.

When I try to understand why Queensland slipped into the shameful malaise that we now know about for the past 32 years, I find myself returning to the observation that there was a lack of principles to guide Government practices. This lack extended not only to the level of such matters as ministerial expenses, but also to the most fundamental standards of the Parliament itself. I believe that ultimately we must look to an explanation in the great vacuum that was created where a Constitution for this State should have stood as an ultimate protection.

I come to this House with the hope that the vacuum that has been left where the Constitution should have proudly stood will be replaced by thoughtful and thorough consideration by legislators of how those same words may impel a Government to act wisely and properly in the interests of the people who are subject to the laws and administration of that Government. Government is about the exercise of power. Good Government is about the exercise of that power in forms and through institutions the nature of which are determined by all the people of the State.

I believe that Mr Fitzgerald's conclusions about the Queensland electoral system contributing to a poor state of Government in Queensland illustrates a fundamental cause of the sickness in our institutions. The zonal system in Queensland is far removed from the notion of all the people determining the conduct of government in this State. In fact, I will argue that any form of zonal system is anathema to this principle embodied within our Constitution. For all the people to have that say in their own destiny, one vote, one value must be the natural conclusion and the only foundation to provide good government. This is the most fundamental challenge that lies before the Electoral and Administrative Review Commission. Voting is not only about political representation in an electorate; it is about an equal right to determine how political power is exercised.

In his opening of this Parliament His Excellency the Governor referred to his Government's priorities in implementing the reforms recommended by the Fitzgerald commission of inquiry so that Queensland electoral laws may be restructured and the next election can be contested on fair and honest boundaries. In pursuing this process let us not lose sight of that concept of good government and how Queensland people should be provided with the mechanisms to ensure the fair and honest exercise of political power.

Those other salient words, "peace" and "welfare", will also warrant most deliberate consideration in future. I am sure that the meanings originally ascribed to those words when our Constitution was created in the last century may be viewed differently today due to a procession of historical circumstances over the last century.

There are circumstances which have led youth to praise peace and reject war; to appreciate peace within our own bodies and minds; to see the peace that can only be found in the wilderness of this great State threatened and violated; to see the peace of our urban environment intruded upon by all manner of motorised and electronic devices; to see the development of a welfare system so expansive and institutionalised to an extent that would have been difficult to imagine 100 years ago; and to consider the substance of welfare today in the light of massive new demands upon the welfare system, such as those imposed by the advent of the AIDS virus. These are some of the deeper considerations that this Government must face, and I believe that the Labor Party to which I belong has, at its foundations, the principles which will enable its members to address these problems in a most deliberate manner.

There are three fundamental themes which I believe provide the bases for most of our policies and which unite our membership. The first is a sense of optimism. This is a sense that things can be changed for the better. It is a sense that completely unsatisfactory situations should not be accepted and maintained and that they can be overcome in the course of time. It is a sense of optimism that sound institutions can be built in our society, minimising corruption and inequality. While door-knocking in my electorate, far too often I was told by constituents that we must accept corruption in its present form because it is the nature of individuals in general, and politicians in particular, to become corrupt and remain so. The extent to which this belief has become prevalent is a very sad indictment of the society we have formed.

I am very proud to be part of a movement which advocates a distinct break from the past and which believes that we can do better and can forge institutions and create standards of practice by individuals that are beyond reproach. Unless we adopt this as our dominant view, the society that we leave to future generations will not be worth leaving.

Second, I believe that Labor philosophy embodies a sense of common social responsibility for welfare and the action of the economy. This consists of a clear acknowledgment and an acceptance that individuals and groups will exist in our society who will require varying forms and degrees of assistance in order to obtain a reasonable quality of life and an equitable opportunity to compete for education and work in this society. Combined with this consideration is a sense that the operation of the economy has historically shown itself to be dynamic, if not turbulent, both within Australia and at an international level. It is a sense and an acceptance that all participants within the economic system share a common responsibility if this form of producing goods and services is to continue. It is from this foundation that I am proud to say that my party strives for a cooperative approach to industrial relations in this country, and it is one which will in the future provide a cooperative approach to industrial relations in this State.

Such a cooperative approach is at the foundation of our policy which, in the sphere of industrial relations, proposes the adoption of the recommendations of the inquiry into industrial relations in Queensland headed by Mr Ian Hanger, QC. The thrust of those recommendations establishes a framework of industrial law which provides for clear and accessible standards of industrial regulation and a strengthening of the institutions and processes in a way that will be conducive to greater cooperation between employers and their own organisations and organised labour.

These laws alone cannot hope to maintain industrial stability and the conditions for a healthy economy. In conjunction with these laws there must exist a sound relationship between Government, unions and business. The existence of such a cooperative relationship in the Federal sphere speaks for itself in terms of the role that it has obviously played in the course of economic recovery. We can only speculate as to the benefits that have been missed in the past because Governments in Queensland for many years prior to 2 December 1989 found any form of cooperative relationship in this vein completely abhorrent.

The future health of the Queensland economy lies in its ability to be restructured and realigned by various mechanisms so that it is able to compete within the national and international marketplace. This will require very fine tuning, determination and creativity. These are attributes that cannot be gained by wielding the blunt axe of confrontation that has been wielded in the past. These are attributes that can only be found in a subtle and painstaking approach and, most importantly, through cooperative effort. This Government must in future play an important role in facilitating these efforts and providing the institutions and support to enable this process to occur. It is no trivial matter; our future depends on it.

The third element of Labor's philosophy, I believe, is embodied in a sense of our place in the broad continuum of history—past, present and future. This is born from a consciousness that the society we have inherited today is a society which has been forged over many generations of men and women who have asserted their will to have a say in their own destiny. It is also the subjugation of that will in the course of history to the sometimes turbulent and ruthless forces of history that have resulted in wars and various other forms of oppression. The democratic tradition that has evolved is valued highly by my party. We cannot expect to appreciate the future unless we respect and understand the processes of the past.

We stand at this point as a tiny speck in the vast continuum of history. Yet it is from this point that we, as legislators, must maintain a vision of the future. We must appreciate the scope of our decisions and we must be humbled by the prospect of affecting so many future generations.

In making laws that affect this State, we must not simply think of this generation or the next, we must think of the next 10 generations, the next 100 generations and the next 1 000 generations. I believe that these considerations are most pertinent for our future decisions that concern the natural environment. While some laws that Governments make are very temporal in nature, affecting for instance the erection or demolition of a building, decisions that affect our natural environment have a much longer term effect—a permanent effect. Decisions in this area should not be clouded by the exigencies of the present dollar value upon which the decision is calculated. A fresh, new and absolutely honest outlook is required.

Government decision-making regarding projects that may affect our natural environment inevitably come back to a dollar calculation. This is often appointed as a dollar calculation of a sale of some asset or the acquisition of some future cash flow as a consequence of some form of development. We must break from this past in a distinct manner by asking and seeking an answer to one simple question. That question is: what is the value of that part of the natural environment that may be lost as a consequence of the development in question? Every natural resource has some value that may be assigned as a consequence of its preservation in the present and the future in its natural state. One may indeed scoff today at the notion that the British colonisers of Australia declared that this country was practically unoccupied by settled inhabitants, thus deriding their value and their status. I hope that we may direct equal ridicule in the future at those who declare that a pristine environment in this State has no value unless it is realised by some form of exchange of money and resources which results in its development and destruction. Both of these notions are borne from the same arrogant and naive outlook upon the world. Let us debate the derivation of these values in the future. Let us assign these values in future, for it is only by these means that we can achieve truly balanced development.

I now turn to the Greenslopes electorate itself, to the hopes and ideals of the Greenslopes men and women and to how I hope to achieve change on their behalf in the course of this Forty-sixth Parliament. The electorate of Greenslopes is a densely populated urban community. It spans an area of 12 square kilometres and encompasses the suburbs of Camp Hill, Coorparoo, Greenslopes, Holland Park, Holland Park West, Tarragindi and Wellers Hill. In 1989, 21 363 voters were enrolled in that electorate, of whom over 55 per cent were women. The electorate is largely residential with relatively

small pockets of light industry and various pockets of retail and local service industry. At the time of the 1986 census, people in the 30 to 39-year-old age group were the largest single group in the area. At the same time there was a change from the 1981 census which showed a significant population increase in the over 60-year-old age group. I would not care to speculate strongly upon the trends in population since 1986, but I believe from my own experiences that many young families have moved into the electorate in recent years. As the elected representative of the people of Greenslopes, I must therefore be highly conscious of the diverse needs of the young and the elderly in this area. Greenslopes is also very diverse in socioeconomic terms. Much of this diversity stems from its geography. It is a very hilly electorate and consequently the types of dwelling vary according to their proximity to a hilltop. Housing in the electorate varies from extremely small Housing Commission units to some very large and grand Queensland homes, many of which were built early this century.

In voting for change on 2 December 1989, I believe the electors of Greenslopes were moved by a range of general issues that affect all Queenslanders, as well as a range of specific local issues that affect their community. The most significant of these local issues are under the heading of "Local transport and social planning", particularly within the Coorparoo area. Unfortunately, the past has been marked by a lack of consultation, an ad hoc approach to the resolution of local problems, an inability to address the divergent views and needs of the community and a reluctance to make fundamental decisions. Much of the concern relates to the now mythical Coorparoo flyover project. The stories surrounding this project and the confusion and alarm that it has created in the local community over a number of years have left local people to wonder whether fairies, elves and dragons might have also resided under this structure. I would like to provide a brief history of this matter and then leave the fear and confusion associated with it far behind.

For many years—probably since its construction—the Cavendish Road railcrossing has presented a problem to local people because of traffic congestion and the dangers to traffic and pedestrians that it presents. Consequently, there has been a history of attempts to deal with the crossing and even to have it eliminated. As I understand it, for years that crossing was on the top of the priority list for the elimination of railway crossings round the State. In 1988, after joint deliberations by the Brisbane City Council and the State Government, a proposal for a solution to the Cavendish Road railcrossing was unveiled. That unveiling occurred without any real community consultation and the proposal consisted of a single concept for a flyover without any consideration of alternatives, and it was presented more or less as a fait accompli. The proposal was not made readily accessible to local people because it was available for viewing only at the Main Roads office in the city.

Thus commenced a period of uncertainty and disquiet within the community of Coorparoo. In September 1988, after representations to Cabinet from the previous member for Greenslopes, the proposal was shelved and the then Minister for Main Roads, Mr Gunn, claimed that alternatives would be investigated.

I have made it clear that I have always agreed with the rationale for the abandonment of the flyover proposal—proffered by the previous member for Greenslopes—in that it provided for a freeway-type development through Coorparoo. There were never any realistic answers presented as to what would happen to the traffic moving to and from the flyover development. For the ensuing 15 months, the State Government made no concrete moves whatsoever to allay the fears of local people, to consider any alternative solutions or to show that it was serious in any way about providing a solution to local traffic problems.

In May 1989, the situation became even cloudier in the minds of local people when the Liberal alderman for Camp Hill, in a fit of inspiration, claimed in an announcement in the *Courier-Mail* of 22 May that the transport planning committee, consisting of State Government Ministers and the Lord Mayor, had decided to go ahead with the flyover proposal. The handling of this matter from beginning to end has been completely

unsympathetic to the disruptive consequences that have been caused to the daily lives of local people.

The change that I will bring to the treatment of this local issue is as distinct as the change that this Government is bringing to practically every area of Government administration. Today, when people ask me what is happening to the flyover proposal, I provide the answer that should have been given to local residents 10 years ago. I now respond to residents and say that I am working on the establishment of a local plan for the Coorparoo area to cater for its transport and social needs. I have commenced this planning process with the Transport Minister, David Hamill, and I have made it very clear to local people that a real consultation process will be fundamental to the achievement of such a plan and its implementation. I do not pretend that this will be an easy task. Essentially we are setting out to plan for the way in which the people of Coorparoo and the surrounding suburbs will interact with each other and how they will travel and engage in recreation, commerce, education and day-to-day living for many years to come.

I hope that planners and politicians from all levels will sit down together for the first time, look at the community's needs for years to come and address the various competing interests to achieve the best possible plan for the area. We have now moved forward from the era where the dominant mentality was that planning consisted of drawing new and bigger roads on a map. Planning must now be a subtle and delicate exercise of providing a social and commercial environment which adds quality to the daily lives of people in the community—not one that detracts from them.

I issue a challenge to all interested groups within the area to come together to develop a vision of the future that will best service the needs of the community at large. It is a challenge to work together, to be creative and to look to the future. There is a range of planning concerns in the local area which we must confront. We must not arrive at a planning solution for the local area that creates an even greater number of planning problems for the local community. Transport considerations are of widespread concern throughout the electorate. This is the case whether it be in relation to public transport needs or, for example, problems with so-called rat runners taking advantage of short-cuts through local suburban streets.

One of the more substantial problems which causes concern to many of my electors stems from the South East Freeway, which runs through the southern end of the Greenslopes electorate. Since the South East Freeway was constructed, the volume and velocity of traffic along it has increased substantially. The resultant noise vibration and pollution has consequently increased. When the South East Freeway was constructed, noise abatement measures that in more recent freeway constructions have been given greater attention were never contemplated. As a result, today the lives of many residents in the proximity of the South East Freeway are intruded upon day and night by noise pollution and vibration.

I am able to report that the Transport Minister, David Hamill, and I have spent time in this area with local residents walking through their yards and sitting in their houses to gain a greater appreciation of these problems. Again, there will be no easy or overnight solution, but I understand that Mr Hamill and his department are currently developing a policy in relation to noise abatement measures that may be taken by this Government in such cases. We must do all that we can to improve the quality of life for people who live in this area. Many of them lived in the area long before the freeway was ever contemplated, yet today their quality of life is shattered and their health is affected.

Another problem pertaining to noise pollution faces people in the northern end of the Greenslopes electorate. This time it pertains to air traffic in the flight path of the Brisbane Airport. Planning for the current airport goes back to the days of the Fraser Liberal Federal Government. However, there are important planning decisions to be made in the future with respect to the construction of alternative runways which, it is hoped, will alleviate such problems for residents within the city area. Consideration of



matters such as these, where noise and pollution intrude upon the daily lives of ordinary people living in the suburbs of Brisbane, takes me back to my earlier comments in relation to the Queensland Constitution, in particular, to that word "peace".

As legislators, perhaps we should in future be cognisant of that word "peace" and what it means to the urban environment. It is in this sense that the peace that the community should be entitled to enjoy is being violated by forces beyond its control. This violation comes in the form of aircraft or cars which intrude upon the quality of life. As legislators, we must therefore consider our obligations to ensure that in the future these problems are corrected .

A great sense of peace may be found at the southern end of the Greenslopes electorate, which in some parts encompasses, and in other parts borders upon, the Toohey forest area. The existence of such a great area of forest within the city area is a magnificent resource, not only because it provides a beautiful relief to our urban environment but also because it provides scope for recreation and a buffer to clean the air that we breathe.

Toohey Forest is subject to the ownership and control of a number of land-owners. As such it has never had a comprehensive management plan that has the full force of State law. Prior to the election, the now Minister for Environment, Pat Comben, and I joined to promise the people who live in the vicinity of Toohey Forest, in particular, that a future Labor Government would set about the establishment of a comprehensive management plan that would carry the full force of State law. I am pleased to say that work on this matter is soon to commence and the result will be a framework which gives the forest area substantial protection and guarantees the various land-owners and users a role in its ongoing management and preservation.

I now turn to a range of other social and cultural needs of the community within the Greenslopes electorate and to say how I hope that those needs will be met in future. There is one matter in this regard that requires particular mention as it, too, has been a source of much mystery and some controversy. That matter concerns the Queen Alexandra Home community centre, which consists essentially of a building located on Old Cleveland Road, Coorparoo, beside the Coorparoo State School and the Coorparoo College of Technical and Further Education. It is one of the oldest dwellings in Coorparoo, and was at one state an orphanage. It is a beautiful building, with large spacious rooms, and if utilised and managed appropriately, is potentially a great resource for the community. The irony of the usage of the words "community centre" attached to the title of this building is that few people within the community had any idea of what was going on within the building and various groups who over the years attempted to gain access to use the building were flatly refused. As a result, this magnificent resource has been grossly underutilised and potential usage by the various community groups lost.

While many of the mysteries surrounding the establishment and conduct of this institution are still being unravelled in my own mind, certain conclusions are now abundantly clear. It is apparent that the local community had very little real input into the management and direction of the Queen Alexandra Home community centre.

Again, I must emphasise the change that has occurred—the distinct break with the past characterised by the politicisation of the various arms of Government administration and resources. It is my intention as the member for Greenslopes to ensure that this resource is clearly handed over to the community for community usage, control and direction. I wish to make it absolutely clear that I do not intend to attempt to prohibit any of the current users of this facility from using it. Indeed, there are many fine citizens of the local area who currently use that facility and use it to good effect. It is fundamental that those people have a say in its future use and that the facilities are well coordinated as part of an array of local community services.

There are a substantial number of schools within the Greenslopes electorate, public and private. Without detailing the various needs that are apparent at each school, I will simply note that the greatest need for the future for local schools is sound planning. For example, parents from the Coorparoo State School have approached me with a view to

the establishment of a pre-school. This will require careful consideration and cooperation between the various interest groups in the Coorparoo area. I hope to bring together all of the people with an interest in this issue to make sure that our planning decisions are sound ones.

Police stations in and adjacent to the electorate require substantial upgrading. The facilities are old and cramped. I hope that, with this Government's concept of community policing, we will see a greater local coverage of officers at these stations.

In conclusion, there are many people whom I must thank for their efforts and support over the years, and particularly during the 1989 election campaign. Most important of those are my parents—my father, Bernie, and my now deceased dear mother, Doreen, who gave me so very much; my wife, Dianne, who married me even though I had just been elected to Parliament; my sister, Pam Moss, her husband, Peter, and their girls, Michelle and Danielle, who supported me whenever the need arose; my local executive and the hundreds of party members; my colleagues from the Queensland Nurses Union; and friends and supporters who helped in many different ways in the course of our campaign.

I also wish to pay tribute to Bob Lauchlan, who was a previous candidate for the seat of Greenslopes and who passed away during the campaign. On a Saturday morning when he was due to join us on a corner street stall, his wife discovered that he had passed away in his sleep.

There is one family that symbolises all of that effort and commitment over the 1989 campaign. I refer to my campaign director, Linda Holliday, her husband, Richard, and their son, Nicholas, who started school at the Coorparoo State School this year. The Hollidays made their family home our campaign office; and Linda's parents, Alec and Ethel Chervin, also staffed the phones.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

**Hon. D. M. WELLS** (Murrumba—Attorney-General) (5.07 p.m.): Mr Speaker, I move—

"That the honourable member for Greenslopes be further heard."

Motion agreed to.

**Mr FENLON:** Nicholas Holliday probably knows more about the art and science of political campaigning now than most five-year-olds at the Coorparoo State School. If justice prevails, he will also learn about our Constitution before he completes primary school.

**Mr PERRETT** (Barambah) (5.07 p.m.): In rising to speak to the amendment moved to the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply, let me thank my electors in Barambah for their overwhelming support for me in the recent election. On their behalf, I express our allegiance to the Queen and her worthy representative in Queensland, His Excellency Sir Walter Campbell.

As I have listened to the speeches in the Address in Reply debate, one thing has come through loud and clear. The theme seems to be that there has been 32 years of neglect. I warn all those people who have been singing that tune that sooner or later even the most popular of tunes falls from the top of the hit parade. I suggest that we should start to see some action soon.

Today I want to speak on a very important subject and, in so doing, report to the House on the plight of the family farm, particularly in relation to the grain industry. The viability of the family farm has been eroded away by ever-increasing input costs, record inflation levels and immoral interest rates. The monetary and fiscal policies of those economic vandals in Canberra are the fatal blow for an industry that has been a major contributor to the Australian economy. Farmers, small-business people and home-buyers cannot withstand this economic onslaught any longer. The Federal Government has not done anything of substance to solve the diabolical trouble that rural industries are in. Farmers have sacrificed enough to help the Federal Government's fight against inflation. They are being hurt by mountains of debt and interest rates of up to 24 per cent. We hear so often about the record housing interest rates, but many honourable members would not realise that farmers are hit with a high-risk category interest rate, resulting in many of them having to pay up to 24 per cent.

Serious questions surrounding the future of the rural sector have to be raised. A cloud of uncertain future hangs above the head of today's farmer, with no relief in sight from cost/price pressures. Many farmers have existed under adverse economic circumstances for a long period, but the crunch has come. They can no longer afford to find capital for the replacement of plant, for improving efficiency, or for maintaining the soil in an arable state. On the eve of the Federal election we are hearing so much about the environment, but nobody in the Government has dared to mention the devastation of rural lands which is being brought about by Labor's economic policies. Farmers are being forced to overutilise their land in an effort to meet interest bills. Farming land is being double-cropped instead of fallowed and grazing land is being overstocked. Fertiliser subsidies have been discontinued and drought assistance has been cut. All this means that, as the soil is not being maintained in an arable, state soil degradation is accentuated.

It is a joke when \$40m was wasted on a referendum and Federal politicians' postage allowance was increased by \$4.5m in the 1988-89 year, yet in the same period only \$10.6m was allocated to the national soil conservation program.

**Mr Littleproud:** The Hawke Government spent more money on landscaping Parliament House in Canberra than on soil conservation in one year.

**Mr PERRETT:** That is right. That was in the previous year. The Hawke Government spent \$6m on soil conservation—

**Mr Comben** interjected.

**Mr Littleproud** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! Honourable members, I cannot hear the honourable member speaking.

**Mr PERRETT:** The previous year the Hawke Government spent \$6m on the soil conservation program, yet it spent \$5m on landscaping around the new Parliament House in Canberra. It is a sham.

Many farmers have now come to the end of the road financially. There is no light at the end of the tunnel. While many rural industries are on the verge of collapse, some secondary industries are being feather-bedded beyond any reasonable level. I mention in particular the peanut industry, because the heart of that industry is in Kingaroy, where I come from. Cheap peanuts from China, Zimbabwe and other places are coming in and undercutting prices on the local market. Farmers are facing not only the imposition of record interest rates but also having to cope with ever-increasing shire rates, commissions, handling charges and freight rates—and so the list goes on. Farmers are confused and frustrated by predictions that big export opportunities are opening up overseas or that interest rates are about to fall, only to see those predictions fail to materialise. To survive, many farmers lifted their game in terms of managerial skills.

Today's farmer is basically competent and produces a quality product. He seeks to achieve continuity of production and to keep production costs to a minimum. He chooses enterprises suited to his particular property and he attempts to diversify his business structure. He seeks a capital structure which protects his business from industry fluctuations. He develops his managerial ability through experience, acquiring new information and using and cooperating with other people associated with rural industry. He is active in industry matters such as farm unity, rural education and marketing, which affect his survival.

For many farmers, achievement of management objectives has not been easy, but all the managerial skills in the world are of no use if the ledger is weighted against them. In the rural industry, many are only surviving by continually cutting costs, living off capital and maybe seeking part-time employment away from the farm. We should not be satisfied with that definition of survival. Governments have a responsibility to ensure

stability in rural industries. If they do not, all Australians will suffer through an ever-increasing deficit in the balance of trade and increasing prices on supermarket shelves.

For the last two decades, agricultural farmers have been sitting on a time bomb about to explode. For many, particularly grain-farmers, this bomb has now exploded, triggered by Federal economic strategies. Commodity returns have now been superseded by production costs. No longer can farmers cope with adverse seasonal fluctuations such as drought or floods. Farm input costs for 1989-90 are forecast to be 8 per cent higher than the previous year, with total spending being approximately \$20 billion. High interest rates are affecting farm costs directly by increasing the cost of borrowing and, indirectly, through higher costs to firms supplying farm inputs. Fertiliser for the same period will be up by 4 per cent on the previous year to a whopping \$1,190m. This follows a massive 24 per cent increase the previous year.

In 1988-89, the total value of Australia's agricultural production was \$22 billion, generating \$15.5 billion in overseas revenue for the Australian economy, accounting for 40 per cent of all exports, furnishing a major source of economic activity, growth and employment for the nation's service and manufacturing industries and sustaining an estimated one million jobs in the urban areas, where 85 per cent of the population resides.

Australia, which is a nation of 16 million people, produces enough food and fibre to meet the needs of more than 50 million human beings worldwide. The typical Australian farm sustains the needs of 300 individuals. That record is unmatched by any other nation, yet our farmers are being reduced to peasant class. We are losing our farmers at the rate of more than 1 000 per year Australiawide. We now have 165 000 farms, compared with 205 000 40 years ago. The great majority of those farms are owner operated or known as family farms.

Family farms are a tradition in Australia. Many of them have been in the same family for generations. They have kept the family unit together and have been a ready-made source of employment for many young people when they have completed their schooling. How long can the family farm survive? How long can it survive current brutal interest rates and trade policies? Simply put, there is no light at the end of the tunnel.

During the eight years to the end of the 1988-89 financial year farm costs increased dramatically. Some of those increases include fertiliser, which increased by 57 per cent. Fuel costs rose by 52 per cent; plant maintenance, 92 per cent; buildings and fencing, 69 per cent; farm insurance, 47 per cent; agricultural chemicals 56 per cent; electricity, 84 per cent; replacement machinery and farm plant, 104 per cent; rates and taxes, 114 per cent; interest paid, a whopping 152 per cent and marketing costs, 65 per cent.

**Mr Mackenroth:** The previous State Government did a terrible job, didn't they?

**Mr PERRETT:** Most of those increases were caused by the Federal Government.

During the same period, one in six farms had a negative income. The situation is now far worse and has reached desperate proportions. During the past quarter century farm costs have risen by a massive 690 per cent, while during the very same period the price that the farmer receives for his produce has improved by only 316 per cent. It can thus be seen that farm costs have inflated at more than twice the rate of commodity prices. Australian farmers have had to achieve enormous increases in production in order to survive and continue to expand their output. Farm productivity has continued to increase by a steady 2.3 per cent per year, which is more than twice the rate achieved in the Australian economy as a whole. One cannot question the ability of the Australian farmer to compete if he is given a fair go, but out of it all is emerging a peasant class. The problem is not only one for the farmers but also for their creditors.

Banks and lending institutions have generally been as tolerant as possible, but they now appear to be becoming nervous at the worsening situation. Following very low incomes in recent years, particularly for grain-farmers, many farmers are technically

insolvent because they are unable to service and repay outstanding debts. That debt-servicing problem stems principally from a combination of record interest rates and low commodity prices, with poor seasonal conditions compounding the problem in some districts. Sorghum prices being offered to growers at the moment are the same as they were 10 years ago, yet seed prices have continued to rise by more than 15 per cent per year. Total production costs have risen by more than 10 per cent per year.

If badly handled, the forced sale of farms caused by foreclosure, the withdrawal of credit facilities or other means has the potential to collapse land prices, thereby affecting the collateral base of all rural lending and the equity position of many currently secure farmers. As well, growing media interest makes the public relations and political implications of creditor action very sensitive. At present, the land market in debt-affected areas is almost stagnant and sales, which are a normal part of any adjustment, are not occurring. Although buyers are waiting, sales are few because of the uncertainty associated with continuing high interest rates and an expectation that land prices may collapse further.

A cooperative arrangement between creditors and farmers should be established to signal a bottoming of the land market and encourage potential buyers to begin purchasing land. In turn that will assist the sale of properties when there is no reasonable chance of a business being able to recover. As well, those sales will enable farm build-up where necessary to re-establish viability.

As borrowing from conventional sources becomes more difficult and costly, farmers increasingly use the credit of local suppliers. This puts enormous pressures on businesspeople in rural areas. Country towns are severely affected. Small-businesses become unprofitable and unsaleable, and many are closing down. There is no real employment for young people in country areas. Most of them have to migrate to the larger towns and cities to find employment, otherwise they are left with no option other than to go on the dole.

From 1984 to 1988, 1 100 farm machinery dealerships closed down across Australia and the industry retrenched 29 000 employees overall. Other industries associated with the rural sector are suffering similar fates. There is an increasing shortage of available experienced seasonal labour, yet unemployment levels in the agricultural industry have been high during the 1980s. The effects of wage increases and the advent of labour-saving technology have brought a decline in the number of people employed directly in agriculture.

Farmers are working longer hours. Some are working double the national average of 36 hours per week, and many have not had a holiday for years. Wives are increasingly spending more time in the field in an endeavour to make ends meet. Because they cannot afford to, fewer young people are entering the industry, and prospects for a secure future no longer exist.

There has been a gradual decline in the numbers of people living in many rural areas. Very often this leads to the withdrawal of essential services such as hospitals, schools, courthouses, railways, police, etc. Many children now growing up in areas away from the larger rural centres have far less opportunity than their counterparts in the cities. To gain their education, many have to spend long hours travelling to and from school by bus and many have to attend boarding school at an early age. There is a lack of entertainment for young people and, because facilities are not available, they do not get the same chance as other children to develop their skills in sport and the arts.

Shops such as draperies and hardware stores are typical of those closing down. Grocery stores have been replaced by imitations of the big city supermarkets. In many towns, the butcher and the baker are also remnants of the past. Bread is baked in the cities and transported to the smaller towns. Mainly because of high transport costs, prices of groceries and other essential goods are higher in the country. Increasing fuel prices are also creating great difficulties for many. As people in the country have no alternative means of transport and have long distances to travel, fuel is one of life's

necessities, and any price increase flows on directly through increases in the cost of goods purchased and increases in the cost of freighting produce to market.

Deteriorating roads in the country are a major concern. With their contribution to Federal Government revenue through fuel taxes, rural residents expected and were entitled to better roads. It is an indictment of Federal Government policy that roads have been allowed to deteriorate to the extent they have. Once again, that demonstrates the contempt that the current Federal Government has for country people.

To many, country living is an ideal existence, but it hides the dreadful problems of poverty, deprivation and social and economic immobility. There can be no doubt that the tough economic situation is taking a heavy toll on the family unit. It is particularly hard on the women and children. As a result of the deepening rural crisis, many country women feel a loss of dignity and hopelessness and feel like seven-day-a-week peasants. There is no doubt that living standards are falling. Quite often, women ring my office in tears to talk about what is happening to their life's work as they see it going down the drain and can do nothing about it. Children, too, are suffering and are often deprived of tertiary education because their parents cannot afford it. Because of the asset test for their parents—parents who may be asset-rich yet money poor—most do not qualify for Austudy. In some cases, children have blamed their parents for their problems and regard their parents as failures.

Where do farmers go and what do they do? Further borrowing will not help; it will only compound the problem. All farmers ask for is a fair go and a fair and equitable price for their produce, which is surely not too much to ask. Clearly, no progress has been made towards creating conditions of stability, security and confidence in the rural sector, even though in recent years there has been much talk. There is a lack of confidence in the ability of Governments and politicians to handle the situation.

In my electorate of Barambah, the situation is extremely desperate. The problem has been enhanced by eight consecutive abnormal seasons. Farmers have been coming to me for help and advice. They have nowhere to go in these times of despair. Almost every day I hear of someone else who has gone to the wall or whose bankers will no longer give credit. Many have tried to sell but cannot, and interest payments are still accruing at alarming rates. Land values have fallen. Some have no option but to walk away with nothing. Then the future is bleak, with no real prospects of finding employment, as they are either too old or unskilled in other trades or professions.

The South Burnett is one of the State's most fertile and versatile areas. It is Australia's leading producer of peanuts and navy beans and, given a fair go, has the ability to recover fairly quickly from its current situation. The Primary Industries Minister, Mr Casey, is aware of the situation, as he recently met with the Burnett farmers' task force, which was established last year, at a meeting convened by my colleague the member for Burnett, Mr Slack, and me. The task force was established to look at and advise on means of assistance for farmers and small-businesspeople in the area. To date the assistance forthcoming has been of a bandaid nature only. I thank the former Premier, Mr Ahern, and Primary Industries Ministers Harper and Stoneman for the assistance that they gave the farmers in the Burnett. What is required are guarantees of a decent return on investment through fair market prices.

Other areas, too, are verging on the same catastrophe as that besetting the farmers and businesspeople in the Burnett. It must be halted now. If the situation is allowed to continue, or even worsen, Queenslanders will be the losers. Queensland has many billions of dollars invested in its rural and associated industries. If Queensland is to prosper and the present level of unemployment is to be reduced, it is paramount that we rescue primary industry, and do it immediately. We must create opportunities in rural areas and retain essential services. Despite numerous pleas, the Federal Government has not acted. To the contrary, the situation has been allowed to worsen.

The Queensland Government should step in now with a full inquiry into the future of the family farm. We need a full economic study of rural industries and then some definite action taken to ensure a viable future for the State's farmers. If it is good enough

to appoint Tony Fitzgerald to hold an inquiry into the future of logging on Fraser Island, where little more than 100 jobs are at stake, it should be even more important to ensure the future of our rural industries. I call on the Premier, Mr Goss, and Primary Industries Minister, Mr Casey, to instigate a full inquiry immediately and to take steps to ensure the future of all sections of rural industry.

Debate, on motion of Mr Mackenroth, adjourned.

### SPECIAL ADJOURNMENT

**Hon. T. M. MACKENROTH** (Chatsworth—Leader of the House) (5.31 p.m.): I move—

"That the House, at its rising, do adjourn until 8 p.m. this day and that Government business only shall be transacted at that sitting."

**Mr BORBIDGE** (Surfers Paradise—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (5.32 p.m.): Opposition members have no qualms about coming back at 8 o'clock tonight after the special meeting of members in respect of the Senate vacancy. However, our concern is that, without consultation, the Government and the Leader of the House have effectively decided to dispose of Standing Order 67. This House will have no question-time, despite the fact that when the House resumes sitting, it will be another day's sitting. I presume, Mr Speaker, that at that time the Sergeant at Arms will escort you into the Chamber, that you will read prayers, and that then Government business will take precedence. Once again the Opposition in this Parliament is being denied the opportunity to question Ministers.

The Leader of the House, the Robespierre of the Queensland Parliament, the man who was going to bring in this new era of democracy, once again is preventing members of the Opposition, and members of his own Government, directing questions to Ministers.

In this adjournment debate it is not my intention to talk at length. However, I want to express the very strong concern of the Opposition that when the House resumes later tonight, we will again be deprived of question-time during a session of Parliament which, in terms of members of Parliament having the opportunity to ask questions, would be the most pitiful on record.

It is simply not good enough. The Opposition will not divide the House and eat up the time of the adjournment debate. However, I express the Opposition's deep concern at the absolute contempt with which we are continually being treated by the Leader of the House who, just a couple of weeks ago, indicated it was time that the Parliament of this State operated properly.

**Mr FitzGerald:** That was on TV.

**Mr BORBIDGE:** On TV, as the member for Lockyer said. Let it be a matter of public record that in the time that the Leader of the House has been in charge of proceedings, the time that this Government has been attempting to run this Parliament, there has never been a more difficult time for members of the Opposition to ask basic questions. It is an absolute farce.

**Hon. T. M. MACKENROTH** (Chatsworth—Leader of the House) (5.34 p.m.), in reply: Although Opposition members complain that they do not receive sufficient time for questions, I point out that this morning this House witnessed the farcical situation of the Opposition, on an allotted day, seeking leave to move a motion which, in effect, wasted question-time. Opposition members were the ones who chose to seek leave of this House to debate a motion on an allotted day when question-time—

**Mr Borbidge:** You gagged us again. Parliament is a farce.

**Mr MACKENROTH:** The Opposition's argument is that it does not get sufficient time for questions, yet this morning Opposition members wanted to debate a motion which would have cut out the entire question-time.

What members should look at when the House resumes tonight is why this motion needs to be moved now. If the Opposition was prepared to play the game properly, the House would not be faced with this problem. Tonight members would be meeting to debate——

**Mr Borbidge** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Surfers Paradise will cease interjecting.

**Mr MACKENROTH:** Tonight members would be meeting to debate the very important question of who will represent this State in the Senate.

**Mr Borbidge** interjected.

**Mr MACKENROTH:** If the honourable member's party had played the game, that is the business that would have been debated tonight, but the situation is——

**Mr Borbidge** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Surfers Paradise was heard when he spoke. I warn him under Standing Order 123A to cease interjecting.

**Mr MACKENROTH:** The position is that the honourable member's party chose not to meet the requirements of this House.

**Mr Stephan:** When was the last time?

**Mr MACKENROTH:** The last time we nominated someone, you fools put someone else in. The reality is that the Government is going to allow the Opposition to make its nomination for the Senate when, under the law, at 7.30 tonight the Government could nominate someone else. We will not do that.

The reason why there will not be a question-time tonight is that it is Opposition members who have caused this House to go through the procedure in of having to set down a separate day. The reality is that the Government will decide the business of this House and not the Opposition. It is time that Opposition members realised that they no longer sit on this side of the Chamber. They are going to have to learn to cop it.

Motion agreed to.

#### ADJOURNMENT

**Hon. T. M. MACKENROTH** (Chatsworth—Leader of the House) (5.36 p.m.): I move—

"That the House do now adjourn."

#### Queensland Recreation Council

**Mrs WOODGATE** (Pine Rivers) (5.37 p.m.): I rise today to pay tribute to the Queensland Recreation Council, which is the State Government agency responsible for the development and promotion of community leisure services and facilities for all Queenslanders.

The Pine Rivers/Redcliffe office of the Queensland Recreation Council is one of a total of 23 offices operating through the State. Each office employs an area recreation adviser supported by a voluntary area committee for recreation, and special subcommittees made up of local people interested in recreation development in their community.

The role of the area recreation adviser is to offer his or her expertise to assist community groups to provide a wide variety of recreational activities in the community. Advisers implement Statewide programs within their communities, as well as developing local projects with involvement from interested groups and local authorities.

In my electorate of Pine Rivers, we have a recreation committee comprising local people who are vitally interested in improving the leisure life-styles of the people who



live in our community. The recreation adviser works closely with recreation committees to implement local projects.

The recreation committee exists to develop and promote recreation opportunities within our community. The community is encouraged to contact the area recreation adviser for information and assistance about any recreation issue. The services include: advisory/consultancy services, which cover such things as community events, fun days, general recreation programs and general advice on promotion of sport and recreation activities; technical services offered, which include research and advice on community recreation development and identification of all known recreation facilities; promotion in the area of the Queensland Recreation Council, which publishes a recreation directory of sporting clubs and community organisations, and promotion and programming of Queensland Recreation Week at the local level; promotion and development of recreation opportunities to people with a disability, old adults and other special populations; and last, but not least, promotion and programming of 12 Queensland Recreation Council camps. We all know that over the years these camps have proved very popular with the younger generation.

In my electorate, the Pine Rivers Shire Council gives provision of recreation and leisure services a high priority in the overall provision of services to the community. The Queensland Recreation Council is working closely with the council on recreation planning and development projects, and technical advice and assistance are always readily available.

Projects undertaken last year included a study of neighbourhood parks in the Pine Rivers shire. This was a study of selected neighbourhood parks in the shire to determine proper planning guidelines for facility provision requirements for existing and future parks.

The projects planned for this year include: Albany Creek recreation needs study; a Pine Rivers parks brochure; and provision of skateboard facilities. There will be a discussion on the issues that may need to be considered when developing a skateboard facility. We have arguments for and against such a facility.

I will be giving the Pine Rivers branch of the Queensland Recreation Council all the assistance and encouragement that I can in my capacity as the member for Pine Rivers.

#### **Federal Government's Housing Policy**

**Mr ELLIOTT** (Cunningham) (5.40 p.m.): Because of the election to be held next Saturday, I take this opportunity to point out to the public of Queensland what has taken place under Labor for almost a decade. Labor has claimed to support the workers of this nation, but let me outline its record in the housing area. I suggest that Government members and their Federal counterparts have created the worst housing crisis in history.

**Mr Beattie** interjected.

**Mr ELLIOTT:** The honourable member, as the architect of the ALP, should hang his head in shame; so should his old mate, Tom Burns. Quite frankly, he goes out among the workers and pretends to support them, but Labor has presided over a large increase in interest rates which has had a twofold effect on its own supporters. Government members in this House claim that the National Party does not support the workers and the small people. They should look at what has happened in housing. Labor has pushed many house-purchasers out of their homes because they could not meet their mortgage payments which have increased from about 14 per cent of income to about 36 per cent of income. This morning, the honourable member for Toowoomba North referred to housing, but he was wrong in respect of who created the housing problem.

The second difficulty is that the Labor Party has forced up the cost of public housing so much that people cannot afford to pay the rent that is being asked. There has been a shortage of people prepared to build public housing because, owing to the high interest

rates, the returns are not good enough. The Labor Government removed negative gearing for quite a long time but fortunately had enough brains to reintroduce it. The private sector has not been prepared to build rental housing and the Government has not built enough public housing. The Labor Government has attacked its own supporters on three fronts.

The friend of the workers, the honourable member for Lytton, is not in the Chamber to hear what I have to say about his record. In the short time he has been the Minister, the waiting-time for interviews has blown out considerably.

**Mr Beattie:** That's rubbish!

**Mr ELLIOTT:** That is not rubbish at all. I wish it were.

It now takes nearly three months to get an interview whereas it was only a couple of weeks under the National Party Government. So the honourable member should hang his head in shame. He is the person who has been responsible for ALP policy. He has been working in the back rooms of the Trades Hall. He is the person who, together with the president of the party, should make sure that these things do not happen.

The Federal Government promised that housing would be at a premium and that under its policy it would make certain that housing was available to the people. The Federal Government also stated that no child would live in poverty.

**Mr Beattie** interjected.

**Mr ELLIOTT:** Bill Gunn is busy.

It is obvious that Government members do not give a damn; they think it is a joke. This morning in this House the honourable member for Toowoomba North referred to the housing problem in his electorate which is very much in the minds of the people. On Saturday, Government members will find out just how much this matter is in the minds of the people.

Time expired.

### **Crocodiles; Tourist Industry**

**Dr CLARK** (Barron River) (5.46 p.m.): Tonight I wish to change the topic somewhat and bring this debate back to Queensland from the realms of fantasy and the wider Australian scene. There is a consensus in the community that crocodiles pose a danger to people. It is true that these relics of the dinosaur age have the ability to dispatch human beings with great relish, although the number of human beings taken is not very large. Despite that popular belief, crocodiles are, in fact, under threat from people. All along the eastern coast of Queensland crocodiles are being removed and put into crocodile farms or being shot by individuals who are trigger-happy and have no respect for nature. The previous Government adopted the policy of classifying or creating zones for Queensland's coastal rivers. That policy was supposed to take account of people and their needs.

**Mr FitzGerald:** What do you think of sharks and the netting? Do you believe in that?

**Dr CLARK:** The policy was supposed to have the result that either all crocodiles were removed or only those crocodiles over 2.1 metres in length were removed. This was all to no avail, because this policy took no account of the reality of crocodile behaviour. Crocodiles can swim from one river system to another and therefore there is no possibility of ever guaranteeing our safety from crocodiles or sharks.

In light of this information, I welcome the change that has occurred since the election of the Goss Government and this absurd policy is now to be reviewed. Once again, biology and not politics will be taken into account. This Government's policy will no doubt disappoint the former member for Barron River, Martin Tenni, who was well known in this House for his obsession for crocodiles.

**Mr FitzGerald** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member for Lockyer will cease interjecting.

**Dr CLARK:** That obsession for crocodiles resulted in the former Minister for Environment having to suffer being rolled by his colleague Mr Tenni. In fact, in the electorate of Barron River, Mr Muntz tried quite valiantly to enable the crocodiles to remain there as a way of supporting the tourist industry. Mr Tenni had tantrums, overturned common sense and the result was that all crocodiles over 2.1 metres in length were removed from the river.

**Mr McGrady:** What happened to Mr Tenni?

**Dr CLARK:** Yes, what happened to Mr Tenni? That is a good point. In the end, it was not the crocodiles who got him.

**Mr Beattie:** What a shame!

**Dr CLARK:** Yes.

As well as giving me pleasure, this review of the policy will also be welcomed by the tourist industry. To a very major extent, the tourist industry in far-north Queensland is dependent on being able to offer a wildlife experience to people so that they can see nature at its best. They do not want to see crocodiles in crocodile farms or zoos; they want to see them in the wild. That is what they pay good money to see and that is what the tourist operators advertise.

This Government's policy of learning to live with nature will enable the tourist industry to continue to promote and market far-north Queensland for its natural attractions. Our educational programs need to be improved so that people learn to live with crocodiles. We need to learn to live with nature and change our philosophy of always dominating and destroying nature. There should be a little more rationality.

#### **Doctrine of Separation of Powers**

**Mr LITTLEPROUD** (Condamine) (5.51 p.m.): During 1989 many political commentators dined out on the separation of powers. I refer to the Westminster convention of the Parliament, judiciary and police force. Honourable members will recall that Mr Fitzgerald, QC, made a very strong recommendation that there be a clear separation of those bodies. During the election campaign the ALP strongly supported those recommendations. In fact, Premier Goss campaigned for open, honest Government and promised the people of Queensland that he would govern by the highest of ideals. Since the House resumed, I have heard claims that the people gave him a mandate for that reason, and he claims that the people believed his promises. That promise has now been broken.

The Goss Government has infringed the convention of the separation of powers by politicising the police force. I will give this House the details. On 22 January this year I had occasion to write to the Commissioner of Police because, on the last day of sitting of the last Parliament, a question was asked of Mr Gunn concerning matters involving Mr Tom Burns. The question was never answered properly because it was to be referred to the Police Department. Before the sitting of the new Parliament, I took it upon myself to write to the Commissioner of Police asking if the investigations requested by Mr Gunn had been carried out and, if so, if he could give me a report. Early in March I rang the office of the Commissioner of Police reminding him that the letter I had written to him on 22 January had not been answered. This week, when I reached my electorate office in Dalby I was surprised to find that a letter I received dated 14 March was a reply from the Minister—not from the commissioner—on that very same issue.

If this Government believes in the separation of powers, I was entitled to a response from the commissioner himself. I am not attacking the commissioner, but unfortunately in this case the Minister has placed the commissioner in a very difficult position. If the

Minister believes in the separation of powers, he should not have intervened. It may have been proper for the commissioner to have referred to the Minister, but if the Minister did not wish to leave himself open to the claims of politicising the police force and of infringing the principle of the separation of powers, he would have directed the commissioner to have handled the matter in his own way.

This matter raises some very serious questions. The people of Queensland have every right to ask: why did the Minister answer the letter instead of the commissioner? Why should he even know about the content of the letter that was sent by a member of Parliament to the Commissioner of Police? What other political direction was given to the commissioner who, by convention, should be quite separate from the political arm of Government? Probably most importantly of all, the people of Queensland have every right to ask: can the public be confident that a complaint against a member of the Goss Government will in fact be treated impartially by the Commissioner of Police and by members of the police force?

That action may have been an unfortunate mistake on the part of the Minister for Police, but quite obviously he is now an embarrassment to the Goss Government. The Premier, Mr Goss, promised open, honest government, and government of the highest integrity; yet this is an instance in which the doctrine of the separation of powers has been infringed.

### **Public Housing; Federal Opposition's Health and Education Policies**

**Mr WELFORD** (Stafford) (5.54 p.m.): I welcome this opportunity to speak during the Adjournment debate. I thank the member for Cunningham for his illuminating contribution on housing, because members of the Labor Party certainly can have plenty to say about the housing policies of the previous National Party Government.

After the Labor Party won office in this State, it took over a housing policy implemented by the previous State Government whereby less was spent per capita on housing in this State than was spent in any other State in Australia. Squeal as members of the National Party might about the Federal Government's contribution to public housing, it must be remembered that it was the National Party Government's failure to sign the Commonwealth/States Housing Agreement that led to its failure to take up the funds that had been provided to the Queensland Government for that purpose.

Because the cost of rental housing accommodation will remain at approximately 20 per cent of a person's income, the cost of public housing has not increased.

**Mr Stephan** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Gympie will cease interjecting.

**Mr WELFORD:** For those people who wish to obtain accommodation through the agencies of the Goss Government, there is no increase in the cost of public housing. When the Goss Government won office, the waiting list contained 13 400 names of people who wanted interviews and to have their applications processed. The waiting list has increased. Why is that the case?

The answer is that the Goss Government has let people know that a whole range of initiatives in housing will be made available to them. People have flocked to the public housing agencies in the knowledge that this Government will rescue them from decades of neglect.

I am happy to look at the record of the Federal Government—a record that over a period of seven years was unmatched by the efforts of the previous conservative Government. A great deal of squealing about interest rates has been heard, but what have the conservatives—the Federal Liberal/National Parties—offered as an alternative? When is the Federal Liberal/National coalition going to bring down interest rates? Andrew Peacock has been asked dozens of times what his target is. To what level will he bring interest rates down? Not once has he been able to set a target that is achievable.

**Mr Elliott** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Cunningham will cease interjecting.

**Mr WELFORD:** Andrew Peacock has said that he will bring down inflation and unemployment levels. He also said that he would reduce foreign debt. However, on not one of those issues has he been able to set a single target by which the people of Australia can judge him. Not once!

**Mr Beanland:** The 18 per cent interest rates—that's what your people will be judged by.

**Mr WELFORD:** The member for Toowong has also said that the interest rates are high. All members of the Liberal Party are squealing about interest rates, but the Leader of the Federal Opposition—the honourable member's leader—has not told the people of Australia the level to which he will bring interest rates down. He cannot do that because, as every respected economic commentator knows, they will not be brought down in the near future.

An essential component of inflation and high interest rates is wage costs. What can members of the Liberal Party offer the Australian public on the subject of managing wages costs? The Liberal Party does not have a wages policy. It advocates the law of the jungle but calls it flexibility. "Freeing up the system" is the euphemism members of the Liberal Party use. In the absence of a wages policy, all that the Liberal Party can offer is the law of the jungle. In the Liberal Party, it is the same problem with wages policy as it is with every other item that is a crucial economic indicator. The Liberals cannot tell the people of Australia what their target is and cannot say how they will restrain wages.

As an illustration of the Liberal Party's lack of direction, I do not need to rely only on economic issues. What is the Liberal Party's policy on health issues? Contrary to the deceitful advertising campaign conducted by the Liberal Party, it proposes to dismantle Medicare. In that event, those who can least afford medical expenses and those who are chronically ill will suffer more from a health system that is underfunded. The Federal Liberal Party will return health care to the position it was in 20 years ago.

The Liberal Party has also engaged in deceitful advertising in relation to education and is suggesting that, under a Federal Liberal Government, education fees would be \$400 less than those imposed by the Labor Government. However, the Liberal Party has not told people that, under a conservative Government, it would not even be possible for a person to take up tertiary education unless that person could produce \$1,200 up front. The Liberal Party does not want to tell people that, by virtue of its policies on education, hundreds and hundreds of middle and lower-income families will be stripped of opportunities to provide education for their children.

Time expired.

#### **Sexually Transmitted Diseases, Methadone and Needle- exchange Clinic at Miami**

**Mr QUINN** (South Coast) (6 pm): I am appalled at the Goss Government's arrogant and irresponsible attitude to the location of a sexually transmitted diseases, methadone and needle-exchange clinic at Miami on the Gold Coast. Indeed, everyone on the Gold Coast is concerned about this matter. This is the second incompetent decision made by the Honourable the Minister for Health in relation to this matter.

**Mrs Edmond:** They put it where it is needed.

**Mr QUINN:** I will tell the honourable member the full and sorry story.

In a first abortive attempt, the Minister tried to establish a drug clinic at Burleigh Heads. He did that because the clinic needed to be centrally located so that it would be easier for drug addicts to arrive there. It was centrally located, all right. It was situated

next to two churches, a day-care centre for children, the local primary school, the business centre of Burleigh Heads and a hall used by CWA ladies and other elderly people.

As a result of public outcry, the Minister reversed his decision and decided to locate the clinic at Miami, just 1 kilometre down the road and 100 metres from the North Burleigh Surf Life Saving Club, which has approximately 600 members, including hundreds of nippers. Some decision! The life-saving club uses the beach for carnivals, club days and practice for its life-savers and nippers. As well, each morning the beach attracts a substantial number of residents from the area and tourists. Obviously, the Minister does not understand or care about the devastating effect that that clinic will have on the local community and the Gold Coast's reputation for clean and safe beaches. Tourist organisations, community groups and sporting clubs are astounded at the Minister's incomprehensible decision.

At Tweed Heads in New South Wales, which has a needle-exchange program in place, fears have already been expressed about what is happening. The local newspaper, in an article titled "AIDS fear over beach needles. Hospital boss slams exchange programme", has instanced this example—

"Puncture wounds caused by stepping on discarded syringes . . . are creating growing concern in Gold Coast medical circles.

And Tweed Heads District Hospital medical superintendent Dr Barry Rigby yesterday blamed the ready availability of needles for contributing to the problem.

'Before needle exchange programmes started needles were like gold. They (addicts) bought them from the chemist and kept them,' said Dr Rigby yesterday.

'Now that they can pick them up so much easier some are not disposing of them properly. It's unfair to the rest of the community.'

If this decision goes ahead, one shudders to think of the effect that it will have on Burleigh Heads beaches. After all, the Tweed Heads Hospital is a kilometre or more from the beach, whereas the proposed site for the clinic is merely 100 metres from the beach.

People are objecting to taxpayers' money being wasted to supply methadone and syringes to addicts under a questionable program. There has never been one case in respect of which that program could be justified. As well, there are adverse effects on the safety and health of the local community and tourists.

Over the years, the Gold Coast has spent millions of dollars on tourist promotion of the attractive beaches, which are the life-blood of its tourist industry. Yet with one incompetent decision the Minister will single-handedly place at risk the Gold Coast's image as a safe holiday destination.

There is no doubt that a drug problem exists in certain areas of the Gold Coast. However, it is time that, before making his decisions, the Minister for Health consulted the local communities so that the best site—not the worst—can be found for this drug clinic.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 6.05 p.m.

**TUESDAY, 20 MARCH 1990**

Mr SPEAKER (Hon. J. Fouras, Ashgrove) took the chair at 7.30 p.m.

**VACANCY IN SENATE OF COMMONWEALTH OF AUSTRALIA**

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! Honourable members, I have to announce that this meeting has been summoned for 7.30 p.m. this day under the provisions of Standing Order 331 for the purpose of the election of a senator. There being a quorum present, the meeting is now constituted. I now call for nominations. I point out that every nomination must be accompanied by a declaration by the nominee of qualification and consent to be nominated and to act if elected. Are there any nominations?

As there are no nominations and as a senator cannot be elected, I ask for a motion to adjourn the meeting to a time on a specified date so that nominations may be made and votes taken.

**Hon. W. K. GOSS** (Logan—Premier, Minister for Economic and Trade Development and Minister for the Arts) (7.31 p.m.): I move—

"That the meeting be adjourned until 7.30 p.m. on Tuesday, 8 May 1990."

Motion agreed to.

The meeting concluded at 7.32 p.m.

**TUESDAY, 20 MARCH 1990**

Mr SPEAKER (Hon. J. Fouras, Ashgrove) read prayers and took the chair at 8 p.m.

**MINISTERIAL STATEMENT****Vacancy in Senate of Commonwealth of Australia**

**Hon. W. K. GOSS** (Logan—Premier, Minister for Economic and Trade Development and Minister for the Arts) (8.01 p.m.), by leave: On 8 July last year the people of Queensland were told by the National Party that Senator John Stone would be resigning from his position in the Senate to contest the House of Representatives seat of Fairfax. That is a full eight and a half months ago. Since then the Queensland National Party—that legendary, well-oiled party machine—has done absolutely nothing to consider filling the casual vacancy that it knew would eventually arise. I repeat that the vacancy was known eight and a half months ago.

Because of the past behaviour of the National Party in Queensland, because of the behaviour revealed in the Fitzgerald inquiry and elsewhere, and because of the deceit of the National Party in the past, there was an understandable degree of scepticism about the real intent of the National Party. The questions that the public has asked are: is the vacancy being kept for John Stone? Or is it being kept open in the increasingly likely event that the National Party in Queensland does not receive enough votes this Saturday to have even one senator returned? That means that the Nationals could be keeping this vacancy open because not only will Senator Glen Sheil lose his seat but also the National Party vote could be so low that Senator Ron Boswell will also be looking for alternative employment. The latest private polling shown to me indicates that the National Party vote in Queensland is down to 6 per cent, and if that translates to the Senate, the predictions that I have made will come true.

We challenged the Leader of the Opposition to give his word of honour, his assurance to this Parliament—which represents the people of this State and which has been charged with the responsibility of filling this vacancy—that there was no back room deal for Senator Stone, no back room deal for any of these failed candidates—

**Mr Borbidge:** We are happy to bring on a debate. Are you going to gag us again? You stopped question-time. This gutless Premier has stopped question-time.

**Mr W. K. GOSS:** I am happy to take that interjection because the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, the person who has made himself famous for spying on the daughters of Ministers, does not seem to know—

**Mr BORBIDGE:** I rise to a point of order. The comments made by the Premier are offensive. I ask that they be withdrawn.

**Mr W. K. GOSS:** I withdraw. I agree that the actions to which I referred were offensive.

**Mr BORBIDGE:** I rise to a point of order. Mr Speaker, under the Standing Orders I ask for an unequivocal withdrawal and an apology from the Premier.

**Mr W. K. GOSS:** I give an unequivocal withdrawal.

In response to the interjection, "We are happy to bring on a debate.", I point out that the Leader of the Opposition wrote to me on 8 March asking that the matter be adjourned and that there be no debate. So much for wanting a debate! The Leader of the Opposition had the opportunity to have a debate at 7.30 p.m. He was called upon



to nominate someone and he squibbed. I will now tell the people of this State a few facts.

**Mr Borbidge** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! If the Deputy Leader of the Opposition does not cease interjecting, I will have to deal with him. I cannot hear what the Premier is saying.

**Mr W. K. GOSS:** The Opposition seems to have some inexplicable difficulty in providing the people of Queensland with an assurance backed by the Leader of the Opposition's word of honour. It is for that kind of conduct that these people have been overwhelmingly rejected by the electorate. I suggest that that is their concern and that is the reason that there has been eight and a half months of inaction.

I would like to convey to the House that some interest in this vacancy has been shown in the community and, indeed, in the ranks of National Party members and former National Party members.

**Mr Borbidge** interjected.

**Mr W. K. GOSS:** Even if the honourable member is not interested in this vacancy, some of his colleagues certainly are.

Even if Mr Stone, Mr Cooper and Sir Robert Sparkes need more than eight and a half months to settle this issue, there are some names that I can suggest to them. Firstly, I suggest Mr John Callaghan, chairman of the Springwood electorate council and a member of the National Party central council. I am quite happy to table a letter from Mr Callaghan to me offering himself as a nominee. I understand that he may have some bitterness because he, too, was promised a Senate position by Sir Robert Sparkes and it was not delivered. I will table that letter shortly.

In addition, we have Mr Colegrave of Sherwood. I am advised that Mr Colegrave has stood against the Leader of the Liberal Party, Mr Innes, as a National Party candidate. Apparently he then—as is the habit—switched to the Liberal Party when he thought that there was a chance for Senate pre-selection in that quarter. But today, Mr Colegrave—this other loyal member of the National Party, this would-be National Party representative of the people in the Senate—sends me a fax saying that despite the fact that he was in the National Party and stood against Mr Innes and then switched to the Liberal Party in the hope that he could get Senate pre-selection from that party, he is now prepared to leave the Liberal Party and go back to the National Party if he can have this nomination tonight. The fax states—

"I would like to be considered for the casual Senate vacancy.

I rang the National Party requesting them to send a form to join the party—this was not received—I am at present a member of the Liberal Party—but could resign and then join the National Party.

I hope you will consider this application."

It does not end there because during the dinner recess we received another letter. This one is from Mr Sid Bray, who I understand is a former member of the National Party and a former National Party alderman on the Redland Shire Council. He offers himself as a nominee. I intend to table that letter.

As somebody on the ABC said tonight, it seems as though my office has become a de facto employment agency for members of the National Party, former members of the National Party, and former members of the National Party who are happy to rejoin the National Party in these circumstances. Almost the only people who have not applied are Mike Ahern and J. Bjelke-Petersen. I reckon that if we gave them another half an hour we might pull in one of them.

**Opposition members** interjected.

**Mr W. K. GOSS:** How they squirm!

**Mr Borbidge** interjected.

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

**Mr W. K. GOSS:** Unlike the dishonourable conduct of National Party members in the past, let me record that I indicated to my staff that they should convey to those former and current members of the National Party that, although the National Party had engaged in that practice in the past, this Government would not. We will not put forward their names, despite the inability of the National Party to provide a nomination.

My office has been contacted by people who have expressed concern about the National Party's real intent. Those concerns were heightened by an article that appeared recently in the *Northern Times* in which the former member for Pine Rivers, Mrs Chapman, said that she wanted to be a Senator and that she had the backing of Senator Lady Florence Bjelke-Petersen. The interesting thing about the interview with Mrs Chapman is that she went on to say that the party would not make a decision on the Senate vacancy until after the Federal election. Mrs Chapman is then quoted as saying, "We have to get Stone into the House of Representatives first."

I wish to record once again what the Labor Party's position has been from the outset. We will respect the spirit and the letter of the Constitution. On that basis we did what we always intended to do. After we smoked out the National Party and finally got that categorical assurance from Mr Stone this morning on ABC radio, we did as we had always intended to do and moved that the debate be adjourned until May.

There are two other matters that I wish to outline. Firstly, as I have indicated, in a letter to me dated 8 March, the Leader of the Opposition asked me to move a motion on that day suspending so much of Standing Order 331 as would require the convening of a meeting of this House for the purpose of appointing a replacement for Mr Stone. Anyone who is familiar with or who has read the Standing Orders would understand that any such motion at that time to adjourn a special sitting under Standing Order 331 could only be moved when a special sitting takes place; that is, the meeting itself. That is why that meeting had to be held tonight and that is why it was always going to be held tonight.

Secondly, Mr Cooper has been telling some people during some interviews that the casual vacancy created by the resignation of his colleague Mr Stone cannot be filled until 1 July. That is nonsense. Mr Cooper has neither read nor understands the Australian Constitution.

The vacancy that was created by the resignation of Mr Stone can be filled on the first sitting day of the Senate following the return of the writs governing this current Federal election. I am advised that the writs are likely to be returned late next month. Therefore, theoretically, the Senate could sit as early as late April and, on that first sitting day, a replacement senator could be sworn in to fill the casual vacancy. However, we would be one Senator short because, for eight and a half months, the National Party has been unable to nominate a candidate.

The Nationals in this State are in disarray. They are incapable of organising their own affairs. Apparently it will take them more than nine months to find a replacement. I believe that that indicates that the Nationals do not care about proper parliamentary representation. I suspect that they are more interested in a back-room deal. It will be interesting to see who is proffered to the House. As well, it will be interesting to see if, at any stage in this House or in public, there will be an assurance from the Leader of the Opposition on this point in respect of a back-room deal for failed National Party candidates.

Because of that sort of conduct, the National Party has been overwhelmingly rejected by the people of this State, and it will be rejected again on Saturday. I table the letters from the various job applicants.

*Whereupon the honourable member laid the documents on the table.*

**Mr COOPER:** Under Standing Order 108A, I move—

"That the House take note of the statement."

I have moved that motion so that the House can debate the statement.

**Mr BORBIDGE** (Surfers Paradise—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (8.12 p.m.): I move—

"That the Leader of the Opposition be now heard."

Under Standing Orders, any member may rise and move that a member be heard.

**Mr Mackenroth:** Only if you are debating something. You are not debating anything.

**Mr BORBIDGE:** What does the honourable member call this if it is not a debate? I have moved a motion that the Leader of the Opposition be now heard.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! The resolution that was passed this afternoon to have the sitting at 8 p.m. tonight stated quite clearly that this sitting be for Government business. Therefore, the honourable member's motion is out of order, and I rule accordingly.

**Hon. W. K. GOSS:** I seek leave to move a motion without notice.

**Mr Borbidge** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! I will not countenance the Deputy Leader of the Opposition's disputing my rulings. I have already warned him under Standing Order 123A. If he persists in doing that, I will deal with him accordingly.

### **MEMBERS (E.A.R.C. and C.J.C.) BILL**

#### **All Stages**

**Hon. W. K. GOSS** (Logan—Premier, Minister for Economic and Trade Development and Minister for the Arts) (8.14 p.m.), by leave, without notice: I move—

"That so much of the Standing Orders be suspended as would otherwise prevent the immediate presentation to the House of a Bill to amend the Electoral and Administrative Review Act 1989 and the Criminal Justice Act 1989 each in relation to membership, and the passing of such Bill through all of its stages in one day."

Motion agreed to.

#### **First Reading**

Bill and Explanatory Notes presented and Bill, on motion of Mr W. K. Goss, read a first time.

#### **Second Reading**

**Hon. W. K. GOSS** (Logan—Premier, Minister for Economic and Trade Development and Minister for the Arts) (8.15 p.m.): I move—

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

The Fitzgerald report provided that persons from educational institutions should be eligible for consideration for appointment as part-time commissioners on both the Criminal Justice Commission and the Electoral and Administrative Review Commission. It was considered that people with this background would provide valuable input to the work of the commissions and provide necessary balance of views together with those with experience from other sectors of the community.

The current definition of "unit of public administration" in both Acts was drafted with necessary breadth to ensure that both commissions had sufficient scope for their spheres of review. This definition, which includes certain educational institutions, was

also used in drafting the section specifying qualifications for membership, with the consequence—I believe the inadvertent consequence on the part of the then National Party Government—that there is an unintended general exclusion which prevents the appointment of any members of educational institutions to either commission.

This technical deficiency needs to be remedied to ensure that the recommendations of the Fitzgerald report which enable members of educational institutions or persons serving on the governing bodies of educational institutions who are also academics to be appointed to the commission as part-time members. The amendments are required urgently, to finalise the appointment of the complete number of part-time members to both commissions so that they may commence their important work.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Sherwood for their participation in the consultation and selection process. I would also like to thank them for their agreement to this measure being passed expeditiously by the House, after being briefed on the necessity for this technical amendment and after being briefed on the effect of the amendment by the Fitzgerald Implementation Unit last week. They were, of course, provided with details of the legislation prior to tonight.

I am pleased to say that the selection of the chairmen of the two commissions as well as the part-time commissioners has occurred with genuine consultation between the Government and the non-Government parties as recommended in the Fitzgerald report.

I commend the Bill to the House.

**Mr COOPER** (Roma—Leader of the Opposition) (8.18 p.m.): There has been consultation about these amendments, with which the Opposition has no problem. Under these circumstances, we in the Opposition recognise the need for them. Naturally, we do not necessarily support their being rammed through the House in one sitting. However, I am afraid it has been a hallmark of the Government in its progress so far that this is the sort of reform that we have now become accustomed to, and I find it extremely unfortunate.

Most members will realise that the Acts setting up both the Electoral and Administrative Review Commission and the Criminal Justice Commission had their origins under the National Party Government only last year. As the then Government believed that those two commissions were the very basis of Mr Fitzgerald's recommendations, the legislation was introduced and passed through this House with quite a good degree of support. At the time, it was felt that those recommendations from Fitzgerald would not be dealt with, that they would not be the subject of legislation and that they would not be achieved. But today we know that that has been achieved, and now the legislation is being amended. As I said before, we understand why the amendments are necessary.

In view of recent statements emanating from the Attorney-General and the Treasurer, Labor's commitment to the reform process is now an issue of quite considerable uncertainty. I remind honourable members that the former Leader of the Opposition, who is now the Premier, stoutly declared at the time that, in line with the Fitzgerald recommendations, these two bodies should have a permanent place in Queensland. Since he has become Premier, I guess things have changed and now he cannot give that commitment of permanency which Fitzgerald recommended and which we certainly support. I believe that he has back-pedalled from that stance to the point at which he publicly floated the view, certainly in the media, that the legislation concerning the commissions should contain sunset clauses to put them out of existence.

We certainly remember the Premier's castigation of the Liberal Party at the time for proposing such a course when this legislation was being debated. It now seems that EARC in particular is cramping Labor's style because, as we know, George Street is alive with rumours that it is hardly worth being in Government when bodies such as EARC and the CJC have to be contended with, because they are usurping the role of Government, or so the Labor Party and quite a few of its back room boys believe. In relation to redistribution and the review of the electoral system for a start, EARC will

carry out its role—its charter. But I think the Government is more worried about the actual drawing of the lines for the boundaries, which is to be done by EARC. That is set in legislation. I know that quite a few stories have come from the other side of the House. As I said, the back room boys would rather have their hands on the pencil themselves. Thank heavens that there is every chance that we will see a reasonably fair review of the electoral system for a start and then a drawing of the boundaries. Let there be no doubt that many Labor Government members are really concerned about this, and I bring this to the attention of the House.

The Opposition believes that the present system will deliver independence. I believe that the people who will undertake the chairmanship and the part-time membership of both the CJC and EARC certainly have an extremely responsible and important role to play. There is no question about that; they will have tremendous responsibilities. I understand that they realise they have those tremendous responsibilities. Certainly, the eyes of Queenslanders will be upon them in their very difficult tasks. Also, their very integrity is on the line. I want to reassure them that they will certainly have the Opposition's support in the onerous tasks that they have in front of them.

Because of the two people concerned, in this instance the Opposition understands the need for the proposed amendments. However, we are concerned that, once the Act is amended to include educational institutions, that will open the door for more people with those qualifications—Labor Party cronies in high places in universities and other places of learning—to be appointed. I sincerely hope that that does not occur.

Every application should be treated on its merits. The National Party will be watching to ensure that that occurs. I believe that that is what we owe the people of Queensland, and that the appointments receive the support of the people of Queensland.

Members on this side of the House do not want to see those commissions utilised for purely political purposes by having matters referred to them which are really ducking and dodging away from decisions that the Government should make.

The commissions should not be used for political purposes, nor to duck the hard questions. That is what Governments are there for. The commissions must be utilised for the purposes for which they were set up; namely, as far as EARC is concerned, the review of the electoral system, the drawing of the boundaries, and the review of local government boundaries.

Members of the commissions, as they travel the length and breadth of the State, should take note of the views of the people of Queensland when carrying out their tasks.

At all times, matters under the scrutiny of the EARC and the CJC must come back to this Parliament. No-one on this side of the House wishes to see the role of Parliament usurped in any way, shape or form. Parliament must have final control. That is always the way it should be; Parliament should be supreme. I sincerely trust that it will be.

Both commissions have much work to do. They have not been set up in a temporary capacity. We do not support any sunseting as far as either commission is concerned. They are there to serve a purpose in the interests of the people of Queensland. We do not want to see a piecemeal approach. After a certain period, it is quite appropriate that there be a review of the performance of the commissions, but they should not have the sword of Damocles hanging over their heads.

As I said before, the commissions have much work to do. I wish the commissioners and the part-time commissioners well in the onerous task they have in front of them.

**Mr INNES** (Sherwood—Leader of the Liberal Party) (8.26 p.m.): I have three short comments to make on the Bill.

Firstly, members of the Liberal Party want the work of the EARC and the CJC to start as soon as possible. The Bill before the House proposes a simple amendment that corrects what I believe was a totally unintentional error. Members of the Liberal Party have pleasure in supporting this legislation and assisting in its expeditious passage

through this House tonight so that the commissions can start operating as soon as possible.

Secondly, on the question of consultation, I point out to the Premier and the House that there was a difference in the process of consultation. Consultation on the CJC was effective and took place within a reasonable period. With regard to EARC, the Liberal Party literally received the names of the part-time commissioners on a Thursday with an "ask for response" by Friday or Saturday. As some of the nominees were unknown to us, not unreasonably we requested time to investigate their backgrounds. There was no time to interview the nominee from north Queensland. In the end, the names went forward without the blessing of the Liberal Party.

If consultation is to take place, reasonable time should be allowed. I know that there are problems within Government and all organisations in terms of deadlines. It does take time to process matters. However, the consultation in relation to the EARC membership was not as effective or as amicable as might have been suggested by the Premier. In future, I hope that the consultation process does allow time for reasonable investigations to be carried out in order to ensure a reasonable response to the Government.

The nominees are there. The Government has acted. Members of the Liberal Party want the work to commence.

The Liberal Party has not changed its view on the subject of sunset clauses, but we take comfort from the fact that the new Government itself sees problems. In relation to the CJC, it is envisaged that it is to be a permanent structure with permanent functions; but when looking at the EARC, it is perfectly clear that it has a range of tasks that do not need to be repeated.

The review of the electoral boundaries, the drafting in of freedom of information legislation, the setting up of administrative appeal tribunals and the setting up of guidelines with regard to a variety of parliamentary functions, are all one-off tasks. The number of staff and the functions and powers necessary to do the preliminary work will not be necessary in the long haul. If some structure is necessary in the long haul, such as the review of boundaries, we believe a sunset clause would have been a proper approach. It would have forced a review and a rethink of the tasks to be carried out now and in the future. It would have obliged all people participating in the task to believe that there was a finite period involved. It was not a career structure, the start of some new bureaucracy, and in three years' time it could have been pared back to the structure necessary—if any structure at all was necessary—to carry out those functions that were to be continued.

We still think that there is an argument and we are reassured that the Government itself apparently sees some wisdom in providing an obligation to reassess functions and size. We suggest to the Government that it is not too late to look at the introduction of a sunset clause that would impose an important mental discipline on the Parliament, and on the people involved, and set some deadlines in terms of the work to be achieved by the first spate of activity.

**Mr FITZGERALD** (Lockyer) (8.29 p.m.): This is a Bill amending legislation that was introduced into this House by the National Party with the support of the other two parties. It should always be on the record that the National Party did move along the lines recommended by Mr Fitzgerald and the implementation committee.

I have a couple of questions to ask the Government. Is the Government committed to supporting the CJC and the EARC? I ask that question because the Treasurer has already stated publicly that the cost to the State of the commission of review that has taken place, the cost of setting up these committees and the cost of the Cooke inquiry are very high. I believe it was the Treasurer's intention to imply that it would be great if the Government could cut down on this expenditure and firstly wipe out the Cooke inquiry. I hope that the Treasurer's intention was not to strangle the CJC and the EARC.

My position is different from that of the Leader of the Liberal Party concerning the sunset clause for the EARC. I am speaking about the parliamentary committee which

has not even been formed yet. I will certainly be speaking to that motion if it is ever moved, and I say that because we have been sitting since the end of last month——

**Mr Beattie:** It is on tomorrow.

**Mr FITZGERALD:** Very well. I think that it is by design that the Government has let that notice of motion drift on. I shall speak to the motion tomorrow.

It is impertinent of the Government to tell the committee whether there should be a sunset clause or whether any limit should be placed on the commission. The proper way to do it is for the commission to report to the parliamentary committee, for the parliamentary committee to report to Parliament and for Parliament to debate it.

Ministers of the Crown are riding shotgun over these committees and the Treasurer is threatening to starve them of funds. That is not democracy. This Government rode into power on the claim that it would bring democracy to the State. It said it would make all the changes that were necessary in this State. I accept the judgment of the people of Queensland but I now think that Government members are going back on their word and will be found out for exactly what they are.

The Minister for Local Government indicated that he wants the local government boundaries attended to as a matter of urgency. As we all know, the legislation provides for a review of State electoral boundaries and that the commissioners can look at all other matters. I think that the Minister even placed a time limit on the investigation.

**Mr Stoneman:** He is very adamant that he wants one vote, one value.

**Mr FITZGERALD:** He has made many judgments. He is one of the Ministers who are trying to ride shotgun over this parliamentary committee and the commission. I will not stand for it. My name has been put forward for membership of the EARC committee and I will not stand for Ministers telling us——

**Mr McLean:** Sit down.

**Mr FITZGERALD:** They cannot argue with logic. They just come out with the big bluff. They are all the same. If they cannot bluff, they argue by numbers and they have a strike and walk out. That is the way they want to handle this matter.

This side of the House supports the Bill. However, does the Government want reform or does it intend to attach strings to it? Will it allow the committee to report to the House so that it can be debated here? The Government is clearly indicating to the electorate that the CJC and the EARC will be limited. It is putting out the feelers already. We know how the Government flies kites. The signs are going out already.

**Mr WELFORD:** I rise to a point of order. What the honourable member is saying has no relevance to the amendment.

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

**Honourable members** interjected.

**Mr FITZGERALD:** I thank you, Mr Speaker, for your decision.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! I point out to honourable members on my left that one of their members is making a speech. I am having great difficulty in hearing him and I am sure that all honourable members are having similar difficulty. I suggest that honourable members on my left give him a fair go by ceasing interjecting all the time. Give him a fair go.

**Mr FITZGERALD:** Thank you, Mr Speaker, for ruling that my speech is relevant to the subject matter before the House. Most of the members on this side of the House understand that, while very few on the other side do.

We want an assurance from the Government that it will give this system a fair trial. We want an assurance that it will set the commissions up properly and let the

committees report back to the House so that we can have a fair and proper debate in this House and not be gagged and have the Government carry on as it has started to carry on. It does not want a fair debate in this House.

We will support the Bill. I will certainly be speaking tomorrow, if the motion concerning the committees comes before the House.

Motion agreed to.

#### **Committee**

Clauses 1 to 5, as read, agreed to.

Bill reported, without amendment.

#### **Third Reading**

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

#### **POLICE SERVICE ADMINISTRATION BILL**

**Hon. T. M. MACKENROTH** (Chatsworth—Minister for Police and Emergency Services) (8.38 p.m.), by leave, without notice: I move—

"That leave be granted to bring in a Bill to provide for the Queensland Police Service and its administration."

Motion agreed to.

#### **First Reading**

Bill and Explanatory Notes presented and Bill, on motion of Mr Mackenroth, read a first time.

#### **Second Reading**

**Hon. T. M. MACKENROTH** (Chatsworth—Minister for Police and Emergency Services) (8.40 p.m.): I move—

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

It is my pleasure to introduce the Police Service Administration Bill which will provide the essential foundation for far-reaching reforms within the Queensland Police Department. The need for this reform is both urgent and unprecedented. In Fitzgerald's words—

"The Queensland Police force is debilitated by misconduct, inefficiency, incompetence and deficient leadership.

The situation is compounded by poor organisation and administration, inadequate resources, and insufficiently developed skills and techniques for the task of law enforcement in a modern, complex society".

Those are damning criticisms.

It is a shameful disgrace that our police service has been allowed to degenerate to the point where it warrants such criticism, but, in reality, it is an indictment of the previous Government and its paucity of support for the police both in leadership and in resources. The tragedy is that dedicated, honest police have been let down badly in the process. What is needed now is a shared rebuilding of the Police Department by the police service, Government and the general community, to ensure that the police services in Queensland regain the high standing and credibility expected by all.

Put simply, there are three areas of reform essential, which are recommended from the Fitzgerald report—



### 1. Crime prevention

Additional police, revised methods and procedures and improved training are all essential if we are to achieve a significant reduction in the alarming growth rate in crime in Queensland. Experience confirms that community-based policing approaches do reduce the incidence of crime. Queenslanders deserve the full protection offered by these measures.

### 2. A more efficient police organisation

Little can be gained until Queensland police have adequate resources and equipment, the necessary level of support services, and effective management and organisational arrangements to perform their duties efficiently.

### 3. Honesty and integrity

The process of healing and commitment to honesty and integrity has already commenced and must continue within the organisation itself, assisted by organisations such as the Criminal Justice Commission. This legislation will enable these three priorities to be achieved.

As new and pioneering legislation, I believe it is of paramount importance that it is reviewed. To ensure that this happens, I have had inserted a clause which requires the legislation to be reviewed in two years and that a further review would be conducted in another five years. The reports of these reviews will be tabled in the Parliament and the opportunity will be there to debate them.

The legislation is deliberately and necessarily different from the old Act. It is enabling legislation. It relies on a commissioner as chief executive to manage the Queensland Police Service. It incorporates necessary accountabilities and controls on the commissioner's responsibilities and authorities. It provides for required flexibility in command structure and managerial approach to ensure policing services are effective at regional levels throughout Queensland. It will improve the standards within the police services, by better selection, education and training, promotion by merit, and fair and equitable review processes. It will also ensure the process of healing from within by making it possible for all police officers to report frankly and openly on incidents of misconduct, which can then be dealt with in the appropriate terms specified in this Bill.

The preparation of this Bill has created some controversy. It has been interesting to listen to the criticisms of the president of the Queensland Police Union of Employees, John O'Gorman, that the legislation does not ensure enough power for police. Then there was the criticism of his brother, Terry O'Gorman, vice-president of the civil libertarians, that the Bill has too many powers for police. However, I think that it is with their brother Frank—whose union, the Commissioned Officers Union, fully supports the legislation—that we have struck the perfect balance. The Queensland Police Union has consistently opposed some of the essential reforms proposed by Mr Fitzgerald, which will take place with the passage of this Bill. This is the same union which repeatedly defended the conduct of all police prior to the commission of inquiry.

Since becoming Minister, I have attempted to involve the police union in the consultation process on the new legislation. Late last year I attended a union executive meeting at which members claimed that little consultation had taken place with the previous Government in relation to the proposed legislation. They claimed that the Fitzgerald implementation unit had supplied them with only draft copies of legislation and asked them for comments on those drafts. The union expressed a desire to have an input before legislation was drafted. To enable that to happen, I authorised the release of a concept paper, which was forwarded to the union, to police officers throughout the State, and to members of other bodies which could be seen to have an interest in the new police Act. Unfortunately, only 17 replies were received to the concept paper from throughout the State. The police union made a late submission on 1 March, which was forwarded to the Commissioner of Police. Interestingly, its reply addressed only half of the matters raised in the concept paper, and did not comment on pages 10 to 25 at all—a section which dealt with subjects such as the appointment of the commissioner, staff and recruits, and the bases and conditions of employment, discipline and misconduct.

One of the matters the union said was totally unacceptable was the flattening of ranks. However, the union quite obviously forgot that in its submission to the Fitzgerald inquiry at pages 35 to 56 it called for a flattening of ranks, suggesting that it would be suitable to have eight ranks, rather than the present 13. Despite numerous discussions and my direct involvement, it became obvious that the union was philosophically opposed to fundamental recommendations in the Fitzgerald report, which have been included as provisions in this Bill. The union's claims of non-consultation might be better understood as its reaction to not achieving its ultimate objective, which is to throw out the Fitzgerald reforms.

Let me hasten to emphasise that the commissioned officers' union supports this Bill, but let us look at the police union's objectives. The first area of disagreement related to the nature of the Act itself. The Fitzgerald reform process calls for a modern enabling piece of legislation, not constrained by the administrative detail of the past.

This legislation would enable the Governor in Council, me as Police Minister, the Police Commissioner and in some cases the Chairman of the Criminal Justice Commission to exercise proper oversight, leadership, management control and accountability for Police Department affairs. The commissioner's powers are similar to those of other chief executives but he has greater accountabilities in terms of the Criminal Justice Commission.

It is mischievous to suggest that the commissioner has unfettered powers. This legislation will provide the necessary authority, balanced with proper accountability, for the commissioner to manage the organisation in the same manner as for every other chief executive of a department in Queensland. Details of the department's structure, ranks of police officers, numbers of police officers and their deployment will now be administered by regulation or internal administrative instructions, as is the case in all other departments, not by legislation. This will allow essential management flexibility for the commissioner, especially during the next several years when significant changes in structure, deployment and methods of operation within the police service will be essential. These new arrangements will be revised promptly and progressively in the light of results achieved. Regulation and instruction will be revised in line with these changes.

The next area of difference of view refers to contract employment. The Fitzgerald report calls for contracts of employment for senior police in the same manner as that applying to the rest of the public service. The purpose is to ensure that leadership of Queensland's police force can be reviewed effectively at the end of each officer's contract period. It is also an essential part of the reform blueprint that no commissioned officer appointments be confirmed permanently prior to the end of the transition period in December 1992, when all commissioned officers will have their performance reviewed to see if they should remain as commissioned officers in a leadership capacity or not. The requirement for this is obvious, given the break-down in leadership that has occurred in the force over the last decade. Mr Fitzgerald concluded that contracts for senior officers would be better than tenured employment, especially considering the problem of corruption which developed under the tenure system. All members will recall the difficulty of removing senior police found wanting under the current Act.

A third major area of disagreement related to the vetting and appeal process. It is considered essential that police with questionable behaviour and integrity records not receive preferential promotion over other honest, dedicated officers, merely because they are more senior in rank or years of service. The existing appeal system has not always ensured promotion of the best officers with the highest integrity, and changes are necessary. Last year, the union objected strongly to amending the old legislation to enable necessary vetting by the CJC of police officers seeking promotion. It now requires retention of the external judicial appeal process. This process has been proven to be inadequate. The elevation of corrupt officers to leadership positions during the last decade illustrates the point.

The proposed Act will incorporate merit-based promotion and other review arrangements which protect officers' rights in line with Fitzgerald recommendations. The

new legislation also allows for lateral entry of other police to the Queensland police force on the basis of merit, integrity and special skills. This is also opposed by the union. Lateral entry enables the recruitment of police officers who have served outside the Queensland system and who may possess special skills and training, which is not presently available within the Queensland service. Experience with community policing and crime-prevention methods not used extensively in Queensland up until now present good examples. What we are talking about here is police professionalism—the professionalism of police officers, not just in Queensland but all over Australia. The improvement and standardisation of police training and education will enable police to transfer to police services interstate in much the same way as nurses and other professions do now. It will also, of course, lift morale amongst officers and help to restore police to the high esteem they should enjoy. All of these matters are essential to the reform process.

As the police union resolutely refuses to contemplate any compromise, it is impossible to accommodate its point of view on these matters. Its response to this Bill was delivered beyond the deadline that had been set, despite its being given two days at taxpayers' expense to respond. There were few suggestions which could be accepted in the light of responsible reform obligations.

However, in the process of drafting this legislation, the Police Officers Union and other interested parties have provided valuable and constructive feedback. As a consequence, this legislation includes much that will be to the benefit of hard-working, honest police officers.

I shall now outline the details of the proposed legislation.

Part I contains important definitions including those which distinguish breaches of discipline, misconduct, and official misconduct. These have been formulated in conjunction with the Chairman of the Criminal Justice Commission and are consistent with that legislation. Disciplinary matters will rightly be dealt with internally within the police service. Misconduct will be subject to Criminal Justice Commission investigation.

Part II establishes the Queensland Police Service as opposed to police force, to emphasise the "service to the community" dimension.

Membership of the service is defined, and functions of the service are spelt out for the first time in this Bill. The shared responsibility that the police and community have for crime prevention and law enforcement is stressed.

All public servants retain their status and position in terms of the Public Service Management and Employment Act 1988-1990, including their appeal entitlements. All public servants and all other members of the police service, however, shall be subject to the command structure, in the context that the Commissioner of Police is also the chief executive.

Part III relates to police officers' powers and duties.

Police officers will be subject to the command structure existing within the organisation. Uncertainties in the existing legislation are removed to ensure that officers can efficiently perform their tasks in regard to establishing proof of identity, and the execution of warrants.

Part IV of the proposed legislation relates to the appointment, conditions of service and conditions for removal of the Commissioner of Police. As specified in the Fitzgerald report, the conditions for removal from office of the commissioner are clearly outlined, and will be a joint responsibility of the Minister and the Chairman of the Criminal Justice Commission. Should a situation ever arise when those two authorities do not agree on an appropriate course of action, then the Governor in Council, on an address from the Legislative Assembly praying for the commissioner's removal, may remove the commissioner from office.

To stress again—the commissioner not only has powers similar to those of other chief executives in the State; he has the added obligation and accountability to satisfy both the Minister and the Chairman of the Criminal Justice Commission regarding his stewardship of the Queensland Police Service.

This part of the Bill also establishes the formal register of communication and directions between the commissioner and the Minister—also required from the Fitzgerald report. This register will be tabled yearly in the House so that all may see the policy directions to the commissioner from the Minister, and recommendations from the commissioner to the Minister.

The commissioner's power of delegation is similar to that of other chief executives. Delegation of authority, of course, is essential if regional policing is to be effective. Police officers working at the community level must be able to make decisions having regard to local needs and the requirement for the effective delivery of police services for that particular community. Regional commanders, assisted properly by administrative staff, will make necessary decisions regarding regional infrastructure, purchase of equipment and deployment of resources. They will, of course, be accountable to the commissioner in exercising their delegated authority.

Part V covers the appointment of police officers and staff members of the Queensland Police Service who will be appointed on terms and conditions that are fair and equitable, compatible with general community standards, but flexible enough to cater for the special needs of police officers.

The most important provision in this part is that promotion and career advancement within the police service shall be on the basis of merit, with necessary impartial procedures put in place to ensure the removal of any prejudicial or unjust selection or promotion practices.

Merit-based advancement will reward performers and encourage excellence in the leadership of our police service, which is essential for crime prevention and effective law enforcement.

The majority of police officers in Queensland will continue to be employed under award conditions with permanency of tenure and with all the rights and safeguards of a career service. However, in areas of special need, certain positions may be prescribed in the regulations to require different employment arrangements.

The Fitzgerald report clearly specified the need to appoint the most senior leaders of the police service on contract. This will ensure that all leaders may have their performance reviewed periodically to ensure that the police service maintains quality of leadership through time. Police recruits will now be appointed on a contract basis, with obligations and entitlements for both recruits and the commissioner clearly specified.

During the training period, recruits will be able to make informed decisions about the suitability of life-time employment as a police officer. This decision should not be pre-empted, as it is currently, by a full-time service decision before recruits have an opportunity to assess their suitability for policing roles, and the police service has an opportunity to confirm their suitability. Under the proposed legislation, this would happen towards the end of the training period.

Part VI gives much needed discretion to the commissioner to manage day-to-day problems within the police force both internally and externally, as recommended in the Fitzgerald report. Appropriate external action involves cases of misconduct or official misconduct.

The commissioner will have the ability to:

- . permit a police officer who is being investigated to remain on duty;
- . stand the officer down, but permit continued work within the department;
- . suspend the officer on full pay; and
- . suspend the officer without pay, in which case the officer will be permitted to undertake suitable alternative employment.

That is a vast improvement for police officers on suspension, who currently are prevented from taking alternative work.

This part also provides an obligation on members to accept transfer, but with the right to raise objections for consideration by the commissioner.

Part VII covers internal command and discipline arrangements.

Command and discipline have been lacking in the past, and this part of the Bill will ensure that the police service is a disciplined organisation with the highest standards of conduct and suitable spans of command at all levels.

All members will have a responsibility to report reasonable suspicions of serious misconduct to the commissioner and to the complaints section of the Criminal Justice Commission. This part also protects those who make complaints to ensure they are free from any victimisation.

The commissioner is obliged to manage internal disciplinary arrangements within the police service in a way similar to that applying to other chief executives. It will also encourage the police service to assume greater control of discipline, so that unfortunate incidents such as that which occurred at Toowoomba are able to receive prompt and thorough investigation, with appropriate remedial action.

Part VIII spells out resignation, retirement and change of status provisions. The essential feature of this part is the provision to have more flexible arrangements in the event of officers seeking termination of services because of medical incapacity.

In recent years there has been an escalating problem of advancing medical grounds as reasons for early retirement with receipt of lump-sum payments. In the case where a police officer is sufficiently fit to perform other duties with the police service, provision is made for the person to undergo a change of status and become a staff member.

Suitable changes are foreshadowed to the Police Superannuation Act to ensure that an officer who maintains service as a staff member can receive a gap pension to make up rights and entitlements to that formerly accruing as a police officer. This provision does not give police officers automatic entitlement to become public servants. It allows a police officer to continue to pursue worthwhile work in the service, in a status other than as a police officer, having full police powers and duties.

Part IX provides for a review of decisions made within the service by an external Commissioner for Police Service Reviews. This process will ensure that police officers have the right to bring before an administrative review process any concerns they have about unfairness or improper conduct in the process of making such decisions.

As I foreshadowed earlier, the Fitzgerald report made it clear that the legal process of disputing promotion decisions was no longer appropriate and that an administrative process should be implemented. A part-time member of the Criminal Justice Commission will be nominated from time to time by the chairman to perform the responsibility of Commissioner for Police Service Reviews and make appropriate recommendations to the Commissioner of Police. The Commissioner of Police is subject to overview by the Chairman of the Criminal Justice Commission, who would direct the commissioner to take appropriate action, if it was felt in the circumstances that the commissioner had at any time failed to act properly on the advice of the Commissioner for Police Service Reviews. The review arrangements proposed are seen to accommodate the Fitzgerald requirements but ensure that police officers receive fair and just treatment and access to an external review body to hear their particular concerns.

Part X contains the necessary machinery, offences and penalties to ensure that the intention of the legislation is achieved in practice.

The first provision ensures that confidential material held within the police service may not be sold or released to other sources. In addition, it is made lawful for any officer or staff member within the service to express in a report made in good faith, in the execution of duty, matters of opinion regarding the conduct, efficiency or character of any officer or staff member. This provision will assist the service with its internal improvement of integrity and ensure high standards of conduct are achieved and maintained.

Under this part, the commissioner may also reject frivolous complaints made against police officers. The legislation also makes provision for legal costs of indemnity for officers who are sued in civil actions for matters arising during the course of their employment. Police officers will also have the equivalent of full workers' compensation

coverage in the appropriate circumstances so that no police officer who is injured at work, or on the way to or from work, is in any worse position than any other working member of the community.

It also provides a redeployment option for officers suffering the effects of ill health, so that officers who can no longer serve as operational police can be offered employment which is in accord with their capacities and are not mandatorily retired, as had occurred previously.

This part also creates as an offence the bribery or corruption of officers or staff members of the police service. The power of arrest for certain serious offences against the Act and machinery necessary to identify such persons is also provided. The identification provision is particularly important, so that the current problem of mistaken identity does not occur when following up offenders who fail to appear in court.

The final section in this part requires a compulsory review of this legislation to be carried out in consultation with all interested parties before the end of the term of the first incumbent commissioner of the Queensland Police Service.

Part XI of the Bill deals with transitional and repeal provisions, to ensure the smooth and effective transition of the police force to the Queensland Police Service.

Some officers have expressed disquiet regarding the removal from this legislation of the simple offences of assaulting a police officer and resisting arrest. This is not intended to deny officers any legal recourse in these matters and leave them unprotected. It is intended to amend the Criminal Code to ensure that these offences are included in the code as simple offences. Until this is done, the relevant provisions of the present Police Act will remain in force.

In conclusion, this legislation will enable implementation of Fitzgerald report recommendations. It will ensure that the three reform objectives of effective crime prevention, efficient police service operations and honest police service performance will be achieved. Under this proposed legislation the Queensland Police Service will be able to reform and revitalise itself and achieve the standards of excellence desired by all Queenslanders.

I seek leave to have incorporated in *Hansard* Explanatory Notes relating to the Bill.

Leave granted.

#### POLICE SERVICE ADMINISTRATION BILL EXPLANATORY NOTES

This Bill is for an Act to provide for the Queensland Police Service and its administration.

The Bill has as its objects the provision of the maintenance of the Queensland Police Service, the membership of the Service and the development and administration of the Service.

#### PART I—PRELIMINARY

*Clause 1.1* sets out the short title to the Act.

*Clause 1.2* sets out the commencement dates.

*Clause 1.3* details the objects of the Bill.

*Clause 1.4* provides the interpretation of a number of words and phrases used throughout the Bill.

#### PART 11—QUEENSLAND POLICE SERVICE

*Clause 2.1* provides for the maintenance of a body of persons under the name and style "Queensland Police Service".

*Clause 2.2* details the membership of the Service. In this clause it is made clear that the members of the public service who are employed in the Department of Police and Emergency Services are to be considered as members of the Service. Other clauses will deal with the obligation for these personnel to comply with the instructions of the Commissioner of Police or delegates. The Bill does not alter the status of such persons as public servants.

*Clause 2.3* sets out the functions of the Service.

*Clause 2.4* provides that the community's responsibilities in regard to peace and good order are not abrogated.

*Clause 2.5*, in conjunction with the provisions of clause 2.2, deals with the appointment and administration of staff members including those who are members of the public service.

#### PART III—POLICE OFFICERS' POWERS AND DUTIES RELATED TO THOSE OF CONSTABLES

*Clause 3.1* defines the term officer, for the purposes of Part III, to include a special constable.

*Clause 3.2* details the position of the officers of the Service as constables at common law. Under this section a constable's powers at common law will be granted to officers of the Service generally and the duties of a constable at common law will be imposed on constables and non-commissioned officers.

*Clause 3.3* requires an officer, before commencing duty as such an officer, to take and subscribe to the prescribed oath.

*Clause 3.4* details the method of proving that a person is a police officer.

*Clause 3.5* permits one officer to act for any other officer in the execution of warrants and the service of process.

*Clause 3.6* spells out when an officer is acting in the execution of his duty.

*Clause 3.7* spells out that when an officer ceases to be an officer he or she shall cease to have all of the powers of an officer.

#### PART IV—COMMISSIONER OF THE QUEENSLAND POLICE SERVICE

*Clause 4.1* establishes the office of the Commissioner of the Queensland Police Service.

*Clause 4.2* empowers the Governor in Council, on the recommendation of the Minister for Police in which the Chairman of the Criminal Justice Commission concurs, to appoint a fit and proper person to be Commissioner.

*Clause 4.3* spells out the conditions of appointment of the Commissioner.

*Clause 4.4* spells out that the term of appointment of the Commissioner shall be from three to five years and that the incumbent is eligible for re-appointment.

*Clause 4.5* details the mode of removing or suspending a Commissioner from office. This clause spells out that the office becomes vacant on the death, resignation or retirement of the Commissioner. The Commissioner may be removed from office for a breach of contract. Additional grounds for removal are if the Commissioner is incapable of performing the duties of the office, is incompetent, has been found guilty of official misconduct, has been convicted of an indictable offence or is imprisoned for any offence. In such a case the Governor in Council, on the recommendation of the Minister and with the concurrence of the Chairman of the Criminal Justice Commission, may remove the Commissioner from office. If the Minister and the Chairman cannot agree then the Governor in Council, on an address from the Legislative Assembly praying for the Commissioner's removal, may remove the Commissioner from office.

*Clause 4.6* deals with the method of formal communication between the Minister for Police and the Commissioner. Under this clause the Commissioner must furnish reports required by the Minister and may at other times furnish reports dealing with the efficient and proper administration, management and functioning of the Queensland Police Service. The clause empowers the Minister to give to the Commissioner directions in relation to the overall administration, policy and priorities of the Service. The Commissioner is to comply with such directions.

*Clause 4.7* spells out the system of recording and publication of communications between the Minister and the Commissioner. Such communications are to be recorded in a register and a certified correct copy of the register is to be forwarded to the Chairman of the Criminal Justice Commission who may add any comments he or she may wish to make. The copy of the register is then to be forwarded to the Chairman of the Parliamentary Criminal Justice Committee. The Chairman of the Parliamentary Criminal Justice Committee is then required to table the copy in the Legislative Assembly within 14 sitting days.

*Clause 4.8* spells out the responsibilities of the Commissioner. These responsibilities are seen as necessary for the Commissioner to efficiently and properly administer and manage the Service and are similar to those of Chief Executives as detailed in the *Public Service Management and Employment Act 1988-1990*.

*Clause 4.9* empowers the Commissioner of Police to give directions to officers and staff members on matters he or she considers necessary and convenient for the efficient and proper functioning of the Queensland Police.

*Clause 4.10* permits the Commissioner to delegate all or any of his powers and duties to any person. This degree of flexibility will allow the Commissioner to delegate to the Commanders of the Regions certain of his or her powers to enable a more efficient regional structure to be implemented in the Service and to delegate to officers in other positions sufficient responsibility and authority to effectively and efficiently perform the duties required.

*Clause 4.11* spells out the procedure for appointing an acting Commissioner. If the Commissioner is absent the Commissioner will be able to appoint an acting Commissioner. If the Commissioner is unable to perform duty because of incapacity or suspension from office the Minister will be able to appoint an acting Commissioner.

*Clause 4.12* grants to the Commissioner an official seal and requires courts to take judicial notice of the seal and signature of the Commissioner.

#### PART V—APPOINTMENT OF PERSONNEL

*Clause 5.1* permits the ranks in the Service to be prescribed by regulations.

*Clause 5.2* requires that appointments to and promotions in the Service be on merit and on impartial procedures. This clause is designed to prevent any prejudice or unjust discrimination in the appointment and promotion process.

*Clause 5.3* permits the Governor in Council to appoint executive officers. These officers will provide the executive management in the Service and will fill, amongst others, the roles of Deputy Commissioner for Operations, Deputy Commissioner for Support Services and the positions of Regional Commanders.

*Clause 5.4* spells out the conditions of service of executive officers.

*Clause 5.5* deals with the appointment by the Commissioner of acting executive officers.

*Clause 5.6* permits the Commissioner to appoint persons to be commissioned officers, non-commissioned officers, constables and police recruits.

*Clause 5.7* details the conditions of employment of commissioned officers. In summary, these will be:

- full time and on limited tenure until reaching retirement age;
- full time and on unlimited tenure if the position is especially prescribed;
- full time and on a contract if the position is especially prescribed.

*Clause 5.8* deals with the appointment by the Commissioner of acting commissioned officers.

*Clause 5.9* details the conditions of employment of noncommissioned officers and constables. In summary, these will be:

- full time and on unlimited tenure until reaching retirement age;
- full time and on limited tenure if the position is especially prescribed;
- part-time if the position is especially prescribed.

*Clause 5.10* provides that if an officer is a member of the Service when he or she is appointed to a position on contract or upon limited tenure, then special provision will be made to permit the officer to return to the rank held prior to the appointment if the appointment expires or is terminated for reasons other than resignation or disciplinary reasons.

*Clause 5.11* spells out that police recruits (persons selected to undergo training to assess their suitability as officers) shall be on a contract basis.

*Clause 5.12* details a system of probation which will be used to ensure that appointees either in the first instance or on promotion perform to satisfactory standards.

*Clause 5.13* requires an officer to accept a transfer unless he has a good cause for not so doing.

*Clause 5.14* permits the holders of prescribed offices under the Crown to transfer their entitlements if they become officers in the Police Service.

*Clause 5.15* spells out that an officer is an employee of the Crown and in Industrial Law.

*Clause 5.16* permits the appointment by the Commissioner of special constables. These are usually serving interstate police officers in border stations who assist the Queensland Police in the execution of their duty.



## PART VI—STANDING DOWN AND SUSPENSION

*Clause 6.1* gives to the Commissioner the power to stand down or suspend a police officer in a range of circumstances. Standing down removes the officers status as a constable but permits him or her to continue in the paid and active employment of the Commissioner. Suspension removes the officer from the Police Service for the period of suspension. The grounds for such standing down and suspension are either disciplinary or medical.

*Clause 6.2* spells out that the entitlement of an officer to salary and allowances whilst stood down is the same as prior to the standing down.

*Clause 6.3* spells out the entitlement of an officer to salary and allowances whilst suspended. The general rule is that such an officer will be entitled to salary and allowances except in those exceptional cases where the Commissioner determines otherwise. If an officer is not permitted salary and allowances whilst suspended the officer will be entitled to gain alternative suitable employment. If the employment is found by the Commissioner to be unsuitable this will be possible grounds for dismissal. If an officer is reinstated after being suspended he or she will be eligible for whatever salary and allowances or difference in salary and allowances they have lost. An officer suspended for reasons of ill health will always be entitled to full salary and allowances.

*Clause 6.4* spells out that an officer who is stood down or suspended is relieved of power and duties while stood down or suspended.

## PART VII—INTERNAL COMMAND AND DISCIPLINE

*Clause 7.1* spells out the responsibility for command at any incident that calls for action by the police.

*Clause 7.2* imposes a duty on police officers and staff members to report all alleged or suspected misconduct to the Criminal Justice Commission and the Commissioner and to take all appropriate disciplinary action.

*Clause 7.3* creates an offence of victimization to protect those who have done their duty under clause 7.2.

*Clause 7.4* empowers the taking of disciplinary action by the prescribed officer. The range of disciplinary measures are of those which are available to Chief Executives in the equivalent other Government Departments.

## PART VIII—RESIGNATION, RETIREMENT AND CHANGE OF STATUS

*Clause 8.1* provides for the resignation procedure.

*Clause 8.2* provides for the retirement procedure.

*Clause 8.3* enables a person who is no longer medically fit to be a police officer to retire on medical grounds in the appropriate case. However, if the person is still fit enough to perform duty within the Service, provision is made for the person to undergo a change in status and become a staff member within the Queensland Police.

## PART IX—REVIEW OF DECISIONS

*Clause 9.1* limits reviews under Part IX of the Bill to those where the person has no right to appeal or seek a review under the *Criminal Justice Act 1989-1990*.

*Clause 9.2* ensures that reviews of decisions do not impede the good management of the Service. It does this by ensuring that a review does not stay the decision.

*Clause 9.3* gives to an aggrieved officer a right to seek a review of certain decisions. This review is to be conducted by the Commissioner for Police Service Reviews.

*Clause 9.4* spells out the procedures which are to be followed by the Commissioner for Police Service Reviews. These will be administrative and informal, and this will enable a speedy resolution of the grievance.

*Clause 9.5* requires the Commissioner for Police Service Reviews upon completing the review to make recommendations to the Commissioner and the Commissioner is then to take such action as appears to the Commissioner to be just and fair.

*Clause 9.6* provides that if a decision is rescinded after Review, the effect will be the same as if the decision was never made.

## PART X—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

*Clause 10.1* makes it an offence for any officer or staff member to improperly disclose information whilst clause 10.2 enables authorization to be given in cases approved by the Commissioner and permitted by the regulations.

*Clause 10.3* provides protection from liability for police officers and staff members in respect of work reports. This protection is to ensure that full and frank reports are made so as to enable the Service to effectively operate as a disciplined body.

*Clause 10.4* makes provision for the Commissioner to reject frivolous and vexatious complaints.

*Clause 10.5* makes provision for the liability of the Crown, officers, staff members and in respect of torts. Subclause (5) offers protection in cases where an officer is engaged in rendering assistance. The remainder of the clause details the liability of the Crown with respect to acts of officers and staff members.

*Clause 10.6* permits the Crown to pay any damages (other than punitive damages) with respect to a tort committed by the officer, staff member or recruit.

*Clause 10.7* empowers the Commissioner to provide a police officer, staff member and police recruit with legal representation.

*Clause 10.8* empowers the Commissioner to provide injured officers and police recruits with adequate compensation if such injuring was received whilst acting in the execution of duty. Under this clause the officer will be entitled to similar benefits as all other workers. The provision will extend to the families of such officers similar benefits if the officer or police recruit is killed whilst acting in the execution of duty.

*Clause 10.9* provides for the service of documents on a delegate of the Commissioner.

*Clause 10.10* provides for the declaration of police establishments.

*Clause 10.11* deems all police establishments and property to be the property of the Commissioner.

*Clause 10.12* spells out that proceedings to which the Commissioner is a party do not cease with a change of holder of the office. The clause also makes an averment of certain administrative facts sufficient proof of those facts in the absence of evidence to the contrary.

*Clause 10.13* requires officers to surrender equipment on discharge.

*Clause 10.14* provides machinery to remove occupiers from premises which are the property of the Commissioner.

*Clause 10.15* provides the machinery for the disposal of property such as lost property which has made its way lawfully into the possession of the police.

*Clause 10.16* permits the Commissioner to charge for certain prescribed police services.

*Clause 10.17* exempts police from tolls when such police are acting in the execution of their duty.

*Clause 10.18* makes provision protecting the integrity of names associated with police.

*Clause 10.19* makes a number of offences dealing with the integrity of the police service.

*Clause 10.20* creates an offence of bribery or corruption of officers or staff members.

*Clause 10.21* creates an offence of false representations causing police investigations.

*Clause 10.22* provides a power of arrest for certain serious offences against the Act and machinery to identify such persons.

*Clause 10.23* deals with the method of taking proceedings under the Act.

*Clause 10.24* permits police prosecutors to act on the behalf of other officers in the Magistrates Court and Children's Court.

*Clause 10.25* provides power to make regulations.

*Clause 10.26* requires the Commissioner to prepare an Annual Report.

*Clause 10.27* requires a compulsory review of the Act to be carried out before the end of the term of the first incumbent Commissioner.

#### PART XI—TRANSITIONAL AND REPEAL

Part XI of the Bill is solely concerned with the smooth and effective transition of the Police Force to the Queensland Police Service. When that is accomplished the present Acts dealing with the Police Force will be repealed.

**Mr MACKENROTH:** I commend the Bill to the House.  
Debate, on motion of Mr Lingard, adjourned.

**DRUGS MISUSE ACT AMENDMENT BILL**

**Hon. T. M. MACKENROTH** (Chatsworth—Minister for Police and Emergency Services) (9.08 p.m.), by leave, without notice: I move—

"That leave be granted to bring in a Bill to amend the Drugs Misuse Act 1986-1989 to vary punishment and for related purposes."

Motion agreed to.

**First Reading**

Bill and Explanatory Notes presented and Bill, on motion of Mr Mackenroth, read a first time.

**Second Reading**

**Hon. T. M. MACKENROTH** (Chatsworth—Minister for Police and Emergency Services) (9.09 p.m.): I move—

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

Last year we saw the inability of the then Premier, Mr Cooper, and prior to that the failure of Joh Bjelke-Petersen to define the principle of the separation of powers. That inability to define the principle was also carried through into legislation which they steamrolled through this Parliament. One of the most draconian Acts in that regard surely must be the Drugs Misuse Act and its provision for mandatory life sentences.

This Act was passed in the Queensland Parliament in 1986 in an attempt to show the people of Queensland that the National Party was tough on drugs. Likewise, it was amended prior to the 1989 election to further sell the myth that the National Party was tough on drugs. But the true picture was that the National Party was long on rhetoric and short on action.

When I became the Minister for Police I found a Drug Squad that had been starved of funds and manpower for the past decade. The only initiative of the former Government that I could find was a trial sign which declared schools to be drug-free zones—a sign which would have had as much impact in combating the major drug trade in Queensland as the Drugs Misuse Act.

The reality is that one cannot fight the drug war with metal signs and paper Acts. What is needed is a police service which has the resources and manpower to get out and find the Mr Bigs and the people who make their living out of other people's misery. Our Government has taken that action.

As the new Minister for Police, I have been given the responsibility to make the fight against drugs in Queensland the No. 1 priority for the Queensland Police Department. One of my first actions as Minister was to double the resources allocated to the drug fight. This Government has allocated the sum of \$736,000 for this financial year to be specifically spent on increases in staff and equipment for the drug fight. In particular, this allocation of resources will result in an additional 25 Drug Squad detectives for the Brisbane-based Drug Squad, which presently has 33 members, bringing to 58 the total Drug Squad officers based in Brisbane.

The far north of Queensland has been recognised as a major drug problem area. There has never been an officially dedicated Drug Squad based in Cairns or Townsville. In the past Cairns had two detectives operating as an unofficial Drug Squad. Townsville also had two detectives operating as an unofficial Drug Squad. The detectives in Townsville did both Drug Squad and criminal investigation work. Their activities were therefore only partly directed to the drug fight. The allocation of those increased resources will result in the establishment of a four-man Drug Squad in Cairns and a four-man Drug Squad in Townsville. The task of those two units will be directed solely towards fighting drugs.

The total increase in staff for the Drug Squad represents an increase of 33 additional detectives. Along with the allocation of additional staff, the increase in funding will allow for the purchase of 20 additional motor vehicles fitted with radio equipment. It will allow for the purchase of additional secure communications equipment, more photographic equipment and more recording equipment. In the past, all those items have been in short supply for the Drug Squad.

The increase in funding will result in an enhanced capacity of the police Drug Squad to apprehend offenders, to seize drugs and the proceeds of drug sales and to enhance the overall operation of the Drug Squad in its fight against heroin, other hard drugs and cannabis. It will allow the allocation of more resources to detect and bring to justice the large drug-traffickers through an enhanced information and intelligence-gathering system.

It will allow also follow-up investigations resulting from the public supplying information on drug-related activities. In line with this Government's targeting of the Mr Bigs of the drug world, the increased staff will allow for an increase in the number of detectives devoted to the recently formed implementation unit. The additional allocation will allow for an increase in investigation and pin-pointing of profits from drug-trafficking. There will be a more effective collation of intelligence information, which is the basis for any effective and efficient drug operation and more so in the fight against the Mr Bigs. The resources will allow for the targeting of the production of amphetamines, which are the cheap man's cocaine, and heroin. The use of such drugs is becoming a worldwide problem and no less so for Queensland.

The allocation of additional resources will allow for the establishment of a drug training section within the Drug Squad. This section will, for the first time, establish a means for training detectives in the highly specialised task of drug investigation work.

The allocation of resources will allow for the use of technical and electronic equipment, which is essential for the modern drug investigation.

That is the type of action which will win the war against the drug barons—not rhetoric and metal signs. Never again do I want to hear that the Labor Party is soft on drugs. Our Government has done more in the past three months to combat the drug problem than the National Party did in the past 10 years.

I turn now to the amendments to the Drugs Misuse Act. The amendments remove from the Act the mandatory life provisions and provide for a review of sentences of people who are already serving mandatory life sentences. All provisions of mandatory life in the Act will be replaced with a term of 25 years. Provisions relating to life will be replaced with a term of 20 years.

When the new provisions in this Act are considered, it is important to note that they will be equal to the toughest in Australia and will accord with the Commonwealth Customs Act, but they will be realistically tougher.

The fallacy that this is in some way softening our stance on drugs can be discounted by considering two recent court cases in New South Wales where eight people were charged by the National Crime Authority under the Commonwealth Customs Act with importation of drugs. The sentences handed out could in no way be considered light.

In the first case the persons were sentenced to the following—

24 years (non-parole period: 18 years)

20 years (17 years)

15 years (12 years)

15 years (12 years).

In the second case, the following sentences were handed down—

18 years (non-parole period: 13 1/2 years)

22 years (16 1/2 years)

24 years (18 years)

12 years (8 years).

Those sentences can be compared with mandatory life in Queensland, which allows an application for parole immediately; but, in the case of the previous Government, people had to wait 13 years. Of those eight convictions, five can be seen to be tougher sentences than those that have been previously handed down under the provisions of the Drugs Misuse Act. But the most important aspect of them was that the sentence was decided by a judge and not by the Parliament.

In considering the amendments before the House, I think all members should consider some of the following criticisms of the legislation over the past 3 1/2 years. On 7 August 1986, the *Courier-Mail* editorial stated—

" A court denied discretion in imposing a sentence cannot measure the degree of guilt or punishment because it cannot take into consideration the circumstances of the case, the previous record of the accused or any of the grounds that otherwise would ensure that the punishment fits the crime."

This editorial reflected the criticisms at the time of the Queensland Bar Association, the Law Society, the Council for Civil Liberties and other groups in relation to mandatory life sentences.

A report by the criminal law subcommittee of the Queensland Bar Association to the association's president, Ian Callinan, QC, described the mandatory life sentences as implying that—

". . . judges are too soft on drug offences which is an insult to the judiciary . . . Mandatory life imprisonment will undermine public confidence in the justice system."

That was reported in the *Sun* of 8 August 1989.

Drug Arm was also critical of the legislation. It said that the Bill was unlikely to deter drug-traffickers and said that, under the legislation, many people would be condemned to life imprisonment although, if they receive suitable treatment, they could be returned to a normal and productive life. That was reported in the *Courier-Mail* of 1 September 1986.

In April 1988, in the Supreme Court, Mr Justice Dowsett criticised the activity of police undercover agents when he said—

"It is a situation where police agents are provoking users to become suppliers presumably because it carries higher penalties."

On 25 June 1988, the second International Criminal Law Congress endorsed a motion calling for the removal of the mandatory life sentence provision from the Act. The Public Defender's annual report for 1987-88, tabled in Parliament in October 1988, criticised the effect that mandatory life penalties were having in clogging the Supreme Court lists.

The Queensland Government was accused of playing politics in a joint parliamentary committee hearing into the National Crime Authority inquiry into drugs. The inquiry was told by the State's Justice Department's legislative director that the success of the Government's drug policy was "measured at the ballot-box". When pressed, Mr Brian Stewart was unable to produce statistics to prove that drug use in Queensland has fallen as a result of the 1986 Act. That appeared in a report in the *Weekend Australian* of 18-19 February 1989. The former Chief Justice, Sir Dormer Andrews, said in his retirement speech in April 1989 that the Supreme Court list had become too long, mainly due to the Drugs Misuse Act. The new Chief Justice, Mr Justice Macrossan, repeated Sir Dormer's comments at his swearing-in ceremony in April 1989.

Mr Justice Thomas, in the Supreme Court, said that he had difficulty in sentencing a drug offender because the Drugs Misuse Act had removed the court's traditional discretion. In sentencing a 22-year-old mother to mandatory life for trafficking in a total

amount of 1.2 grams of heroin, Mr Justice Derrington in the Supreme Court said it was regrettable that mandatory life legislation did not allow for variations in the degree of seriousness of offences. He sentenced Kerrie Anne Savarin to mandatory life for this amount and recommended release on parole after four years.

In August 1988, the *Legal Service Bulletin* reported—

"The purpose of mandatory sentences is to take away all discretion from the judiciary. Chief Justice Burger of the US Supreme Court stated in *Furman vs Georgia* that: 'It has been widely accepted that mandatory sentences for crimes do not serve the best ends of the criminal justice system'. This attitude was supported by a judicial officer survey conducted by the Australian Law Reform Commission in its 1980 report, in which judges expressed negative sentiments about mandatory penalties, an attitude shared by the Law Reform Commission itself".

Added to those criticisms can be those of the police, clergy, civil liberties groups and others. The reality is that there is no evidence to show that the mandatory life provision has in any way affected the drug trade in Queensland.

Recently, the Leader of the Opposition stated that a recent incident showed that the mandatory life provisions were forcing drug-dealers out of Queensland. I immediately asked the police for a report into those claims and was given the following information: there is only one incident in which the Leader of the Opposition may attempt to argue that a drug-dealer was not coming to Queensland because of the deterrent effect of the mandatory life in prison penalty.

The circumstances of that incident are as follows: on 28 February 1990, the staff of the Brisbane Drug Squad targeted a Gold Coast hotel for drug offences. An undercover agent had purchased drugs from a person in a motor vehicle outside the hotel. This agent then went to New South Wales with the offenders to meet the principal of a drug-growing operation. New South Wales police then became involved in the investigation and the principal offender was arrested and charged with aiding/abetting/supplying and cultivating cannabis. Five kilos of cannabis, 35 cannabis plants and the sum of \$5380 were seized.

The question arises as to why this person was not in Queensland with his plantation. The answer to that is that he is a native of New South Wales; his property is situated in New South Wales; and it appears that most of his drug-dealings and activities were conducted in New South Wales. He did not come to Queensland on 28 February 1990 because his motor vehicle was unregistered and he did not have a driver's licence. The issue of mandatory life sentences was in no way a consideration. That information completely discredits the claim by the Leader of the Opposition.

Of course, the fallacy expounded by National Party members is believed by some people. They have worked on the principle that if a lie is told often enough someone will believe it.

It was interesting to read a story in the paper last week about a New South Wales policeman who claimed that people were growing

marijuana in northern New South Wales to escape the provisions of the Queensland legislation. Directly under his claim in the same paper on the same page were two stories outlining major discoveries of plantations in Queensland by Queensland police, which is surely a total contradiction of his claim.

Turning now to the clauses in the legislation—clauses 1 to 4 are machinery clauses. Clauses 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9 amend sections 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9 of the principal Act by replacing the mandatory life provisions with a maximum 25 year sentence and a life provision with a maximum 20 year sentence.

Clause 10 amends section 19 of the principal Act to insert a subsection that will require police officers to issue a written receipt for seized property. Clause 11 amends section 25 of the principal Act in consequence of the changes to the sentence provisions.

At present an interception warrant can only be obtained from a Supreme Court judge in cases in which the offences under investigation carry a maximum life sentence. As this sentence is to be replaced with a maximum sentence of 20 years, the Bill amends this section accordingly.

Clause 12 amends section 32 of the principal Act, which requires destruction of forfeited drugs and drug-related paraphernalia, to permit the Minister to authorise the retention of these things for training, educational and related purposes. Clause 13 amends section 49 of the principal Act in consequence of previous amendments. Clause 14 amends section 54 of the principal Act to ensure consistency with previous amendments.

Clause 15 inserts a new section 61 in the principal Act which gives a right to persons already sentenced to life to request that they be re-sentenced under the amended penalty sections. Such a person would then be sentenced under the offence sections as amended. All appeal rights will then follow.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate, on motion of Mr Lingard, adjourned.

### **FIRE SERVICE BILL**

**Hon. T. M. MACKENROTH** (Chatsworth—Minister for Police and Emergency Services) (9.25 p.m.), by leave, without notice: I move—

"That leave be granted to bring in a Bill to provide for the constitution, functions and powers of The Commissioner of Fire Service and the Queensland Fire Service and to provide for the prevention of and response to fires and certain other incidents endangering persons, property or the environment and for related purposes."

Motion agreed to.

### **First Reading**

Bill and Explanatory Notes presented and Bill, on motion of Mr Mackenroth, read a first time.

### **Second Reading**

**Hon. T. M. MACKENROTH** (Chatsworth—Minister for Police and Emergency Services) (9.26 p.m.): I move—

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

I am pleased to introduce a Bill which will, at last, lever Queensland's fire services into the 1990s and take them confidently into the twenty-first century.

The Fire Service Bill 1990 provides the foundation for a single modern fire service to serve all Queensland. Despite the recommendations of two major and independent reviews, this was not achieved by the previous Government, and the State's fire services would have remained wallowing in conditions equivalent to a village fire service until some catastrophe exposed them, and that kind of catastrophe would have been inevitable.

When we have 81 individual employing authorities with 81 standards of equipment and training varying from the barely efficient to the obsolete, and we top that with a feudal administration system which actually prevents pumps from turning out to major fires, we have a calamity waiting to happen.

With this Act, those 81 fire service boards are disbanded.

They will be replaced by a regionalised single fire service covering all of Queensland, and a single head, in the form of a Commissioner for Fire Services, will be appointed.

Of course, there will always be some discomfort in abandoning the old ways; there will always be shrill voices of discontent, which can be quietened by staying in the

quicksand of the status quo. In this case, the discomfort comes from the displacement of some 500 to 600 board members throughout the State, who will no doubt clamour around with 600 reasons why they cannot be dispensed with. One of the arguments already raised concerns the myth that these actions will create some kind of huge, all-powerful centralised bureaucracy which will leave any area outside Brisbane without a voice and impotent in the area of fire services.

In fact, quite the opposite is true. With the establishment of these regions, there will actually be fewer people working out of the Brisbane headquarters. There will be no concentration of power in the city. The whole strategy is based around the autonomy of the new regions, which will operate in much the same way as the police regions do now.

The huge difference will be in the improvements which will flow through in equipment, training and procedures because of the standardisation which comes with having one single fire service.

This Bill will mean there are no more poor relations in the fire service.

It will ensure that every region is equipped and manned to the level necessary to provide efficient, effective firefighting services to local residents. And it will ensure effective decisions are made promptly where they need to be—in the region concerned.

Managerial authority and responsibility would pass to the regional commanders. The chain of command will be simple and direct to central office through the Deputy Commissioner, Operations. This does not mean the end of community input. Regional commanders and deputies will seek the advice and opinions of the local people, particularly their community-leaders, whenever they desire it. As sensible managers they should be able to do this without having a board to sustain the practice.

We acknowledge the attempts made with the introduction of the Fire Service Bill 1989 to accommodate some change to the service.

But the Act itself was very much a compromise. It was a very hesitant first step towards what we will only now achieve with this Fire Service Bill 1990. The previous Act did, in fact, fail to address the fundamental points contained in the previous Government's own commission of review, which found that (a) the present management structure is at least 40 years behind international standards; (b) that what we have is at best a village fire service driven by ad hoc arrangements throughout the State, with no concept of coordination; (c) that there is no capacity for strategic planning across the 81 boards and 1 400 bush fire brigades; and (d) that the structure itself was an impediment to any improvements.

It would seem glaringly obvious that the 81 boards and their fragmented system had served their time and would have to go to make way for a modern, regionalised system and improved conditions that go with it in the 1990s. But, as I have already indicated, change often brings discomfort and, unfortunately, the discomfort of board members piqued by their removal won out in the minds of the last Government over the concerns of fire safety and efficiency.

I do not wish to be unkind to any particular board. But it is obvious that the continued existence of boards has hindered the progress of an integrated fire service and stifled the growth of both brigades and individuals. They have become the dinosaurs of the system—81 qangos with 81 different perspectives. But that has been the fault of the system, not necessarily the boards themselves, which I believe have been served over many years by some diligent and community-minded people.

Beneath the surface, however, has been a fire service struggling to maintain its operations around a crumbling and depleted infrastructure. The blame for this situation lies entirely with the previous Government, which would have been happy to wait until that inevitable catastrophe hit, just as it did with its police force.

Nero, fiddling while Rome burned, had nothing on the Nationals.

The proposals in this Fire Service Bill 1990 have the full support of the fire-fighters who have worked for so long under the old archaic system. That our fire services have maintained the enviable reputation they have for efficiency and safety is in large part



due to the efforts of these people around the State. They deserve a major input into the restructure of the service.

I have already initiated an overhaul in training and education to be steered by a working party of fire-fighters and training officers which will plan a new training division. Work has already begun on bringing fire-pumping appliances and other equipment up to date, and the results should see Queensland in the vanguard of fire-fighting in Australia.

Again, without the presence of boards, industrial relations should be more streamlined. We will continue to consult the United Firefighters Union on matters such as rank structures, workplace health and safety and industrial relations. This is the first time that fire-fighters on the ground have been given the opportunity to have a say in how fires are fought. I have no doubt they will relish the task and that our fire services will be the better for it.

Auxiliary fire-fighters have a critical role to play, but I believe this role should occur within the State Fire Services framework. The importance of auxiliary fire-fighters in maintaining an effective fire-fighting service throughout Queensland will remain undiminished and, in some areas, may even be increased under the new organisational arrangements. Auxiliary fire-fighting units should be integrated under the operational control of district commanders, who will be responsible for the recruitment, administration and development of these units. There will be a fresh focus on their development as a professional arm of the service and on enhancing the operational efficiency of auxiliaries.

The Bill also includes provision for a change of name for the Rural Fires Board to the Rural Fire Council, and a change of role for that organisation to providing advice to the commissioner and the Minister on matters relating to rural fires and rural fire brigades. The council will also, of course, continue to be involved in the promotion of fire safety, fire prevention and the reduction of fire danger in rural areas.

Queensland has been admirably served for many years by all fire-fighters--full-time, auxiliary or volunteers. They have provided the best service they could under often trying circumstances. With this Bill, they will finally get the reforms their service needs to operate at optimum level. The disbandment of the boards and the creation of a single, regionalised service with regional command and one single head of the State Fire Services will finally deliver these reforms.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate, on motion of Mr Lingard, adjourned.

#### **TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT BILL**

**Hon. D. J. HAMILL** (Ipswich—Minister for Transport and Minister Assisting the Premier on Economic and Trade Development) (9.36 p.m.), by leave, without notice: I move—

"That leave be granted to bring in a Bill to amend the Traffic Act 1949-1989 in certain particulars."  
Motion agreed to.

#### **First Reading**

Bill and Explanatory Notes presented and Bill, on motion of Mr Hamill, read a first time.

#### **Second Reading**

**Hon. D. J. HAMILL** (Ipswich—Minister for Transport and Minister Assisting the Premier on Economic and Trade Development) (9.37 p.m.): I move—

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

This Bill contains initiatives as the first step in the Goss Labor Government's commitment to reduce the road toll and to combat bad and dangerous driving. The

amendments contained in this Bill address the introduction of "red-light" cameras to detect offences at intersections controlled by traffic lights; provide a scheme to allow for modification of conditions imposed on work licences granted to first-time drink-driving offenders where they encounter changed employment circumstances; and have a provision to prevent the dumping of removed buildings on public roads and adjacent land.

I will now address each amendment as it appears in the Bill. Since 1984 the Traffic Act has contained a provision which allows certain persons convicted of their first drink-driving offence to apply for a special provisional licence which is restricted by conditions to permit driving in the course of employment. In consideration of this licence—which may be granted by a magistrate only at the time of conviction—the magistrate may impose a period of disqualification up to twice the time normally incurred for the particular offence. This legislation was intended to ensure that, where a driver was convicted for a first offence, unnecessary hardship was not placed on the driver or his family in circumstances where the loss of licence would also result in the loss of employment. Since 1984 this provision has prevented undue social and economic hardship on the other innocent victims of drink-driving offences—the families of the drink driver. However, experience has demonstrated that there have been some problems in the operation of the scheme which require addressing.

This Bill contains a number of amendments to rectify these problems, namely—

- to allow employers to give supporting testimony to an application before a court;
- to ensure that any court order does not permit the applicant to drive any type of vehicle on which he has not previously been tested and held a licence;
- to not allow the holder of a learner's permit to apply because he has not been tested as to his ability to drive safely on our roads;
- to restrict the eligibility of applicants, as was originally intended, to those drivers who held a Queensland licence at the time of the offence and who continue to hold a Queensland licence when they appear before a court on the drink-driving charge;
- to extend the ineligibility of persons who have had a previous dangerous-driving or interstate drink-driving conviction in the previous five years;
- to substantially increase the maximum penalty for disobeying the restrictions placed on the special licence from 20 to 200 penalty units, which is currently \$1,200 in monetary terms; and
- to permit holders of such restricted licences to reapply if during the holding of the licence the circumstances surrounding earning their livelihood have changed.

This last point is an important initiative, and one on which I wish to elaborate further.

Currently, when a convicted drink driver convinces a court that he is a fit and proper person to drive and that depriving him of his driver's licence would affect his means of earning a livelihood and thereby cause him extreme hardship, a court can order the issue of a provisional licence. Naturally, when a person first applies for a work licence he will generally confine his application to the circumstances which pertain to his current work situation in the belief that they are not likely to change. The restrictions placed by the court on his licence usually only apply to his current vehicle, his current employer, the times he works for that employer and his current occupation. Therefore, when any of those circumstances changed, it has been unfair and inhumane to say to that person, "You can no longer have a licence to go to or do your work", and at the same time expect that he should now complete a period of disqualification for the original drink-driving offence when that period may have been doubled on the basis that he successfully obtained a work licence.

The provisions contained in this Bill will correct that situation. The Bill allows for any person who holds a work licence to be able to apply to a Magistrates Court for a

variation to the restrictions on his licence where those circumstances change. The procedures prescribed therein are virtually the same as if he were applying for the licence originally, and provide that the Commissioner of Police be advised of the application so that his representative may also appear.

The Bill also provides for the introduction of photographic detection of red-light offences. The Department of Transport has estimated that some 220 crashes and 122 casualties—including deaths and injuries—were caused by red-light running in Brisbane in 1987, at an estimated community cost of more than \$20m. Initially the cameras will be positioned at 15 intersections around Brisbane and, depending on the equipment selected, could be operating by mid-year. Following a period of evaluation of their effectiveness, it is intended to widen their use to major provincial cities where red-light offences are causing too many accidents. The emphasis of this scheme is to deter motorists from running red lights. Evaluation of similar systems interstate and overseas has established that "red-light" cameras are a cost-efficient measure to reduce the running of red lights and improve the safety of motorists at intersections.

**Mr FitzGerald:** How about red-light areas?

**Mr HAMILL:** I am sure that the former Minister was an expert in such matters.

The selection of sites for the installation of cameras will be based upon accident data. The actual equipment to be used is yet to be determined, but generally the system will work on the following basis: the cameras will be activated when a vehicle enters the intersection a specified time just after the light has turned red.

**Mr FitzGerald** interjected.

**Mr HAMILL:** The former Minister ought to be careful.

Two photographs are then taken to indicate that the vehicle continued into the intersection. The image of each incident will then be checked, and, if necessary, enhanced, to establish the registered number of the vehicle. This will be checked against the vehicle registration records and a notice sent to the registered owner of that vehicle. If the owner was not the driver at the time, he will have 21 days in which to notify the department who was in charge of the vehicle at the time. This is the owner-onus basis of the legislation, which will make this method of enforcement possible. A notice will then be sent to the nominated person, who will also be given 21 days to advise if another person was driving the vehicle. Naturally, there will be heavy penalties for providing false information and for not providing information about the person in charge of the vehicle if that information could reasonably be obtained. There are also protections afforded to drivers who, for good reason, could not identify the driver, for example, when a vehicle is stolen. If a driver wishes to contest the notice, he or she will be afforded the opportunity to view the evidence and, if he or she so wishes, contest the matter before a court. Prosecution action will be instituted if the fine is not paid by the due date. I must stress to honourable members that the emphasis of this system is the reduction of accidents, not the collection of revenue.

The final provision in the Bill is to provide regulation-making power to control the dumping of houses in public places and on the roadside. This initiative is in response to representations by local authorities, which have lacked the effective power to stop this practice. The intent of the legislation will be to provide that, where a police district superintendent of traffic grants a permit under the Traffic Act for the transportation of a house, then, before issuing the permit, he will be required to be satisfied that the appropriate local authority has granted permission for its re-establishment on land in its area.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate, on motion of Mr Lingard, adjourned.

**STATE TRANSPORT ACT AND ANOTHER ACT AMENDMENT BILL**

**Hon. D. J. HAMILL** (Ipswich—Minister for Transport and Minister Assisting the Premier on Economic and Trade Development) (9.45 p.m.), by leave, without notice: I move—

"That leave be granted to bring in a Bill to amend the State Transport Act 1960-1985, and the Education Act 1964-1988 as subsequently amended, in certain particulars and for related purposes."

Motion agreed to.

**First Reading**

Bill and Explanatory Notes presented and Bill, on motion of Mr Hamill, read a first time.

**Second Reading**

**Hon. D. J. HAMILL** (Ipswich—Minister for Transport and Minister Assisting the Premier on Economic and Trade Development) (9.46 p.m.): I move—

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

The State Transport Act currently provides for the licensing of a number of passenger and goods transport industries, including road, air and water transport services. However, the water transport provisions have been invalid by virtue of a Full Court of Queensland ruling in 1961 in the Cobb and Co. case.

The purpose of this Bill is to improve a number of established administrative processes associated with particular licensing activities under the State Transport Act. In addition, the Bill makes provision for the formal transfer of responsibility for the administration of school transport services from the Honourable the Minister for Education.

Since the introduction of the State Transport Act in 1960, there have been few amendments. However, there have been significant changes in the transport arena since then, including—

- improvement in vehicle construction design and technology over the last 30 years;
- improvements in roads and road designs;
- major increases in vehicle volumes;
- expansion in tourism and associated transport;
- introduction of new vehicle types and transport modes; and
- major changes in policies affecting transport modes.

All of these factors have contributed to a changing transport scene and to the need for certain provisions within the State Transport Act 1960-1985 to be amended as they do not provide for present-day requirements and do not allow sufficient flexibility in providing realistic administration of the licensing provisions. A number of segments of the transport industry have approached the Department of Transport to improve existing provisions.

In this regard, the Bill provides for—

- The repeal of the existing water and air provisions and their replacement with an air licensing system that is substantially the same as the present system in intent but does not have to rely, as previously, on the unsatisfactory situation of being linked to the road passenger service licence provisions for administrative purposes. This proposal avoids reliance on the previously complicated system of prohibiting flight between every airport, aerodrome, helipad or float

plane landing site in the State without a licence. The Bill also extends the authority of authorised officers under the Act to passenger transport services generally. The new provisions also encompass rental vehicles and air licences which are necessary for proper enforcement of the provisions of the Act.

- The issue of a rental vehicle fleet operator's licence in place of the existing system of issuing a licence to hire a rental vehicle for each vehicle available for rent.
- A flexible system of exempting certain vehicle types and transport uses from the offence provisions of Part VI of the State Transport Act and allowing them to be specified by regulation. This will allow greater flexibility to deal with changing transport modes and requirements.
- The transfer of responsibility for the administration of the school transport assistance scheme from the Education Act.
- Additional regulation-making powers in respect to—
  - extending the provisions in relation to the classification, identification, safety and maintenance of vehicles which currently apply to vehicles under a passenger service licence to vehicles authorised under permit;
  - a system of licensing taximeter installers and/or repairers to test and seal taximeters on behalf of the Department of Transport;
  - the prescription of all matters relating to the operation of rental vehicles under the system of fleet licensing;
  - the banning of smoking on public passenger vehicles;
  - the requirement of drivers to stop on the display of an approved hand-held sign by authorised officers; and
  - the conveyance of schoolchildren.

This is an important Bill because it provides for administrative improvements which will provide some relief to various parts of the transport industry. It will also provide for some streamlining of processes within the Department of Transport.

I commend this Bill to the House and look forward to the contributions that will be made by honourable members.

Debate, on motion of Mr Lingard, adjourned.

#### **SUGAR EXPERIMENT STATIONS ACT AMENDMENT BILL**

**Hon. E. D. CASEY** (Mackay—Minister for Primary Industries) (9.51 p.m.), by leave, without notice: I move—

"That leave be granted to bring in a Bill to amend the Sugar Experiment Stations Act 1900-1983 in certain particulars."

Motion agreed to.

#### **First Reading**

Bill and Explanatory Notes presented and Bill, on motion of Mr Casey, read a first time.

#### **Second Reading**

**Hon. E. D. CASEY** (Mackay—Minister for Primary Industries) (9.52 p.m.): I move—

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

On the day I was sworn in as the Minister for Primary Industries, I gave a commitment to the sugar industry that I would take immediate steps to rectify a deficiency in the Sugar Experiment Stations Act concerning adequacy of grower and miller representation on the BSES board—a matter which had been ignored for far too

long by the previous Government. For over 18 months, an additional growers' representative and an additional millers' representative had been observers to the board of the BSES but had not been given member status. That commitment to the sugar industry is now honoured with the introduction of this Bill into the House.

The Act presently provides for membership of the Sugar Experiment Stations Board to consist of the Minister for Primary Industries as chairman, the Director-General as deputy chairman, and one representative each of the cane-growers and the manufacturers of cane sugar, nominated by the respective organisations appointed by the Governor in Council by notification published in the gazette. It is now proposed to expand the composition of the Sugar Experiment Stations Board from four to seven members to provide for one additional representative each of cane-growers and mill-owners and the appointment of a person with special qualifications to be nominated by the Minister.

It is further proposed to provide that the Governor in Council may, by Order in Council, appoint a person to act as a delegate member of the board to deputise for a member of the board, including the chairman, during the absence of that member. The delegate is to be nominated by the member, and so long as the delegate's appointment continues in effect, he or she may exercise the powers, functions and duties of that member. I have purposely not included other amendments to the Sugar Experiment Stations Act that have been previously discussed with the industry pending the Government's consideration of the report by the Fitzpatrick sugar industry working party, which is due to be presented to me by 31 May. While I do not propose to anticipate the committee's recommendations, I expect amendment to the extensive range of sugar industry legislation is a possibility, including possible changes to the Act presently under consideration.

Consequently, at this time I propose to implement only those changes which will ensure more appropriate representation for the industry on this important body charged with industry research and extension.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate, on motion of Mr Stoneman, adjourned.

#### **QUEENSLAND GRAIN HANDLING ACT AMENDMENT BILL**

**Hon. E. D. CASEY** (Mackay—Minister for Primary Industries) (9.54 p.m.), by leave, without notice: I move—

"That leave be granted to bring in a Bill to amend the Queensland Grain Handling Act 1983-1988 in certain particulars and for related purposes."

Motion agreed to.

#### **First Reading**

Bill and Explanatory Notes presented and Bill, on motion of Mr Casey, read a first time.

#### **Second Reading**

**Hon. E. D. CASEY** (Mackay—Minister for Primary Industries) (9.55 p.m.): I move—

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

The purpose of this Bill is to amend the Queensland Grain Handling Act to restructure the membership of the board of directors of the Queensland Grain Handling Authority, and in so doing reduce the size of the board from 13 members to 10.

The authority, which trades under the business name Bulk Grains Queensland, was constituted in 1983 to take over from the State Wheat Board as the bulk grain storage

and handling organisation in south and central Queensland. At that time, the authority's board was formed with 13 members, namely—

- a grower chairman;
- the five grower members of the State Wheat Board;
- one representative each from the Barley Marketing Board, the Central Queensland Grain Sorghum Marketing Board and the Queensland Graingrowers Association;
- three directly elected grower representatives; and
- the Director of Marketing of the Department of Primary Industries.

The new membership structure which this Bill puts in place and which will take effect as from 1 October 1990, will retain the grower chairman, the three directly elected grower representatives, the director of marketing and one representative each from the Barley Marketing Board and the Central Queensland Grain Sorghum Marketing Board. There will also be one representative from the State Wheat Board and two persons with special qualifications nominated by the Minister for Primary Industries, of whom one will be a representative of the grain merchants and traders operating in Queensland.

This means that the Goss Labor Government has taken the initiative to do what the previous Government lacked the courage and sense to do, namely to give proper recognition to the bodies involved in the marketing of the non-statutory grains such as grain sorghum in south Queensland, oilseeds and the legume crops which are handled through the authority's facilities.

I have not yet finalised what the special qualifications of the other member will be, but my preference is for a person with a recognised financial background. The reduction in the representation from the State Wheat Board is in accordance with the wishes of the industry, and the board itself has agreed to this change. Similarly, the industry has agreed that, as the Queensland Graingrowers Association is no longer directly involved in marketing and hence is no longer putting grain through the authority's facilities, it is no longer necessary for the association to have direct representation on the authority's board.

As soon as this legislation is in place, I will consult with all of the relevant industry organisations before nominating a person to be the chairman of the authority for the new term, which commences on 1 October 1990. As specifically provided for in the Bill, the chairman will continue to be a grain-grower.

Turning to the text of the Bill itself—the substantive provision is clause 6, with most of the remaining provisions dealing with consequential matters. However, I also draw the attention of the House to clauses 8 and 11. These provisions are designed to eliminate the risk of political interference in the affairs of the authority and it is my intention that similar provisions will be progressively inserted in other primary industry Acts as they come before the Parliament.

The effect of clause 8 is to disqualify any person from being appointed to the board of the authority if that person is a member of the Queensland Parliament or the Commonwealth Parliament. The effect of clause 11 is to disqualify a person from continuing as a member of the authority's board if that person is subsequently elected to either the Queensland Parliament or to the Commonwealth Parliament. I am sure that all members of this Parliament will agree that there is no room for party politics in the administration of statutory authorities and I look forward to the Opposition's support for this initiative.

I would like to briefly comment on a number of other current developments in the Queensland grain industry. Since taking up my appointment as Minister for Primary Industries, I have actively encouraged the grain industry bodies to take a good, hard look at the future direction of the grain industry in this State. Basically, I have asked the industry to take a strategic approach and decide where it wants to be in five to 10 years' time and what structure needs to be put in place to best achieve that objective.

I am pleased to see that the industry has responded to my request in a positive manner. A working party has been established by the industry bodies to examine such issues as amalgamation of the grain marketing boards, corporate restructuring, grower equity and an industry financial contribution towards relieving the capital debt burden of Bulk Grains Queensland. The industry working party will report to me in early June.

With the approval of the Premier and the Treasurer, I have also established a task force comprising representatives of Bulk Grains Queensland, the Treasury, the Premier's Department and the Department of Primary Industries to look at options for Government assistance to restructure Bulk Grains' debt position.

In January, I obtained the approval of the Governor in Council for an Order in Council under the Wheat Marketing (Facilitation) Act to allow the Australian Wheat Board to become involved in the marketing in Queensland of the non-statutory grains such as grain sorghum produced in south Queensland, and the major oilseed and legume crops. This will be done through the Bulk Grains Queensland joint venture with the State Wheat Board.

It is a matter of record that the previous Government procrastinated on this issue. In contrast, I responded quickly and positively to requests from the State Wheat Board and the Australian Wheat Board and I believe the action I took will be very much in the long-term best interests of the Queensland grain industry.

Honourable members will no doubt be aware that Bulk Grains Queensland has recently announced that it will be operating both a pool and a cash-trading operation for grain sorghum in south Queensland this season. This is a direct result of my initiative in bringing the January Order in Council forward for approval.

**Mr FitzGerald** interjected.

**Mr CASEY:** Well, it fixed the problems of many growers in the honourable member's electorate. The former Government procrastinated and was not prepared to do the right thing by the primary producers of this State. It claimed to be representative of primary industries. No wonder the former Government's vote declined in so many areas of Queensland, including the primary-producing areas.

The Labor Party will look after the primary producers far better than the National Party did over the 32 years in which it gave most of them a flogging and looked after only the favoured few from the treeless plain areas near Jandowae, or wherever the key people of the National Party are. It let the other primary producers go to rack and ruin as it pleased its whim and wishes. The former Government turned its back on those people and went to the white-shoe brigade on the Gold Coast. However, we have seen where it finished up.

The honourable member wonders why he finished up on the Opposition benches in this State. Members of the Opposition really have not woken up yet. They do not realise what has happened to them.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! I ask the Minister to return to the Bill.

**Mr CASEY:** Given the well-recognised marketing expertise of the Australian Wheat Board, to my way of thinking it makes good sense to have the board involved in a positive and meaningful way in the Queensland grain industry, in conjunction with the existing Queensland industry marketing and handling organisations such as the State Wheat Board and Bulk Grains Queensland.

I have also announced my intention to form a grain industry peak representative council. This will bring together the major organisations in the Queensland grain industry, both statutory and non-statutory, to discuss matters of importance to the industry directly with the Minister for Primary Industries. The peak council will include representatives of the grower, marketing, handling and research arms of the industry and will, I believe, form a most valuable consultative model which other States could well follow. I hope



to be in a position to introduce the necessary legislation in the spring session of this Parliament.

The Bill now before the House represents the first stage of this Government's program to place the Queensland grain industry on a sound, sensible course for the future, and it will do the same for every other primary industry in this State and clearly show that Labor knows and understands primary industry in this State a darned sight better than the National Party or Country Party Governments of the last 32 years ever did.

**Mr Lingard** interjected.

**Mr CASEY:** The honourable member is just an old rump, and a tough and leathery one at that.

Other legislation will follow in due course and after appropriate consultation with the industry.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Bill, on motion of Mr Booth, adjourned.

#### **YOUNG OFFENDERS (INTERSTATE TRANSFER) ACT AMENDMENT BILL**

**Hon. A. M. WARNER** (South Brisbane—Minister for Family Services and Aboriginal and Islander Affairs) (10.03 p.m.), by leave, without notice: I move—

"That leave be granted to bring in a Bill to amend the Young Offenders (Interstate Transfer) Act 1987 in certain respects."

Motion agreed to.

#### **First Reading**

Bill and Explanatory Notes presented and Bill, on motion of Ms Warner, read a first time.

#### **Second Reading**

**Hon. A. M. WARNER** (South Brisbane—Minister for Family Services and Aboriginal and Islander Affairs) (10.04 p.m.): I move—

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

The Young Offenders (Interstate Transfer) Act has never been proclaimed. This Amendment Bill will adjust the technical difficulties which have made the Act inoperable until now.

The Young Offenders (Interstate Transfer) Act is part of uniform legislation enacted by all States and Territories to enable the interstate transfer of young offenders. The legislation allows young offenders serving a period of detention or subject to a community correction order to apply for transfer to their home State for the balance of their sentence. This provision has long existed for adult prisoners.

The Act was not proclaimed because it did not allow Queensland to accept young offenders subject to interstate detention orders. Queensland and Tasmanian courts cannot order the detention of a young offender. The Queensland Children's Services Act provides for courts to make care and control orders, which transfer guardianship from the young offenders' parents or guardians to the Director-General of the Department of Family Services and Aboriginal and Islander Affairs. The power to detain the young offender is then derived from the guardianship powers of the director-general, rather than from an order directly imposed by a court.

This amendment will accommodate this difference. It specifies that a young offender who is the subject of an interstate detention order be deemed to be subject of a care and control order under the Children's Services Act. This will enable the director-general

to accept and detain the offender in Queensland. Once the amendment is passed, the Act can be proclaimed without delay. This will allow Queensland to enter into reciprocal arrangements with other States and Territories and commence the transfer of young offenders to and from Queensland.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate, on motion of Mr Slack, adjourned.

### **RETAIL SHOP LEASES ACT AMENDMENT BILL**

**Hon. G. N. SMITH** (Townsville East—Minister for Manufacturing and Commerce) (10.05 p.m.), by leave, without notice: I move—

"That leave be granted to bring in a Bill to amend the Retail Shop Leases Act 1984-1989 in certain particulars."

Motion agreed to.

#### **First Reading**

Bill and Explanatory Notes presented and Bill, on motion of Mr Smith, read a first time.

#### **Second Reading**

**Hon. G. N. SMITH** (Townsville East—Minister for Manufacturing and Commerce) (10.06 p.m.): I move—

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

This Bill represents further refinements to the Retail Shop Leases Act 1984-1989. The Act regulates retail shop leases in Queensland and provides an independent forum for the low-cost resolution of disputes between landlords and tenants. The Act also provides for prohibited and implied conditions in retail shop leases and provides for mediation in lease disputes and, in instances where mediation fails, referral to the Retail Shop Leases Tribunal.

Approximately 80 per cent of all disputes brought before the mediator in 1988-89 were resolved to the satisfaction of both parties.

However, where agreement cannot be reached through mediation, disputes are put before the Retail Shop Lease Tribunal, which has the power to make judgment and issue an enforceable order on disputes.

In 1984, when the Act was introduced, it provided for a tribunal of three members consisting of a District Court judge and representatives of the landlords and tenants. In the 1988-89 financial year, 11 disputes were heard by the tribunal, which was presided over by His Honour Judge Skoien, who has given learned and honourable service over the past years.

It is with regret that I must accept His Honour's resignation from the tribunal as the commitments of the District Court and recent increases in jurisdiction of the court do not allow His Honour, nor his colleagues, time to serve on the tribunal. As a consequence, I propose that a retired judge or a person eligible to be appointed as a judge of the Supreme or District Courts be appointed to the position of chairman of the Retail Shop Leases Tribunal.

In line with the appointment of a chairman who is not a serving judge, it will be necessary to provide remuneration for services, as is the case with other members of the tribunal. Because we must be mindful of the industry representatives' business commitments, I propose that the terms of appointment to the tribunal be for a maximum of three years. As the tribunal's industry representatives generally do not hold formal legal qualifications and are unable to comment on points of law, in the interests of efficiency and practicality, I propose that such matters be heard by the chairman alone.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate, on motion of Mr Borbidge, adjourned.

#### **LAND ACT AMENDMENT BILL**

**Hon. A. G. EATON** (Mourilyan—Minister for Land Management) (10.09 p.m.), by leave, without notice: I move—

"That leave be granted to bring in a Bill to amend the Land Act 1962-1989 in certain particulars."

Motion agreed to.

#### **First Reading**

Bill and Explanatory Notes presented and Bill, on motion of Mr Eaton, read a first time.

#### **Second Reading**

**Hon. A. G. EATON** (Mourilyan—Minister for Land Management) (10.10 p.m.): I move—

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

This is a short Bill to place on hold the freeholding of certain tenures under the Land Act. This Government has set up a committee of review to advise on the underlying principles for future policy and administration of land in Queensland. It is intended that, within three months, the committee report to me with findings and recommendations.

As an interim measure, until the recommendations of the committee are received, considered and acted upon, the freeholding of grazing homestead perpetual leases, special leases and non-competitive perpetual leases has been frozen on applications received on or after 5 February 1990.

Special leases and non-competitive leases in an industrial estate, which are administered by the Department of Manufacturing and Commerce, are not affected, nor are special leases which contain a specific condition for their freeholding. Applications for freeholding may still be lodged. However, all applications received on or after 5 February 1990 will not be processed to an offer for freehold stage. Applications received prior to 5 February will be processed and, where approved, offers for freeholding made. Freeholding tenures and tenures containing a right to freehold are not affected by this legislation.

The last public inquiry into land policy in Queensland was the Payne report of 1959. In the three decades since that review, the economic and social bases have changed and a new inquiry is long overdue.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate, on motion of Mr Hobbs, adjourned.

#### **PROPERTY LAW ACT AMENDMENT BILL**

**Hon. A. G. EATON** (Mourilyan—Minister for Land Management) (10.12 p.m.), by leave, without notice: I move—

"That leave be granted to bring in a Bill to amend the Property Law Act 1974-1989 in certain particulars."

Motion agreed to.

#### **First Reading**

Bill and Explanatory Notes presented and Bill, on motion of Mr Eaton, read a first time.

**Second Reading**

**Hon. A. G. EATON** (Mourilyan—Minister for Land Management) (10.13 p.m.): I move—

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

In September 1987, the Property Law Act 1974-1989 was the subject of a substantial report by the Law Reform Commission. A number of amendments were proposed by the commission in that report. At this time it is intended to proceed with those recommendations of the commission which relate to prescribed authorities so far as they relate to instalment contracts of sale of land and enduring powers of attorney.

"Prescribed authority" is defined in section 76 (4) (d) to include a solicitor or conveyancer or firm of solicitors or conveyancers approved by the Minister upon the recommendation of the president of the Law Society. It is proposed that the amendment will provide that solicitors and conveyancers be prescribed authorities unless the council of the Queensland Law Society Incorporated resolves otherwise. This will remove the present time-consuming and cumbersome system for the appointment of persons as prescribed authorities. An enduring power of attorney will be able to assist in the effective management of a person's property in the event that he or she becomes incapacitated.

Under current Queensland law, a power of attorney is revoked on the donor becoming mentally incapable of managing his or her affairs, whether or not that person has become a protected person within the meaning of the Public Trustee Act. This operation of the law has two consequences. Firstly, people are unable to make provision for the management of their affairs in the event of their incapacity by old age or illness and, secondly, the donee of the power is legally liable if he continues to act if he knows that the donor has become incapacitated.

In most other jurisdictions in Australia, a form of enduring power of attorney has been provided by statute. This amendment will provide worthwhile benefits for those involved in management of the affairs of persons suffering from mental illness while, at the same time, reducing the incidence of improper and ineffective usage of powers of attorney. The legislation protects the interests of the donor, gives authority to the Public Trustee to intervene in certain circumstances and provides clear guidelines for the donee to follow in the exercise of the power.

Finally, I take the opportunity to thank those persons and organisations for their interest, time and effort in helping to redraft the law in what is much-needed reform, particularly those provisions relating to enduring powers of attorney. The ramifications of the amending legislation are to simplify the manner in which a person becomes a prescribed authority for the purposes of instalment contracts of sale of land and to provide for the creation of enduring powers of attorney.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate, on motion of Mr Hobbs, adjourned.

**LEGAL AID ACT AMENDMENT BILL**

**Hon. D. M. WELLS** (Murrumba—Attorney-General) (10.16 p.m.), by leave, without notice: I move—

"That leave be granted to bring in a Bill to amend the Legal Aid Act 1978-1989 in certain particulars."

Motion agreed to.

**First Reading**

Bill and Explanatory Notes presented and Bill, on motion of Mr Wells, read a first time.

**Second Reading**

**Hon. D. M. WELLS** (Murrumba—Attorney-General) (10.16 p.m.): I move—

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

This Bill alters the composition of the Legal Aid Commission. It adds to the commission a nominee of the Queensland Association of Independent Legal Services and the Public Defender. This broadens the representation of relevant community interests, at the same time as better equipping the commission for the role it will play in the months leading up to the amalgamation of the Public Defender's Office and the Legal Aid Commission.

Another feature of the Bill is that the tenure of the new president, who will be appointed by the Governor in Council on the nomination of the Attorney from among the members of the commission, will be coterminus with the rest of the commissioners. This means that we have been able to bring on two commissioners, while increasing the size of the commission by only one. This has been possible because of the retirement of Sir Jack Rowell, who has been chairman of the Legal Aid Commission since its very inception. This afternoon at the Legal Aid Commission, Sir Jack announced his retirement from the chairmanship. On behalf of the Government, I thank him for his years of service to legal aid and for his assistance to me since I have been the Attorney.

This Bill provides for the establishment of a Fees Committee representing a cross-section of the commission which will make recommendations to the commission on fees to be paid to private legal practitioners for services performed on behalf of legally assisted persons. During the death throes of the previous Government, substantial fee increases were granted but I was subsequently able to convince members of the Legal Aid Commission as to the totally inconsistent situation this would have created when compared to the level of existing public defence fees, and the decision was overturned and replaced with one granting a moderate increase in fees of 7 per cent across the board.

Such action on my part would not have been necessary if a fees committee such as this had existed. It has long been the view of members of the legal profession that they should receive 80 per cent of the reasonable fee for legal aid work. The Fees Committee will be able to address the question of what is a reasonable fee. It will also be able to ensure that no more uncostered increases, of the kind that were voted by the commission on the day before the election, take place again.

It is mentioned that the measures I am taking are of an interim nature only, as it is my intention in the longer term, with a view to improving the future provision of legal assistance to the citizens of Queensland, to amalgamate the existing offices of the Public Defender and the Legal Aid Commission of Queensland, as already is the case in other parts of the Commonwealth of Australia.

Of course, prior to taking further legislative action which will enable such amalgamation to take effect, it is my intention to consult with and obtain submissions from interested community groups and other organisations to ensure that the legislation introduced into Parliament is such as will best serve the interests of the community generally.

It is my present intention that appointments to the expanded constitution of the commission be initially until December 1990, and that any reappointments will be subject to the implementation of the restructuring proposals after appropriate consultations.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate, on motion of Mr Lingard, adjourned.

**PUBLIC SECTOR MANAGEMENT COMMISSION BILL****Second Reading**

Debate resumed from 1 March (see p. 81).

**Mr COOPER** (Roma—Leader of the Opposition) (10.20 p.m.): The Opposition will support this Bill, but with a great number of reservations, which will be spelt out at the

Committee stage. The Bill is before us, and we must deal with it. It must be dealt with in the way that provides the Opposition with the greatest opportunity to shield members of the public service from the worst of the excesses of this Government, that provides some assistance to them as they work their way through the extraordinary years ahead of a rolling review, which can only be a rolling disaster for the administration of this State, and for their security and their peace of mind.

The Bill will create a two-year vacuum, that is, a two-year hiatus. The Government has chosen, extraordinarily, to replace a working Act with a largely unnecessary, redundant, rolling two-year review. This is yet another review! The number of reviews undertaken by the Government is now well over 50, which is better than one review for every two days it has been in office. This latest review leaves the entire public service in a state of limbo for the best part of the Government's term. I confidently predict that it will be one of the key reasons why the "just one term", as the Premier pleaded for at the last election, will prove to be just that.

This Bill has the potential to be disastrous for public servants, for Queensland and for the Government. The Labor Party talks about the Westminster system. Let us look at the reality of the Westminster system as it applies to this Government. Let us reveal the full extent of this Government's hypocrisy and then look at the real reason why this Bill is before the House.

It is a long trail. I will start at the beginning. One of the first of this Government's actions was to indulge in one of the most bloody purges at all levels of the public service, from chief executives to stenographers, that this country has ever seen. Examples are legion, but I will cite a few to show the extent of the hypocrisy. One of the first actions of this Government in relation to the public service was to summarily execute professionally a number of departmental chief executives. This Government has, and will have, no credibility whatsoever in the public service. In its very short life, the Government has indulged in treatments of public servants that are copybook examples of why legislation is needed for the protection of the public service from political interference.

Inside three months, this Government has totally outdone itself. Let us look at the record and the light that it throws on this Bill. The Government's treatment of former chief executives and scores of other public servants is deplorable. Seven chief executives were given their marching orders simply because they had been loyal servants of the previous regime. There is a basic tenet of public servants, that is, the principle of public service independence. I have said it before, and I will tell the Government's story again. All of those chief executives were prepared to serve the new Government—I know that for a fact. I also know that they were shocked at their treatment. They certainly accepted that there would be changes. They did not expect to remain in charge of their departments, but they did expect that the Government would respect the well-established tradition followed by previous incoming Governments in this country.

This tradition, they reasonably surmised, would mean that they would be replaced but would, in all probability, remain in their departments—certainly removed from the front line, and from automatic contact with their Minister, but for the most part doing the work that they had previously been doing.

Because they were public servants, they adopted this attitude. They do not like this new Government at all, and who can possibly blame them? Let us look for the real reason behind the decision to remove the protection of the current Act, and to place the public service in two years of rolling limbo.

The answer is overly simplistic. It is an article of faith that must now be blindly adhered to. It is here now because it is in the Labor Party policy manifesto, which predated the Fitzgerald report and which predated the establishment of the Electoral and Administrative Review Commission.

Recently, in my speech on the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply I said—

"We will be vigorous and vigilant and active. . . We will try and keep this Government on track so that it does not mortgage the future, ruin our economy and our life-styles, or in any other way abuse the trust of the people."

I also said that—

"We will not do so in a negative way. When this Government proposes action which is sensible, and which will benefit the people of Queensland, and advance the cause of open Government, we will back them."

The National Party Opposition will support this Bill, not because the action is sensible but because the public service is the heartbeat of Government administration. It must therefore be supported, come what may. We consider it completely unnecessary to abolish the Public Service Management and Employment Act. The reason the Labor Government now wishes to abolish this Act is not for sound policy reasons but because it opposed the legislation when it was introduced in April 1988.

The then shadow Treasurer, the now shaky Treasurer, the Treasurer who simply cannot count, the Treasurer whose name appears in *White Mercantile*, was among those then Opposition members who were opposed to the Bill for spurious reasons—

"Firstly, it entrenches contracts; secondly, it provides a legislative prerogative to retrench public servants; and thirdly, it destroys the independence of the public service."

Although Labor ridiculed contracts, an analysis of the Labor Party document *Public Sector Reform* shows that it talks with a forked tongue. There will be contracts for the Chief Executive Service and the Senior Executive Service. Page 10 of the Labor Party public service reform policy, the document from which this Bill has been drawn, states—

"For the most senior ranks of the public service, a Goss Labor Government is committed to the introduction of chief and senior executive service. Appointment to both ranks will be by five-year contracts."

The Treasurer has again shot himself in the foot, and this time retrospectively. He thinks contracts are dreadful; his leader now supports them.

On the subject of retrenchments/redundancies, Labor's policy again is clear—no redundancies. This is sheer expediency to appease the rank and file of the ALP and the unions.

The third reason for Labor's opposition to the Act was that it destroyed the independence of the public service. What absolute rot! Again, after the events of 100 days of hard Labor, now more than ever the independence of the public service is under threat. To appease the unions and to get itself off the hook in relation to its now revised views enshrined in this Bill, the Government has decided to abolish the Public Service Management and Employment Act and to enact new legislation which will allow for all aspects of the public service to be reviewed.

It is clear what Labor is thinking: let the commission decide on the contracts and redundancies; the unions will just have to accept it. In other words, one of the main reasons we are here tonight debating this Bill is that it is a mechanism for the ALP's policy to be dragged into a twentieth century approach towards public sector management as practised by the previous administration and as now recognised by the current Government.

This Bill, in essence, is a backflip that will take two years to complete. Careful analysis of Labor's public service reform policy embodied in this Bill shows that, when one puts aside the smokescreen of party political rhetoric, the Bill embraces the policy embodied in the Act which it intends to abolish.

The principles of this Act are: maintaining excellence; objectivity; impartiality, and integrity in the provision of policy advice; maintaining standards of excellence in service to the community; deploying and utilising resources with maximum effectiveness; ensuring that staff will be treated fairly; ensuring that all staff will have equal opportunities to secure promotion and advancement; and ensuring that all employees will be provided with safe and healthy working conditions.

The then shadow Treasurer, and now the shaky Treasurer, when debating the Public Service Management and Employment Act summarised it by saying that its principles

"enhanced the concept of merit, equity and natural justice in the management of people and ensures that human resources are developed and deployed in the most cost effective manner." I point out to the House that members of the Labor Party, schizophrenic as they may be, should not suggest that they have some sort of monopoly on those virtues. They are not my words; they are the current Treasurer's words.

In order to replace the Act Labor has introduced the Public Sector Management Commission Bill 1990, which has seven parts. They are: the preliminary; the Commission, its constitution and membership; staff and administration of the Commission; powers of the Commission; Commissioner for Public Sector Equity and the Classification Review Tribunal; Offences; and the Schedule. As I said before, the function is to review.

Details of the major criticisms of the Bill, will be enunciated by the Opposition at the Committee stage. In brief, the first concern is that the Bill was drawn up without consultation with the rank and file of the public sector. Only when the Bill was introduced into the House was any action taken to indicate that very significant changes to work practices and the rights of officers were pending. So much for consultation!

This is in stark contrast with the former National Party Government's public sector reforms. I remind the House that during the preparation of the Public Service Management and Employment Bill, extensive consideration was given to submissions by interested parties, including the public sector unions.

In fact, the then shadow Treasurer in his speech on the second reading of the Public Service Management and Employment Bill in April 1988 said—

"I compliment the Minister for consulting with the unions. That has been appreciated."

Unfortunately, I cannot return that compliment. Consultation on this Bill has, without doubt, been abysmal.

The previous Government's consultative process was embodied in the spirit of the Savage Committee of Review into public sector management. Indeed, the National Party Government's Public Service Management and Employment Act, which I again remind the House is to be abolished in favour of a two-year vacuum, was based on the recommendations of that committee which were, in turn, drawn from a substantial number of written and oral submissions made by a wide range of interested parties.

Consultation is not one of the Goss Labor Government's virtues. It seeks to give the image of consultation through involvement of a representative of the State Service Union on a steering committee. It is understood that this arrangement will continue when the Government, or should I say Dr Glyn Davis of Griffith University, the architect of Labor's public service reform policy, undertakes a review of the Public Service Management and Employment Act in the near future.

The second concern is that the Public Sector Management Commission Bill has been drafted by academics, as I said before, from the Griffith University, not by people with first-hand experience of the public service. It appears that the public service itself has had little to no input into the Bill, nor has the public or industry by way of submissions. Obviously, nobody has told this Government about Green Papers.

The third major concern is that the Government has given the legislation priority over the appointment of the commissioners. The public service management commissioners have not been appointed. Indeed, advertisements for three commissioners and the 58 staff were placed Australiawide, inviting interest from suitable applicants, prior to the legislation being introduced into the House. It would have been proper for at least the commissioners to have been appointed first to oversee the preparation of the Bill and to have input.

It is quite presumptuous, quite centralist and quite arrogant to proceed along the course that has been taken. It is, however, quite consistent with the actions of a Government which is accustomed to and apparently hopelessly hooked on having decisions made by external advisers not accountable to the Parliament. In fact, special



political advisers are very popular with the Goss Labor Government. In Labor Governments in Australia and overseas, it is a widely used practice, their primary functions being to press the political aspects of policies in a Ministry.

It would appear that the Labor Government is trying to emulate the procedure adopted for the introduction of the Criminal Justice Commission Bill and the Electoral and Administrative Review Commission Bill. The difference, however, is that those Bills were pioneering legislation directly emanating from the Fitzgerald inquiry and their drafting was overseen by the Fitzgerald Implementation Unit.

With respect, the same does not apply to the Public Sector Management Commission Bill. It does not have the imprimatur of the Fitzgerald process. It has not been subject to wide-ranging public debate and consultation in the way that the previous Government—my Government—conducted itself in relation to these crucial reforms. This alleged reform is no less important in terms of the significance of the attempt to somehow be seen more by sleight of hand and wool-pulling than reality to reinvent the public sector wheel.

On behalf of my party, I reiterate that we support the Bill, but I state unequivocally that it is unnecessary. I remind the House that the former National Party Government maintained a long-standing interest in and commitment towards the improvement of public sector management. Let me refer to a number of examples of this commitment: the establishment of a comprehensive review of the public sector conducted by Sir Ernest Savage, which achieved considerable reduction of overlapping functions and which streamlined accountability and management practices within the machinery of Government; a comprehensive code of conduct for public servants which was released in 1988 and which set out in clear terms what the Government expected from its public servants and what public servants could expect in return; the enactment of the Public Service Management and Employment Act 1988, which established a framework for more effective management practices and delineated clear processes through which chief executives of departments were permitted to get on with the job and manage their departments without undue constraints imposed by central agencies.

I draw to the attention of honourable members some comments made in the report of the commission of inquiry conducted by Mr G. E. Fitzgerald, QC. On page 131, he stated—

"The Public Service Management and Employment Act 1988 considerably reforms the administration of the public service in this State. All the reforms are consistent with modern theories of public administration: the reduction in the role of central agencies such as the Public Service Board, the increase in responsibility for efficient administration by chief executives, the employment of people by contract, the creation of a redeployment/redundancy scheme, and promotion by merit alone."

It is of grave concern that the imprimatur given to the Public Service Management and Employment Act by Mr Fitzgerald, QC, has been overlooked by the Goss Labor Government for party political purposes. The commissioner, however, proposed three areas for further review and they were: advertising of public service vacancies; unlimited appeals against promotion; and independence to determine the outcome of appeals against promotion without referral to the Governor in Council and, thus, involvement in the political arena. If the National Party had retained office, it intended to implement these reforms recommended by Commissioner Fitzgerald.

These measures will be addressed by the Public Sector Management Commission in the various reviews. The Labor Government, however, has laboured its implementation in a bureaucratic, intrusive, heavy-handed manner via a review which is not in the interests of efficient and fair public sector management.

This Bill sets up the commission but, in so doing, creates an elite group within the public service which erodes the statutory responsibility and accountability of chief executives for the efficient management of their organisations. Indeed, this Bill mirrors

the public service reform policy prepared in August 1989 for the Labor Party by Dr Glyn Davis of the Griffith University.

It is ironical that a person totally external to the public sector and not subject to the stringent accountability processes normally attaching to public servants should be given the task of producing legislation with such momentous repercussions for public servants and Government policy generally. Again I remind this House that this person is Dr Glyn Davis, who was recently openly and widely touted the length and breadth of George Street as a potential chairman of the Public Sector Management Commission. I am sure that Dr Davis is not the J. D. Story of the Ryan Government who carried out the reclassifications and reorganisation of the State public service beginning in 1918. Dr Davis has been given an extraordinarily free rein in his machinations.

The tradition of the Parliamentary Counsel taking his briefing from a department has been overturned and a system instituted whereby consultants now brief the Parliamentary Counsel on the preparation of legislation. This is an extraordinary state of affairs. Perhaps this Parliament has a legitimate interest in asking the Government how much it is paying people such as Dr Davis and Professor Weller for their advice on machinery of Government matters.

The Premier, in his second-reading speech, indicated that the formation of the Public Sector Management Commission will complete the trilogy of reform in Queensland, along with the EARC and the CJC. It would appear that the Labor Government is attempting to portray the Public Sector Management Commission in the image of a Fitzgerald reform and thus provide it with a legitimate existence within the reform program envisaged by Fitzgerald.

I wish to affirm to the House that this Bill is in fact a long-winded wolf in sheep's clothing. It is a Labor initiative, and, whilst I reaffirm my support for the principle of the Bill, I have serious doubts about the intentions of the Government in many specific operational areas of the Bill.

Honourable members will be aware that there is already in place the EARC and the CJC, in addition to pre-existing avenues for investigation, such as the Parliamentary Commissioner for Administrative Investigations. It would seem that we are now faced with a proliferation of investigatory, consultative and review agencies which possess a vast array of powers affecting all areas of the community and which, in many cases, appear to be overlapping in their respective jurisdictions. In addition to those organisations, parliamentary committees are now in the process of expanding the staffing resources available to them and the advisory bodies constituted by the EARC and the CJC to provide recommendations on specific areas. Just how many consultative, review and advisory bodies do we need to make the decisions which are the prerogative and responsibility of an elected Government? I remind the House that the PSMC will also have an advisory board to provide advice on the reviews undertaken. It would seem that under this Labor Government, commissions and commissioners have developed into a growth industry and will no doubt become a very handy mechanism with which to reward loyalty to the cause.

The Bill provides for the establishment of a Commissioner for Public Sector Equity, who incidentally appears to be authorised to override the decisions of departmental chief executives. Upon what criteria is equity determined and what check is there upon arbitrary actions by the Commissioner for Public Sector Equity? What about the many employees of organisations who are not covered by the public service umbrella? Do they not deserve adequate protection along the same lines as public servants in terms of appeal rights? In his second-reading speech the Premier mentioned the reduction in the number of departments from 28 to 18. The institution of mega-departments has been hailed as a major reform. This matter goes to the heart of the Government's well-off-the-pace attitude towards so-called reform. Like so many aspects of the process under this Government, it is a dusty relic from the Labor Party's long years in Opposition. Quite simply, the real world has passed its members by. It has been tried and found wanting. If we apply the "Ask anybody up and down George Street" criteria to the

mega-department concept, the following comments have been made already, "Its unworkable."; "Too large."; "No-one knows what's happening."; "People are sitting around doing nothing."; "Clear guidance and leadership are non-existent.", and "The Minister is not seeing anyone until the mess is sorted out."

A classic example of this is the Transport Department—a failed, Cain experiment in Victoria, which was dutifully copied in Queensland—which has led to massive confusion and paralysis. Even with the failed Cain model to work on, the Minister had to make two attempts at his reorganisation and amalgamation procedures before getting approval from Cabinet. Even now it is not right, and it never will be. The old-fashioned adage that bigger is better is now alive and well in Queensland. The old centralist theme is at work again or, should I say, still at work, given that it has been so roundly discredited. In this mega-Department of Main Roads, the transport backbone of the State plays a poor second fiddle to the big revenue-earning sectors of the department. It is just too big, too complex and too important for the sorts of games that are being played.

In the Housing and Local Government portfolio, the Local Government portfolio has lost out miserably. One of the clearest examples of jobs for the boys is the appointment of Mr Dick Perrsons of Wran, Unsworth and Staples fame. He is now director-general of a department of which half is a total mystery. He has no experience of local government affairs beyond an involvement in housing. As a separate entity, with concerns far wider than the housing issue, local government has been downgraded. The Local Government Association is quietly concerned that many of the senior staff of the Local Government Department have been pushed aside. The concept of reducing the public service departments to 18 will be proven to be totally unworkable. In many cases the departments are far too large to be effectively managed. The outcome will be a proliferation of senior management positions created simply to ease the intolerable burdens placed on the public service chief executives of mega-departments, despite the Premier's claim that efficiencies of scale would be achieved through amalgamation of departments and functions. The question must be asked: what about all the surplus staff which will result if and when functions and operational areas are rationalised in light of the Premier's promise of no redundancies? Anyone familiar with proper management principles for organisations knows that cost-cutting and economies of scale cannot be achieved without staff being displaced. Does the Premier suggest that he can redeploy all these people to where they can be gainfully employed? Already his track record on this front in the short time that he has been in office is quite unenviable.

Labor's document *Public Service Reform Policy under a Goss Government* dated August 1989, in paragraph 7.4 at pages 11 to 12, which refers to redundancies, states—

"In implementing this machinery of Government reforms, a Goss Labor Government is committed to no redundancies in the public service."

Everyone in George Street, and indeed Queensland, knows that the Goss Labor Government has forced redundancies on young, capable and professional public servants. This Government is the most ruthless, uncaring and arrogant Government to have taken office. It indulged in a public servant bloodbath, the like of which has never been seen before in the Government of this country. In 1957 when the conservatives took over after 40 years of Labor rule, there were no wholesale sackings and forced redundancies. Indeed, there were rearrangements, but they were carried out with tact and professionalism and not with the guillotine as is the practice of this Government. Everyone in George Street knows that already dozens, and perhaps hundreds, of public servants have been placed in areas where they have virtually nothing to do. Is this the new age of efficiency that we can expect?

The Public Sector Management Commission Bill creates a Chief Executive Service and a Senior Executive Service. Obviously, the writers of the Labor Party policy copied this from other Labor States. Perhaps the Premier's adviser should inform him that the concept of a senior executive service is not new, but in fact has been proved to be an unmitigated disaster wherever it has been established, for example, in the Commonwealth

administration, in Victoria—Mr Cain again—and in other Labor States. The Chief Executive Service and the Senior Executive Service constitute a blueprint for the politicisation of the public service. The irony is that the Premier has the hide to talk about the National Party's alleged politicisation of the public service. However, with the help of the machinery of Government committees, within 100 days the Labor Government has politicised the public service. I repeat—wherever it has been introduced, the Senior Executive Service has proved the ideal vehicle for the widespread politicisation of the service. Perhaps, on reflection, that is the Labor Government's intention.

Politicisation of the public service by party allegiance is only part of the problem. The other part is bureaucratic cronyism, that is, the installation of an elite corps of whiz-kids, where no outsiders, even with the right credentials, have a ghost of a chance of getting into the action.

In reality, the SES has the potential to create an ongoing system of manipulation in the public service for years to come—a blueprint of elitism, cronyism, partisan decision-making and the club syndrome that will surely be viewed with disdain by the vast majority of Government employees. The Premier is on record as saying—

"We expect senior executives to have high management skills, possess ability to think laterally . . ." He will not achieve that if an intrusive watchdog is looking over the shoulders of senior public servants to assess their every move and that is accompanied by the threat of removal.

In his second-reading speech, the Premier referred to the principle of promotion on merit. I cite the Labor Party's public service reform policy, page 2, which states—

"To ensure independence, it is essential that public servants belong to an established career structure. Their opportunities for appointment must be based on merit, not on the acceptability or otherwise of the advice they provide Ministers. With the exception of recognised political posts such as in Ministers' private offices, politicians should have no say in internal personnel decisions of the public service. This separation of powers—an elected Government directing an independent and permanent public service—is the essence of the Westminster system."

Earlier I touched on the public service witch-hunt and the politicisation of the public service. Everyone in George Street knows that this witch-hunt is being conducted by Labor's public service ideologists for the purpose of ensuring a Labor line of thinking. For example, in the Housing Commission there exists a whole caucus of Labor imports from Canberra and New South Wales who replaced senior executives in the Housing Commission. It is fair to say that only a handful of Queenslanders remain in senior positions. Indeed, the new Housing Commissioner is the former Housing Commissioner of the Wran and Unsworth Governments who, on the election of the Greiner conservative Government, went to work for the Federal Labor Minister for Housing. The Federal Minister was generous enough to allow him considerable time to spend in Queensland during the State election to work for the Labor Party.

It would appear that included in the concept of merit is prior experience as a Labor Party hack. I notice that in Labor Party policy Ministers' private offices seem to have been very carefully exempted from the concept of merit, despite job descriptions emphasising merit. This seems to be very wise. An analysis of the CVs of successful applicants shows that if one wants to work in a Minister's office, one must have a reference from either a Labor Party official, a union official or a Federal or State Labor parliamentarian. This has applied to jobs in Ministers' offices, starting with the Premier. Wayne Swan was the referee for one successful applicant. Similar Labor referees have led to jobs for people in the Housing and Local Government, Administrative Services, Education, Employment, Health, Justice, Land Management, Industry, Primary Industries, Resource Industries, Tourism, Transport and Treasury portfolios. The common denominator is an affiliation of one type or another with the Labor Party. So much for positions being filled solely on the basis of merit!

I inform the House that a prerequisite for working in a Minister's office is that one must be a card-carrying member of the Labor Party or the member of a union. The composition of the Premier's and Ministers' offices conflicts with the position description for ministerial private secretaries and press secretaries. The guidelines for applicants for ministerial, private and press secretaries include this high-sounding paragraph, which states—

"Merit is the sole basis for selection and is gauged by how well you meet the qualifications set out in the position description. Wherever possible, cite evidence of your merit; don't simply state that you meet the qualifications but give a specific analysis that demonstrates that you meet the qualifications."

"Merit" is a pseudonym for Labor ideological purity. In other words, as I said earlier, one has to be a card-carrying member of the Labor Party.

The screening and selection process is a means of justifying and concealing the cynical exercise of providing jobs for the girls and boys. Many public servants have been hurt. They believed that they were independent of the political process. They believed that they had the right to expect that they would be treated fairly and properly. Instead, they were subjected to as much degradation as the Government could heap upon them. Some of the most senior were sent to the Gulag—the Normanby Gulag. They did not have telephones or desks—at least not up until the final days of their three-month incarceration. They did not even have a job statement. They were treated as pariahs, and the Government spent many thousands of dollars of taxpayers' money determining how it might cheat these senior public servants out of their rights under contracts that had been signed by them in good faith during the term of the previous Government.

This episode is an absolute disgrace to this Government and an absolute disgrace to the Westminster system. Similar treatment was meted out to public servants who served in ministerial offices. They have been massively downgraded in their work, not simply moved from the ministerial area. They have been subjected to deliberate attempts to humiliate them.

Ultimately, even union representatives came down hard on the Government. Laurie Gillespie, secretary of the Queensland State Service Union, labelled the Government's actions as vindictive. A senior officer of the Australian Journalists Association—to his great credit—gave the Premier's staff a vigorous caning in relation to the Government's deliberate stalling and efforts to wangle its way out of its obligations to AJA members who were also members of the public service and had contracts signed in good faith with the previous Government.

This Government might not comprehend, even now, how damaging this and related episodes were, and are, to its reputation right across the public service. The Government is feared, and for very, very good reason. We were told that the Westminster system would be the model for all dealings with the public service. In this instance also, where was the Westminster model when the new Labor Government, within days of assuming office, appointed seven new departmental chief executives? Where were the appropriate Westminster-style advertisements? Where was any opportunity whatsoever provided for applications? There was none—absolutely none. These chief executives were chosen by Mr Goss' revolutionary tribunal on the fifteenth floor of the Executive Building—the floor from which public servants have now been banned and the floor that is being extensively remodelled, at taxpayers' expense, to house the private staff, and only the private staff, of the Premier behind soundproof walls. At the very heart of this Government, public servants are not trusted. They have been banished, shut out, and told to get the hell out.

I am advised also that shortly the director-general will be moved to the fourteenth floor so that he cannot hear, know or have any idea about the Government's plotting and planning. Senior organisational roles within the Premier's office are being filled not by public servants but by consultants—very highly paid consultants. Another measure of the Goss Government's regard for the public service is its ignoring of public servants and bringing in consultants. Moreover, if at all possible, it insults public servants on

their way out the door. That is this Government's view of the public service, and it is evident right at the very top. However, that is not where the paranoia begins and ends. It goes much further and much deeper.

Even the Premier's stenographic back-up, the young women who are the backbone of any ministerial office who have traditionally come from the public service and who have worked so hard, so willingly and so loyally for their boss, have been banned from the Premier's office. The public service is not good enough for the Premier. He had to go to the private sector, to private employment agencies, to hire his office staff. He did not trust the public service. What an absolute insult! The public service girls were allowed to stay just long enough to train the incoming girls from the private sector and were then scattered to the four winds. This discrimination—this disgraceful treatment—has even been matched within these precincts.

Because of the continuing vendetta, attendants from this Chamber have been cast aside—demoted—not on the basis of ability, not solely on merit, but because of perceived political allegiances. This is all happening under the aegis of the same man who stood before us today and decried the previous Government's treatment of the public service. He claimed it had fostered inefficiencies and that it did not provide public servants with appropriate levels of redress. What absolute hypocrisy! What a perfect example of the degree to which this Government is willing to play on the trust of the electors who finally gave that party a chance after 32 years in the political wilderness! They are hurling that trust back in the faces of the electorate day by day, hour by hour, insult by insult.

I could go on forever about this business, because few things about the Government have riled me more, but I will content myself with just a few examples in highlighting the Government's outrageous ability to believe its own propaganda at the expense of its hypocritical position on the public service. I will highlight the lie of another of those allegedly enlightened and oh-so-honest and accountable methods, that is, the issue of appointment solely on merit. We in the Opposition have very good information on the nature of the vast majority of appointments by the Government. It is riddled with jobs for the boys. Merit is not free-standing. A referee from the party, or indeed a party ticket—and most certainly a union ticket—are prerequisites for working close to this Government.

That aspect of the Goss hypocrisy has not had the public airing it deserves, because the press gallery, understandably, given the behaviour of Labor Governments round the country in this field, regards it as old hat. But it is extremely important with this Government, because it has adopted such a holier-than-thou approach in its transition to Government. If you believe the PR, Mr Deputy Speaker, we are in Camelot. As long as one does not actually look at the difference between the rhetoric and the action, the Government's moral credentials are impeccable. Once again, it is absolute hypocrisy.

I must make one more specific point in this general regard which relates to the Government's treatment of members of the boards of quangos who will be brought under the centralist Labor umbrella. That is rather more germane here today than all the high-minded twaddle, the high-minded boiler-plate, that surrounds this Bill. This Government has embarked on a far-reaching campaign against statutory authorities. I do not need to detail that here. It is too well-known. But I will refer to the tactics being employed, because it again throws light on the massive hypocrisy specific sections of this Bill represent.

To my knowledge, not one of the board members of statutory authorities and quangos which have so far been scrapped or vastly altered by this new, very accountable, honest, open Government has had the courtesy of a letter before the media announced that his position had been axed. Hard-working, honest men and women have been publicly pilloried for the sake of slaking the need for revenge of this Government. This is not just ill-mannered and cowardly; it is despicable. I will continue to use that word because it is the only appropriate one in the circumstances. It must be used time after time about this Government. It is hypocritical.

We have a Premier who comes to this House espousing high standards and accountability, and merit and fairness in relation to the public service and to statutory authorities; yet it is all a cruel facade. It all flies out the window whenever there is a chance to knee a public servant in the groin or to hurl some invective at a statutory authority via the media—not face to face, man to man, but by the back door.

**Government members** interjected.

**Mr COOPER:** They do not like it one little bit.

At the Committee stage, the Opposition will be taking stances on the various clauses of this hypocritical Bill.

The National Party has a firm belief in achieving quality public administration through the efficient machinery of Government and the principles of fair treatment for all employees. It does not support the establishment of expensive bureaucracies and networks to achieve that end. The final judgment will be made by the persons ultimately paying the bill for this expensive exercise in bureaucratic empire-building and regulation gone mad.

As I said earlier, this Bill is largely redundant. What is worse, it is a rolling two-year review that will leave the public service rudderless until, regulation by regulation, a new format by which the public service can operate emerges bit by bit. In that regard, it is fatally flawed. The only reason that the Opposition today supports the Bill is so that it can help public servants come to grips with this crude fait accompli. We will not let them down, even though the Government has, deliberately and spitefully, from the beginning.

Debate, on motion of Mr Mackenroth, adjourned.

**Hon. T. M. MACKENROTH** (Chatsworth—Leader of the House) (10.59 p.m.): I move—

"That the House do now adjourn."

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Mr Campbell): Order! The question is "That the House do now adjourn." As many as are of that opinion say "Aye"; those against say "No". I think the "Ayes" have it.

**Mr COOPER:** I rise to a point of order.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The question is—

**Mr COOPER:** Mr Deputy Speaker, I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

**Mr Mackenroth:** He can't. I have adjourned the debate.

**Mr COOPER:** Mr Deputy Speaker, I am seeking leave.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The House has been adjourned.

The House adjourned at 11 p.m.