

NOTE: There could be differences between this document and the official printed *Hansard*, Vol. 315

TUESDAY, 21 AUGUST 1990

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

ABSENCE OF THE CLERK

Mr SPEAKER: I have to inform the House of the unavoidable absence of the Clerk of the Parliament, who is attending a funeral this morning.

ASSENT TO BILLS

Assent to the following Bills reported by Mr Speaker—

Appropriation Bill (No. 1);
State Housing (Validation of Regulations) Bill;
Picture Theatres and Films Act Repeal and Other Acts Amendment Bill;
Liquor Act Amendment Bill;
Land Act Amendment Bill;
Jury Act Amendment Bill;
Irvinebank State Treatment Works (Sale and Operation) Bill;
Explosives Act Amendment Bill;
Corrective Services (Validation of Regulations) Bill;
Coal Mining Act Amendment Bill.

ASSENT TO BILL

Appropriation Bill (No. 1)

Mr SPEAKER: I have to report that on 8 August 1990, I presented to His Excellency the Governor Appropriation Bill 1990-1991 (No. 1) for the royal assent and that His Excellency was pleased, in my presence, to subscribe his assent thereto in the name and on behalf of Her Majesty.

LANDSBOROUGH AND SHERWOOD BY-ELECTIONS

Return of Writs

Mr SPEAKER: I have to inform the House that the writs issued by me on 5 July 1990 for the election of members to serve in the Legislative Assembly for the electoral districts of Landsborough and Sherwood have been returned to me with a certificate endorsed thereon by the returning officers of the elections, on 28 July, of Mrs Joan Mary Sheldon and David Anthony Dunworth, Esquire, to serve as such members.

Members Sworn

Mrs Sheldon and Mr Dunworth were introduced, took the oath of allegiance, and subscribed the roll.

PETITIONS

The Deputy Clerk announced the receipt of the following petitions—

Goondiwindi Hospitals Board

From **Mr Springborg** (184 signatories) praying that the present structure and budget of the Goondiwindi Hospital Board be maintained.

Agricultural Spraying

From **Mr Sullivan** (15 signatories) praying for provisions to protect human health from agricultural oversprays in rural residential areas.

Redevelopment of Victoria Park

From **Mr Beattie** (93 signatories) praying that the proposal by the Royal Queensland Lawn Tennis Association and Brisbane City Council to redevelop Victoria Park be rejected.

Use of Horticultural Chemicals

From **Mr Campbell** (336 signatories) praying for legislation to provide for appropriate training, protection and licensing of users of horticultural chemicals.

Bread Industry Committee Act

From **Mr W. K. Goss** (91 signatories) praying that the existing Bread Industry Committee Act including penalty provisions be retained.

Enforcement of Fisheries Rules

From **Mr W. K. Goss** (46 signatories) praying for the appointment of more fisheries inspectors and for an increase in penalties for breaches of the rules.

Literature and Film Boards of Review

From **Mr W. K. Goss** (509 signatories) praying for the maintenance of the Literature and Film Boards of Review and for a continuation of controls outlawing the sale of all pornographic matter.

Dental Technicians

From **Mr W. K. Goss** (499 signatories) praying that legislation be amended to allow qualified dental technicians to deal directly with the public.

Licensing of Firearms

From **Mr Sullivan** (44 signatories) praying that a licensing system for firearms be not introduced until public debate and alternative courses of action are investigated.

Daylight-saving

From **Mr Harper** (11 signatories) praying that daylight-saving be not reintroduced in future years.
Petitions received.

PAPERS

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

Reports for the year ended 30 June 1989—

Registrar of Co-operative and Other Societies

Registrar of Commercial Acts on the administration of the Building Societies Act 1985-1987

Registrar of Commercial Acts on the administration of the Credit Societies Act 1986-1987

Registrar of Commercial Acts on the administration of the Credit Act 1987.

The following papers were laid on the table—

Orders in Council under—

Financial Administration and Audit Act 1977-1988
Parliamentary Members' Salaries Act 1988-1990
Queensland Law Society Act 1952-1988
Prisoners (Interstate Transfer) Act 1982-1989
Harbours Act 1955-1989
Canals Act 1958-1989
Explosives Act 1952-1988
Coal Mining Act 1925-1989
Petroleum Act 1923-1988

Regulations under—

Crimes (Confiscation of Profits) Act 1989
State Transport Act 1960-1990
Traffic Act 1949-1985
Motor Vehicle Driving Instruction School Act 1969-1985
Carriage of Dangerous Goods by Road Act 1984-1988
Motor Vehicles Control Act 1975-1988
Motor Vehicles Safety Act 1980-1989
Tow Truck Act 1973-1985
Queensland Marine Act 1958-1989
Explosives Act 1952-1988
Gas Act 1965-1988
Mining (Fossicking) Act 1985
Petroleum Act 1923-1988

Reports for the year ended 30 June 1990—

Mediation Panel of the Retail Shop Leases Act
Chairman of the Retail Shop Leases Tribunal

By-laws under the Harbours Act 1955-1989

Notification under the Gateway Bridge Agreement Act 1980-1985.

MOTION OF CONDOLENCE

Death of Mr F. J. Waters

Hon. W. K. GOSS (Logan—Premier, Minister for Economic and Trade Development and Minister for the Arts) (10.13 a.m.), by leave, without notice: I move—

"1. That this House desires to place on record its appreciation of the services rendered to this State by the late Francis John Waters, AM, a former member of the Parliament of Queensland.

2. That Mr Speaker be requested to convey to the family of the deceased gentleman the above resolution, together with an expression of the sympathy and sorrow of the members of the Parliament of Queensland in the loss they have sustained."

The death recently of Frank Waters marked the end of an era in Queensland politics. He was the last surviving member of the Forgan Smith Government, having served in this House from 1932 until 1938 as the member for the former seat of Kelvin Grove.

I think that it is fair to say that Frank Waters was in the classic mould of Labor Party politicians of that era: largely self-educated, remarkably well read and utterly dedicated to getting a better deal for the working class—the battlers who were at that stage fighting their way back from the savage impact of the depression.

It has been said by no less than the distinguished Labor historian, the late Dr Denis Murphy, that under different circumstances Frank Waters could have been the Premier of Queensland. His political career came to a premature end in 1938 and, as a result of internal party ructions, he failed to gain re-endorsement. He was expelled from the party in 1941 over his stand in a row involving medical aid to Russia.

Frank Waters' resilience and commitment to the labour movement saw him readmitted to the party in 1956, and he was a prominent delegate to numerous State ALP conventions and Federal party conferences throughout the 1960s and into the 1970s. Nevertheless, Frank Waters will be remembered most for his career and for his contribution as a union-leader.

After war service he turned his talents to the union movement. He had started his working life as a PMG telegram boy. He served as secretary of the Queensland branch of the Postal Workers Union from 1946 to 1972 and also as Federal president of that union from 1961 until his retirement in 1973. He served for 26 years as State secretary and for 12 years as Federal president—a remarkable record of service as a union-leader. He was an outstanding industrial tactician, and as the leader of a major public sector union was involved in many struggles to improve wages and conditions for his members.

In retirement, Frank Waters retained an active interest in the Labor Party and union affairs and continued to make a valuable contribution behind the scenes in Queensland.

Frank Waters was a true Labor man and a true union-leader—a description that is a most fitting epitaph for a person with his record and one that I am sure the members of his family and those who knew him and who remember him will long cherish.

I did not know Frank Waters well, but I had met him on a number of occasions. All of those who knew him, and those whom I met, spoke highly of him. It was in fact officially recorded that he was unable to attend the recent centenary dinner held by the Labor Party on 1 August. It certainly would have been great if he could have been there, but his failing health did not permit it.

On behalf of the Government of Queensland and the Queensland Parliamentary Labor Party in this House, I extend sincere condolences to his family.

Hon. T. J. BURNS (Lytton—Deputy Premier, Minister for Housing and Local Government) (10.17 a.m.): Frank Waters was a mate of mine. I lived with Frank through the turmoil in the Labor Party after the split, served with him on the Federal Executive of the Labor Party, and served with him in the Queensland Central Executive of the Labor Party when I was secretary and he was an official. I knew him as a mate and a good bloke.

His passing was a sad day for the labour movement. As the Premier said, Frank Waters is a part of history. On the day on which he was elected, both Frank Nicklin and Vince Gair were also elected to the Parliament. He was one of the great characters of the Parliament and one of the great characters of the labour movement.

Today when I look around the Parliament, after my few years here, and I see the changes that have come about with members using written speeches and notes, I think of the fellows who made up the labour movement who gained their education by going to the libraries, working at night and on the weekends trying to improve themselves. They were blokes who were real battlers and who had to fight in those days against people who had all of the values of education and all of the money in the community. When one thinks of Frank and fellows like him, and those who have followed him into this place, those who have made this place colourful and interesting, it is sad when they pass on.

Frank used to tell some wonderful stories of his fights with Forgan Smith. In 1941, Forgan Smith was instrumental in ensuring that Frank was not re-endorsed; he opposed him at the convention at that time. I think Forgan Smith and others were involved in ensuring that Frank was expelled from the Labor Party because of his actions during the war.

But Frank never once gave in. He used to tell some great yarns about Forgan Smith, who liked a drink on a hot day, on a cold day and on a number of other days. One story involved Forgan Smith flying to England on a plane which stopped at Cloncurry on the way. On that occasion, Forgan Smith had had more than a scotch or two. There to meet the plane was the president of the local branch of the Labor Party, a very dark-skinned fellow who was sunburnt in the normal traditions of the west. When Forgan Smith got off the plane he turned to his aide and said, "I didn't think we had got to India yet." I am sorry that Mr Katter is not in the Chamber, but the fellow to whom Forgan Smith was referring was Mr Katter's grandfather, who was the branch president at that time.

As far as being a Premier was concerned, Forgan Smith was an old roughie. It was told that, in the caucus meetings of the day, he ruled with an iron hand and that the only one who could take him on was Frank Waters. Frank Waters said that one had to watch Forgan Smith suck on his pipe. When Forgan Smith was happy with what someone was saying about him, he would put his pipe in his mouth, smile and sit back. So Frank Waters would say to him, "Mr Premier, you are the best Premier that this State has ever seen." Forgan would put the pipe in his mouth and put his hand down. Frank would then say, "But you are not doing the right thing by the workers in my area." Forgan would then put his hand on his pipe. As a result, Frank would say, "Just the same, there has never been a Premier like you." Frank could last a few minutes by giving Forgan Smith a shaft and then a pat on the back until finally Forgan Smith would become sick of him, take the pipe out of his mouth and say, "That's the end of that."

Frank Waters was also renowned as a great writer. He used to write letters to people. Any honourable members who were around or who have mates who were around at the time of the split should ask about the letter he wrote to Vince Gair. It was a confidential letter, a very nasty letter, a very defamatory letter, yet it had the widest circulation of any confidential letter ever written.

Just recently we attended Frank's funeral, and many stories were told by Mick Young, Jack Stanaway and me. We had all known him for years. The stories that were told that day would fill a great book of memories of the labour movement.

On behalf of the Labor Party, his mates and the other blokes who knew him, I say that Frank Waters was a good bloke; he was a bloke who believed in the things that he stood for. He fought for them; he never gave in. He never gave an inch. He was prepared to give way for people. For example, he gave way so that Bill Hayden could go on the Federal conference of the party. As we know, Bill Hayden went from there to being our national Treasurer and now our Governor-General. Frank was prepared to stand aside when he saw that young people needed an opportunity. He was prepared to never give in. He was prepared to lose his seat and his job for the things that he believed in. He was a man's man. He will be missed. As I said, on behalf of my mates in the labour movement, I am sorry to see him go.

Mr COOPER (Roma—Leader of the Opposition) (10.22 a.m.): I would also like to place on record the condolences of the National Party. Although I did not know Frank Waters, I listened with interest to the remarks made by one who knew him, the Deputy Premier. I think it is important that those remarks be heeded. As the Deputy Premier said, a lot of history is made in this place and that history can be lost unless it is referred to from time to time. When opportunities such as this arise when we pay respects to people who have earned that respect, it behoves us to listen to the remarks made and so gain some indication of what the person was like.

Last week, the *Courier-Mail* ran a very good article about Frank Waters. Eighty-two years is a mighty long time and not too many people ask for longer than that on this earth. How one spends one's years is what is most important and, from listening to speakers and from reading Frank Waters' background, obviously he was a man who ably represented his electors, which is what all honourable members in this place try to do. The Opposition acknowledges that Frank Waters represented his electorate well and commends him for it.

I am told that Frank Waters was one of the last of the old-time parliamentarians, and that he was part of a very colourful group. Members on both sides of the political fence read history and all political parties have some very interesting history, which adds to the colour of this place. I am told that Frank Waters was a very colourful man, who was quiet and unassuming but pretty handy in a scrap when it came to an issue about which he had very deep feelings.

As the Deputy Premier has said, at one time he did stand aside to give Australia's present Governor-General a break, and I am told that that was a very selfless effort to promote someone who had talent. This world contains many selfish and greedy people, and it is good to meet or read about people who either put the interests of their party or someone else first, and Frank Waters was such a man.

I endorse the remarks of the Premier and the Deputy Premier. On behalf of the members of the National Party, I extend our condolences to the family and friends of Frank Waters, and place on record our commendations and thanks for the service that he gave to this State.

Mr BEANLAND (Toowong—Leader of the Liberal Party) (10.25 a.m.): On behalf of the members of the Liberal Party, I extend to the family of Frank Waters our condolences and I endorse the remarks of the previous speakers.

Frank Waters was not known to me personally or to current members of the Liberal Party in this place. Nevertheless, it is quite clear that, over a long period of time, he left a mark not only on the Parliament of this State but also the history of this State. He was, quite clearly, a man who over many, many years, stood up for his convictions and for his principles. That is illustrated by the fact that, by standing up for those principles, he certainly did not further his own career.

He played a very key role in the union movement in this State and federally. Not only was he the secretary of the postal union from 1946 to 1972, but also the Federal president of that union from 1961 to 1973. He played a very significant role in that union, as well as in the ALP generally.

One cannot help but notice that he came to this place at 24 years of age at a time when not many members would have entered this House at that age. Even today, not many people are prepared to embark upon a political career at that time of their life. However, he was able to ride with the rough and tumble and the hurly-burly not only of the political scene but also of the union movement. Clearly, not only was he a man of strong convictions but also he was a self-made man.

I note that Frank Waters was another Queensland politician born in New Zealand. This House has had a number of members who were born in the Shaky Isles themselves, and he was a case in point.

Frank Waters was a man of deep convictions and he has left his mark not only on the history of this Parliament but also on the history of this State.

The members of the Liberal Party join with other members in this place in extending to the family of Frank Waters their deepest sympathies.

Hon. D. J. HAMILL (Ipswich—Minister for Transport and Minister Assisting the Premier on Economic and Trade Development) (10.27 a.m.): I also associate myself with this motion of condolence to the family and friends of the late Frank Waters.

As a young person in the Labor movement, I came to know Frank fairly well. The comments of the Premier and the Deputy Premier were very much to the point. Frank Waters was a great identity in the Labor Party, both in the industrial and the political wings of the party, and was a great mine of information. He was a self-educated man and, in his own right, an archivist. He kept many old papers and newspaper clippings in the rooms of his home. Frank was always available if one wanted to have a talk to him about past events, and always encouraged to young people.

I remember vividly going and sitting down with Frank in his back room. He would shuffle off and return with old, yellowed pieces of newspaper, interesting pieces of correspondence such as those already mentioned by the Deputy Premier, and a whole range of other important and very fascinating documents from his personal collection. He was also a great source of material for historians such as Dr Denis Murphy, who spent a considerable time interviewing Frank. Much of the material which has been produced over the last 10 to 15 years on the history of the Labor movement, particularly during the turbulent times in the 1950s and the early 1960s, emanated from his resources.

Frank had a chequered career. As has already been mentioned, he spent six years in this Parliament, entering this House at a young age and leaving at a young age but, undaunted, he had another career in the industrial movement ahead of him. One lesser-known fact was that in 1938 Frank became a casualty of a political ruction when he was the only member of the Queensland Parliament to be defeated by a candidate from the then Protestant Labor Party, one of those sectarian sidelights which took place in the 1930s. However, that is not the principal reason why we remember Frank. Those of us who knew him remember him as a very generous and caring person, who had a great regard for his fellow human beings and who strove throughout his life-time to better the lot of others around him. It saddens me greatly to have learnt of Frank's passing but comforted in the knowledge that he is so fondly remembered by so many members of this House.

Hon. P. COMBEN (Windsor—Minister for Environment and Heritage) (10.30 a.m.): For the past seven years, Frank Waters was a constituent of mine. I came to know Frank when I first stood as a Labor Party candidate in the seat of the present Speaker, the seat of Ashgrove. Frank telephoned me one day and gave me some advice. In those days, I was not well versed in the history of the Labor Party, or even the history of Queensland. Frank did not tell me that he was a member of the Labor Party. He did not say much about himself. However, he gave me good advice. From that time onwards, Frank was constantly calling at my home, giving me snippets of information and talking about the direction in which the Labor Party should be heading. At times, he was the conscience of many Labor Party members.

Frank was one of the great people in the Queensland Labor Party. Had history been a little kinder when the dice was thrown, he could easily have been a great leader of this State. Even in his last days, Frank Waters always supported the Labor Party. In my first campaigns, which were unsuccessful, he came out and physically helped. In the last couple of campaigns, he always donated money. He was always keeping an eye on things.

He had a hidden life of which few honourable members would be aware. For over a decade, he nursed his chronically ill spouse. He did a marvellous job. Few honourable members could have carried the burden that he did. Frank Waters must be remembered for that. He never mentioned it. He continued with his very active life. Although it was a sad time for him, it was a time during which his spouse certainly appreciated his efforts.

Frank Waters was always involved in local matters. In Kelvin Grove, Wilston and Ashgrove, he was a leader of a number of community organisations. He will be well remembered in those organisations. Only a couple of years ago, we were planting trees in Frank Waters Park, which was named after Frank. Who should turn up with a spade to give us a hand but Frank Waters. It was a great day. Although he spent most of the day sitting underneath a tree talking both to the children and to us, Frank was still

saying, "I'm here. I'm active. I'm involved." During his long life, that was the feeling that Frank Waters always projected.

On behalf of my local branch of the Labor Party—that of the Alderley/Green Hills branch, which now includes your constituency, Mr Speaker—I wish to be associated with this condolence motion. Certainly, my wife and I and other local branch members are proud to have known Frank Waters, a great Queenslander, to whom we pay tribute today. Few honourable members in this Parliament would be better remembered in terms of local support and being a genuine human being who never did a bad turn to anyone but stood up for what he believed in and did a great job for Queensland as a result.

Mr BEATTIE (Brisbane Central) (10.34 a.m.): I rise to speak to this condolence motion for Frank Waters not only because he represented the old electorate of Kelvin Grove, which encompassed a significant part of my electorate of Brisbane Central, but also because he was a person of considerable integrity for whom I and many other honourable members had enormous respect. He worked his way through the Labor movement and never lost sight of his idealism or those matters of principle that he regarded as fundamentally important.

According to a Labor historian, the late Dr Denis Murphy, Frank Waters was, amongst all his other qualities, "in a real sense, a natural rebel". Early in his career, the strength of his convictions made him critical of the inner executive of the ALP. At that time, he urged reform in both the administration of the Labor Party and in the Labor Party generally. He suggested that the party should meet at night and that the social objective of the Labor Party should be popularised. He also suggested a number of other reforms which were important to the Labor Party.

Frank Waters left school at the age of 13 and became a telegram boy, which indicated that he was prepared to work in order to achieve what he felt was important. In his teenage years, he was a prominent member of the Queensland branch of the Amalgamated Postal Workers Union, now called the Australian Postal and Telecommunications Union. Frank Waters had a long union career. From 1946 to the end of 1972, he was secretary of the Queensland branch of the Amalgamated Postal Workers Union. From 1961 to 1973, he was Federal president of the Amalgamated Postal Workers Union.

With respect to his parliamentary career, in 1932 when Labor was returned to power after three years in the wilderness, Frank Waters was elected to the then safe Labor seat of Kelvin Grove. At the age of 24, he was one of the youngest men ever to serve in this Legislative Assembly. Given his youth and the safeness of his seat, it seemed likely that he would have a long career as a parliamentarian. In his introduction to Frank Waters' history of the Amalgamated Postal Workers Union, the late Dr Denis Murphy commented that Frank Waters was—

" . . . a very capable politician and would certainly have become a Cabinet Minister, and possibly even a Premier, had his parliamentary career not been cut short".

Frank Waters' parliamentary career was terminated in a very unique way. At the State election in 1938, he lost his seat to the Protestant Labor Party, which was a short-lived political entity that only ever elected one member for one term to the Queensland Parliament. He was also the author of a book on the history of this union called *Postal Workers and Politics*. That book was edited by the late Dr Denis Murphy. Peter Charlton of the *Courier-Mail* said in his review of the volume that it was—

" . . . a detailed and objective account—surprisingly so, considering the close involvement of its author in the union's affairs".

Following the death of the late Frank Forde in 1983, Frank Waters was the most senior surviving member of the Queensland Parliament. A check of parliamentary records revealed that in 1974 he was the fourth most senior surviving State or Federal parliamentarian in Australia.

I knew Frank Waters personally. As the Deputy Premier summed up in a very accurate way—which he always does on these occasions—Frank Waters was certainly a

man's man. He knew the occasions which required him to have the appropriate drink. For 17 years, he served on the QCE of the Labor Party. During that time, I think that he found the need to have the occasional drink with his friends and colleagues. When he did it, he certainly did it with style. I spoke to Evan and Robert Schwarten about that. I am sure that the member for Rockhampton North will refer to that in his own contribution to this condolence motion.

It is worth saying that it was the strength, determination and conviction shown by people such as Frank Waters that paved the way for the modern Labor Party.

Motion agreed to, honourable members standing in silence.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

Report on Premier's Visit to Japan and Korea

Hon. W. K. GOSS (Logan—Premier, Minister for Economic and Trade Development and Minister for the Arts) (10.38 a.m.), by leave: Today, I wish to report to the Parliament of Queensland on a trip I recently undertook to Japan and Korea. Members will be aware of the importance of the economic relationship between Queensland and Japan. I felt it appropriate to make my first overseas visit to the country that is Queensland's largest trading partner and is also one which is strengthening its position of world leadership in the areas of industry, technology and foreign investment.

Aside from meetings and briefings with leading Japanese corporations, industry groups and Government departments on matters of trade and investment, my visit served two other more specific purposes. I was able to gauge at first hand Japanese interest in the multifunction polis proposal which, at that stage, had not been awarded to any Australian State, and also to participate in activities marking Queensland's special day at the Osaka Garden and Greenery World Expo on 13 June.

My visit was, I believe, successful in establishing the necessary high-level contact between the new Queensland Government and business and industry leaders in Japan. Through personal meetings and discussions with Japan's leading corporations and industry organisations, the visit provided a valuable opportunity to develop my Government's understanding and appreciation of the vital relationship between Queensland and Japan.

In these discussions, I outlined Queensland's commitment to a strengthening of that relationship. I emphasised how my Government was committed to domestic economic growth, which we would seek to achieve by building on the foundations of the Queensland economy—primary industries, the resources sector and tourism—and that Queensland was looking for opportunities to establish industries that added value to our primary products and, importantly, added technology of manufacturing capacity to the State's economic base.

My report emphasises the importance of the economic relationship between Queensland and Japan and, while the prospects for a continuing productive trading relationship are very good, it is important that Queensland pays the closest attention to maintaining and, where suitable opportunities exist, strengthening existing trade ties.

My report is in the form of a long ministerial statement and outlines most of my individual meetings in Japan and Korea. Because of the time constraints this morning, I seek leave of the House for my ministerial statement and trip report to be tabled and incorporated in Hansard.

Leave granted.

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

At a reception in Tokyo hosted by the Queensland Government I was able to address a large group of leading Japanese businessmen and exchange views and information on important aspects of Queensland's economic links with Japan.

At a major investment seminar also in Tokyo attended by senior representatives from a wide cross section of Japanese business and industry I spoke on the Queensland Government's

approach to foreign investment, stressing our interest in investment that was mutually beneficial to Queensland and Japan.

My visit convinced me of the necessity for Queensland to review and expand its efforts to seize market opportunities in Japan as well as giving greater attention to the task of identifying specific investment opportunities here in Queensland for which we want to attract Japanese investment.

Another important outcome of the visit in this area was an offer by Nomura to have the world-renowned Nomura Research Institute to investigate and prepare a report on new areas of potential investment by Japanese investors here in Queensland that meet the requirement of delivering mutual benefits to our State as well as Japan.

A significant development arising out of the visit in this regard was an undertaking given at my meeting with the Japan external trade organisation to co-operate with the planned new Japan secretariat within the trade development division of my department. This will involve identifying export opportunities for Queensland business and industry establishing or expanding trade contracts with Japan.

Since my return Jetro has announced it will assign an officer to work in Queensland on expanding our State's exports to Japan.

I believe Queensland can look forward to a continuing productive trading relationship with Japan, although it is important that we do not take this relationship for granted. Political changes in eastern Europe are already attracting the close interest of Japanese trading and investment corporations.

The sheer size of the trading relationship between Queensland and Japan imposes a responsibility on the State Government to pay the closest attention to ways of maintaining and where suitable opportunities exist, of strengthening existing trade ties.

In 1988-89 Queensland exports to Japan were in the order of \$3.5 billion while imports from Japan totalled about \$1.5 billion, a trade surplus in Queensland's favour of \$2 billion.

Japan imports a range of Queensland products which not only provide valuable export earnings but also the export orders that provide the basis for local company profits and employment opportunities for Queenslanders.

Japanese investment has financed numerous Queensland developments, funds that are vital for Australia's resource rich, but capital scarce economy. These developments have provided many thousands of jobs and many millions of dollars of State revenue.

Queensland in turn has provided Japan with natural resources essential for development of the country's major industries, agricultural products necessary for food production, and major investment opportunities for its financial institutions and other investors.

As a State we must now explore new ways of ensuring that the relationship between Queensland and Japan continues to be of mutual benefit.

My visit to Korea, although brief, was important in establishing high level contact between my Government and a number of that country's leading corporations.

Trade between Australia and Korea has expanded rapidly over recent years and is now approaching the \$4 billion mark a year. Korea is Australia's third largest export market.

As the Korean economy continues its rapid expansion it is likely that Korean investors will play an increasingly active role in investment ventures in Australia. Korean tourists will also visit Australia and Queensland in growing numbers.

From this initial contact I hope to make further specific visits in the future to ensure close contact between Queensland and such an influential world economic power as Korea.

Mr Speaker, I seek leave to table and have incorporated in *Hansard* the remainder of my report consisting of summary notes on meetings attended by me and Queensland Government representatives and other aspects of my trip to Japan and Korea.

Meeting notes

Daikyo Inc. of Japan

Daikyo is one of Japan's leading real estate companies, primarily involved in property development, with particular expertise as a builder of high quality condominiums. Daikyo Australia, established in 1972, has a strong foreign investment presence in Queensland, mainly in the tourism industry.

Meeting with Mr. Shuji Yokoyama, President.

Discussions centred on development of the tourism industry in Queensland and the necessary infrastructure to support industry growth. Daikyo expressed its enthusiasm for embarking on its major new resort development at Palm Cove, north of Cairns, which daikyo said would be developed as one of the world's best resorts. Daikyo outlined details also of its major new development projects in Japan.

I advised Mr Yokoyama of the Queensland Government's support and appreciation for the setting up this year of the Yokoyama Scholarship Foundation, a \$5 million fund to assist Australian students to study in Japan. This initiative will tangibly strengthen the commercial and cultural relationship between Queensland and Japan.

Nomura securities

Nomura is Japan's leading securities company and the largest financial institution in the world, and is involved in providing Queensland with domestic financing transactions. Nomura is also a major corporate sponsor of the Queensland Art Gallery.

Meeting with Mr Masaki Yoshida, Executive Vice President

During discussions I asked for Nomura's advice on any problems or concerns Japanese companies might have in investing in high technology ventures in Australia.

I emphasised that irrespective of the multifunction polis outcome it was important that Queensland identify where Japan saw its best prospects for investment and was also aware of Japanese investors' concerns so that Queensland could take appropriate action in response to these concerns.

Mr Yoshida offered to have Nomura's world-renowned research institute examine this question and prepare a report.

Representatives of Nomura's research institute have since had discussions in Brisbane with officers of my department and Treasury and have provided indicative information on the question which we can pursue further through our Japan secretariat and Jetro links now being developed.

Nippon Steel Corporation

Nippon Steel is the world's largest steel maker, and is Queensland's biggest coal customer. The company purchases about 45 per cent of its iron ore and 40 per cent of its coking coal from Australia. Two-thirds, by weight, of Queensland's coal exports in 1988/89 were the more highly priced coking coal as distinct from thermal steaming coal.

Meeting with Mr H. Saito, President

Nippon Steel advised that Queensland was vital to Japanese steel-making and the corporation was keen to see the development of new mines in Queensland. Nippon buys coal from throughout the world and the two most important sales factors were price and reliability of supply.

Nippon requested that Queensland do its best to lower Government charges, which would improve the price competitiveness of Queensland coal.

I advised the corporation that the Queensland Government would give the question of rail freights important consideration but emphasised this was an important area of State revenue.

Nippon Steel also outlined its intention to increase its production of special steels, for which demand is growing especially from the automobile industry which is looking for lighter, higher tensile steels which reduce the weight of a vehicle and its fuel consumption.

Nippon Steel advised that generally the demand for steel remains strong throughout the world. Prices of iron and manganese ore have risen sharply in recent years, in particular manganese ore. Nippon is greatly interested in becoming involved in the development of manganese ore supplies.

My discussions with those involved in Japanese industry including Nippon Steel, the powerful electric power development company which builds, owns and operates Japanese power stations.

And major trading corporations such as Mitsui, convinced me of a bright future for Queensland's coking and steaming coal exports and associated crucial export earnings. However, the two major factors in securing contracts for the State's coal will continue to be its price and reliability of supply. I advised these industry representatives that while Queensland

appreciated the need for its coal to be price competitive they too should appreciate how coal rail freights were an important source of revenue to the Queensland Government.

Nikko Securities Co Ltd

After Nomura, Nikko is the second largest securities company in Japan. Nikko has been primarily responsible for Queensland's loan raisings in Japan, which started in 1982, as well as other international financial arrangements. Nikko also is a major corporate sponsor of the Queensland Art Gallery.

Meeting with Mr T. Iwasaki, President

In general discussions I outlined to Nikko the broad approach of the Queensland Government to the management of the State's economy, and its determination to expand its export performance. As with other major companies there was not more than a passing acquaintance with the MFP proposal.

The level of corporate Japanese knowledge and interest in the MFP could only be described as low, although there was a willingness to look more closely at becoming involved once the proposal took on a more definite and concrete form.

Ministry for International Trade and Industry

MITI is one of the most powerful agencies within the Japanese Government, and through its practice of administrative guidance, is actively involved in a wide cross-section of the Japanese economy. MITI has guided Japan's recovery from post-war devastation through to world economic pre-eminence. Its current focus is on reducing Japan's trade imbalance by promoting imports, stimulating domestic demand, and creating jobs through further technological innovation and new business development.

Meeting with Mr F. Nukaga, Parliamentary Vice-Minister

Discussions with MITI centred on the MFP proposal, an initiative put forward by MITI. Mr Nukaga advised that once a site decision had been made Japanese co-operation would flow. Japan, he said, wanted to ensure there was no distrust or misunderstanding of its role and interest in the MFP.

Political instability in china and on the Korean peninsula meant that Japan was looking to other regions for investment more closely than they might have otherwise.

Keidanren (Federation of Economic Organisations)

Keidanren is the most powerful private sector association in Japan, and is invariably consulted on all major decisions by the Government. It facilitates the representation of big business interests, but also gives attention to the varied interests of small enterprises.

Meeting with Mr E. Saito, Chairman

Once again the MFP issue was raised in general discussion yet it did not trigger any more than mild interest from this major federation of Japanese economic organisations and trade association.

Keidanren reassured the Queensland Government of its preparedness to assist in further developing the trade relationship between Queensland and Japan. I asked Keidanren to keep the Queensland Government informed of any matters of importance or concern to member bodies concerning business, trade and investment links with Queensland.

Electric Power Development Company Ltd

The Electric Power Development Company, in co-operation with Japan's 10 private electric power companies, designs, builds and operates coal-fired, hydro-electric and geo-thermal power stations. Almost 40 per cent of the Japanese power generation industry's annual 18 million tonnes of coal imports came from Australia, including several million tonnes from Queensland.

Meeting with Mr I. Fujiwara, President.

I advised EPDC of my Government's intention to ensure that Queensland remained a reliable source of supply including our support for trade union restructuring, designed to reduce the number of trade unions and improve the industrial relations system. From EPDC's viewpoint reliability of supply, price competitiveness and the conduct of contract negotiations in a

"businesslike manner", where Government intrusion or any perception of obtaining public approval was not present or kept to a minimum, were the most important considerations.

Mr Fujiwara advised that Japan would like to increase its nuclear power production to more than 30 per cent of overall energy production, although there were significant difficulties with locating nuclear power plants.

As it was unrealistic to expect solar, wind or tidal energy to generate substantial quantities of power it was clear that coal would remain a major energy source as the world moved into the 21st century. Long-term projections showed substantial increases in Japan's imports of coking and steaming coal.

The biggest technological challenge facing the electricity generation industry was how to reduce current levels of carbon dioxide emissions. Also there remained a great deal of work to be done in improving thermal efficiencies.

Idemitsu Kosan Co. Ltd

Idemitsu is Japan's largest domestically-owned petroleum company. The company has interests in two coal projects in Queensland, Ebenezer, near Ipswich and Ensham. Idemitsu's company museum houses Japan's largest private collection of oriental art. The Idemitsu museum has lent three major exhibitions for display at the Queensland Art Gallery.

Meeting with Mr S. Idemitsu, President

Discussions in general terms centred on difficulties associated with the Ensham coal project in Queensland.

Mr Idemitsu spoke of his company's commitment to community activity, especially through the arts. He spoke of Idemitsu's history in the oil sector, supply for power generation and how changes had come about, particularly after the oil-shocks of the 1970s. He also spoke of the research that the company was involved in.

I expressed appreciation for the provision of selections of artefacts from the Idemitsu collection for showing at the Queensland Art Gallery. There was discussion on the Ensham situation and I said that it was in Idemitsu's best interest to take every effort in re-establishing discussion with the joint-venture partners in order to achieve an amicable settlement for development of the mine.

Japanese Minister for Foreign Affairs, Dr Tara Nakayama.

Dr Nakayama said that he had met in the preceding week with Senator Evans who he has known for some time. He spoke of his visits to Australia for joint ministerial meetings and of trips to Brisbane as a medical practitioner to research work being performed in transplant surgery.

I informed Dr Nakayama of the change of Government in Queensland last December and of the resolve of the new Government to further strengthen commercial ties between Queensland and Japan.

I advised the Foreign Minister of visits to Japan by Ministers De Lacy (Treasurer), Gibbs (Tourism), Vaughan (Resource Industries) and Casey (Primary Industries)—all within the first six months of office—which underscored the commitment of the Queensland Government in this area.

I also spoke of Queensland's efforts concerning the multifunction polis proposal.

I expressed the view that the multifunction polis would be a good opportunity to build on the economic relationship between Australia and Queensland and Japan. The venture would involve attracting participation from a range of overseas countries, including those of America, Europe, the Asia Pacific region, as well as Japan's central involvement. If Queensland was not successful in being chosen as the site to locate the multifunction polis, the State Government would pursue individual project opportunities with the objective of attracting investment in new technology ventures.

Japan External Trade Organisation (Jetro)

the Japan External Trade Organisation was established in 1958 to encourage the development of Japan's overseas trade. So successful has been Japan's economic development that Jetro's primary role is the reverse of that for which it was established.

Rather than promoting Japan's exports—its original role—Jetro now works exclusively to encourage imports and to assist countries to gain access to the Japanese market.

Jetro operates 50 import information centres across Japan. It intends to set up 30 overseas information centres on exports to Japan to implement the activities of its 77 overseas offices which promote imports to Japan.

Meeting with Mr N. Masuda, Chairman and Members of the Board of Jetro

I informed Jetro of the Queensland Government's moves to pull together the various trade related areas of the bureaucracy into a trade development division within my department. The former Premier's Department had been renamed the Department of the Premier, Economic and Trade Development, emphasising the importance the new Government attached to economic and trade development, the interdependence of these two areas, and the Government's determination to improve Queensland's export performance.

In recognising the huge potential for trade opportunities with countries of north-east Asia the State Government would be placing particular emphasis on strengthening its trade ties with Japan.

This would involve setting up a Japan secretariat within the new trade division of my department, an initiative on which the Queensland Government would welcome any advice or assistance from Jetro.

Mr Masuda responded that Jetro was impressed with the Queensland Government's initiatives and enthusiasm to promote further economic exchange with Japan. He offered Jetro's total co-operation towards establishing the Japan secretariat in the trade development division of my department.

Specifically Jetro has authorised that details of that co-operation be discussed between Queensland Government officials and the managing director of Jetro's Sydney office.

Mitsui and Co, Ltd

Mitsui and Co. Ltd is one of the biggest trading companies in the world, with assets approaching us\$50 billion. Mitsui is actively involved in mining, agriculture and tourism in Australia. Recently it took a 16.6 per cent equity in the north west shelf project which is involved in shipping liquified natural gas to Japanese utility companies. Mitsui's operations in Queensland are mainly in the areas of coal and tourism.

Meeting with Mr K. Ejiri, President

Mitsui confirmed the advice by the steel-making and power generation industries that the importation of steaming and coking coal would continue at strong demand levels over future years.

Mr Ejiri forecast a big future for the Cairns region in attracting tourism from Japan, particularly with the completion of the new Osaka International Airport, saying it would rival Hawaii as a tourist destination for Japanese travellers.

Mr Mitsui offered to explore ways of assisting the establishment of a third major domestic airline in Australia through the chartering of surplus DC10 aircraft in Japan.

Queensland Government reception, Tokyo

In Tokyo I hosted, on behalf of the Queensland Government, a reception for leading Japanese companies and business representatives across a wide range of industry sectors. The reception was attended by more than 150 leading representatives of business commerce and industry in Japan. I advised them of the high priority that the new Queensland Government attached to the economic relationship with Japan, and its intention to broaden and strengthen that relationship.

"Investing in Queensland" seminar

In Tokyo I addressed a seminar on investment opportunities in Queensland. The seminar was organised by the Queensland legal firm, Clarke and Kaan, the Queensland accountancy and management consultant firm, Ernst and Young, and the National Australia Bank. These companies deserve commendation for their efforts to secure the foreign investment necessary for Queensland's and Australia's development. A copy of my speech is attached to this report.

Visit to Garden and Greenery Exposition, Osaka.

The International Garden and Greenery Exposition Expo 90 is being held in Osaka from April 1 to September 30 and is expected to attract 20 million visitors.

I was present in Osaka for the highlight of our State's participation in Expo 90—Queensland's special day on June 13 during the week of Queensland's major display in the showpiece Osaka prefecture pavilion.

Only three non-national foreign Governments have been granted the honour of a special day to mark their participation in the expo Queensland, Ontario and Hawaii.

Queensland has installed a 100 square metre nursery exhibit in the main indoor exhibition hall for the full six months of the exposition. The Queensland exhibit has won a number of awards, while the nursery that prepared the plants for the exhibit has received an order for plant material for export to Japan. Although only a small order, it is the first export than can be directly attributed to Queensland's participation in Expo 90, and provides the first step in opening a potentially very valuable new export market.

I want to especially mention the outstanding success of the Queensland youth choir which gave much-acclaimed performances at the Osaka Expo on Queensland's special day and throughout the week of Queensland's major pavilion display.

The special day ceremony also celebrated Queensland's friendship agreement with the Osaka prefecture.

Since it was signed in 1988 a range of cultural, youth and business exchanges have taken place under this agreement.

In Osaka I reaffirmed Queensland's commitment to the friendship agreement and assured the Osaka prefectural Government of Queensland's continuing efforts to expand business and commercial exchanges as well as cultural and youth exchanges.

These expanded links will result in increased economic activity involving our two regions. Already, about half the Queensland production of cotton is sold to mills in the Osaka region, while 20 per cent of Japanese tourists who visit Australia come from the Kinki region of which Osaka is the centre.

I wish to record the gratitude of the Queensland Government for Osaka prefecture's assistance in establishing the Queensland display at Expo 90 and also express my appreciation for the generous hospitality extended by the prefectural Government during my visit to Osaka and the garden and greenery expo.

Korean trip meeting notes:

Lucky Goldstar International corporation.

The Lucky Goldstar group is one of Korea's major general trading companies. It is greatly diversified with interests in plastics, chemicals, electronics, cement manufacture and clothing. Its exports in 1988 totalled \$US3 billion. It holds a 5 per cent equity in the Ensham coal mine project.

Meeting with Mr J. A. Chung, Executive Vice-President.

Lucky Goldstar emphasised its desire to see the ensham coal mine developed. The Korean Government wanted to establish coal imports for the country's publicly owned power stations on a long-term basis. I stated the Queensland Government's position of wanting to see the project commence. There was general discussion of the need for good faith to be shown by the Ensham partners, despite the prospect of legal action.

Korea Electric Power corporation. (Kepco)

The Government-owned Kepco is the major supplier of and distributor of electric power in Korea. Installed capacity operated by Kepco will increase from 19,000 MW in 1987 to 25,589 MW by 1996. The South Korean Government has confirmed its intention to build a series of new coal-fired stations in the early 1990's. All coal needed for the new power stations will be imported.

Meeting with Mr. B.H. Ahn, president.

Electricity demand in Korea is expected to increase at the rate of 15 per cent a year over coming years. The increased power generation will be met equally by additional coal-fired and nuclear power stations. Kepco advised that it would be looking to expand existing coal imports from Queensland. Kepco would deal either directly with Queensland coal exporters or through a general trading company. The Korean Government was becoming more stringent about environmental standards to be observed by the power generation industry. I advised kepcos of Queensland's initiative in conjunction with the CSIRO to establish a centre for advanced

technologies associated with the mineral resources sector and raised the possibility of information and technology exchanges with Korea in this area.

Pohang Iron and Steel Company. (Posco)

Posco is Korea's major steel producer, with production capacity now reaching 10 million tonnes a year. The company is a major importer of Australia coal.

Meeting with Y. S.Han, President.

Coal imports by Posco are expected to total 3 million tonnes this year, with 60 per cent of these from Queensland. The company's expansion plans are likely to increase these imports by a further 2 million tonnes with Queensland providing an additional 500,000 tonnes. Special steel presently accounts for 10 per cent of Posco production and is likely to increase in coming years in terms of volume although its market there is likely to remain broadly the same as overall steel production increases further. Posco advised that it would be investing substantially in new technology in order to ensure stable growth.

Throughout my trip to Japan I was very capably supported by the Queensland Government Commissioner in Japan, Mr John Kenny, whom I wish to thank for his advice, assistance and efforts in making the visit a success. Similarly I wish to thank Mr Hiroshi Onji, director of marketing with the Queensland Government office in Tokyo, Miss Takeko Kaneyasu, executive secretary, and other staff of the Queensland Government office particularly for their efforts in helping to organise the reception in Tokyo hosted by the Queensland Government, as well as other detailed arrangements, which contributed to the successful outcome of my visit.

In Seoul I was fortunate to have the assistance of the Australian Ambassador, Mr Darren Gribble, in particular for his hosting a lunch at which I was able to meet and hold informal yet valuable discussions with senior executives of the Korean chamber of commerce, the Samsung Corporation, the Hyundai Corporation and the Lucky Goldstar Corporation.

I also thank the staff from my Department of Premier, Economic and Trade Development, in particular the office of international business for their work in organising details of the trip and preparing necessary briefing material.

Speech notes

Mr Wayne Goss

"Investing in Queensland, Australia" Seminar

Tokyo—Tuesday, 12th June, 1990

My Government has a fundamental policy objective of encouraging economic growth in the State of Queensland. In this respect, it is essential that we broaden the economic base and add value to our raw materials that we produce. Our policies will ensure that Queensland is at the forefront of Australia's national economic activity. This is the essential objective of my Government.

In doing this, we recognise the important role of foreign investment and of the private sector in the generation of economic activity and employment.

The Government by itself cannot provide for this economic growth although of course it will provide the foundations which are necessary for that growth to take place. However, without strong foreign investment and innovative and enthusiastic private sector contributions, economic growth cannot be achieved.

In this context, I wish to assure you of my Government's intention to welcome investment from Japanese companies which are willing to help us in Queensland develop our economy.

We will continue to welcome mutually beneficial foreign investment into all areas of the Queensland economy. We will not be discriminatory in the application of our policy.

My Government recognises the importance and the depth of the relationship between Japan and Queensland. That relationship is based on the democratic traditions and practices which both Japan and Australia cherish, our mutual economic, trading and investment relationships, our increasingly close cultural ties and the social inter-relationship between our two peoples.

Let me say by way of affirming the importance we place on the relationship that, in the six months since my Government was elected, four of my Ministers have visited Japan before me. These cover areas which contribute great strength to the relationship: finance, tourism, resource industries and agricultural industries.

In relation to the administration of foreign investment policy, the Queensland Government will work closely and co-operatively with the Australian Federal Government.

Like the Federal Government's foreign investment policies we encourage foreign investment on a non-discriminatory basis where there is benefit for Australia.

To this end, we have established a foreign investment secretariat within the Treasury Department.

The primary function of the secretariat will be to liaise with the Federal Government's Foreign Investment Review Board on investment proposals and policies. The secretariat will focus on the socio-economic impact of specific new investment proposals referred to it by the Foreign Investment Review Board.

Queensland economic outlook

The Queensland economy has performed strongly over the past few years, restoring the pace of economic development achieved during the early 1980's.

Major factors associated with strong economic growth, in our State have been:

- high rates of population growth, particularly due to interstate migration which is currently running at record levels;
- strong growth in our tourism industry, both in the international and domestic sectors of the market;
- the resurgence in commodity prices following the collapse of the mid-1980's and, in particular, the more recent improvement in the world coal market; and
- strong domestic demand.

Over the past 12 months to date, Queensland has continued to experience levels of economic activity above the national average, as evidenced by partial indicators such as employment growth, building activity, retail turnover, new motor vehicle registrations and export growth.

In the short-term economic activity at the State level is expected to slow during 1990-91, in line with the national trend. However, as an export-oriented economy likely to benefit from the resilience of commodity prices and continued buoyant world trade volumes, the downturn is likely to be less severe in Queensland than in the rest of Australia.

Treasury forecasts suggest that Queensland's gross State product (GSP), will grow in real terms by 1.6 per cent in the 1990-91 financial year, marginally above the forecast growth in Australia's gross domestic product.

Projections for the medium-term by the National Institute of Economic and Industry Research (NEIR) for the period to 1993-94, suggest that Queensland's economy will grow as fast as the Australian economy over the forecast period but experience above average growth over the next three years.

Strong consumption growth flowing from continued high levels of population growth and expansion of the tourism industry, above average levels of business investment, as well as continued growth in exports, are expected to underpin economic growth during the forecast period.

Economic management strategy

I began by stating my Government's commitment to economic development of the State. Let me specify for you the areas in which we will be concentrating our efforts in implementing that commitment:

firstly, processing of minerals and primary products

- secondly, diversifying manufacturing and service industries
- developing and promoting tourism
- enhancing trade performance

we see a major role for Japan, our major economic partner, in all those areas. Let me continue:

- fostering a more co-operative industrial relations environment;
- increasing capital resources by expanding the State's financial infrastructure;
- revitalising the public sector;
- expanding job training and skills development; and

- creating a genuine market environment for business where competition is encouraged and enterprise rewarded.

Let me emphasise particularly that last point. I have stated to my audiences at home, my Government does not regard profit as a dirty word. I am happy to confirm that again to you here.

Let me also emphasise to you that fiscal responsibility was a strong plank in the platform on which my Government was elected. We are a Government totally committed to fiscal responsibility in the same way we are committed to balanced economic growth and development to secure the long-term future of Queensland.

Opportunity

some of our needs in Queensland are obvious: technology, capital, more developed marketing skills. Let me now indicate what we have, what we can bring to a co-operative production venture.

Queensland has a land area of 1.7 million square kilometres, four-and-a-half times the size of Japan. This huge area, combined with abundant natural resources, gives the State the capacity to absorb the rapid population growth while maintaining a high standard of living.

And the population is growing rapidly. In the past year the State's population increased by twice the national average of 1.67 per cent. Over the next 10 years it is expected to increase from its present level of 2.8 million to 4 million.

This all adds up to opportunity for Queensland and Japan as economic partners on the western Pacific rim, poised to participate in that region's expanding international market opportunities for the next century.

We offer the investor political stability, a growing and adaptable population combined with an on-going program of structural change in the Australian economy and positive approach to foreign investment to make Queensland an attractive location for business.

Queensland's infrastructure includes a Statewide electricity grid and extensive reserves of oil, natural gas and coal, which ensure that industry has a reliable, stable, price-competitive and easily accessible energy supply. Transportation includes 14 deep water ports, many of which are equipped with bulk handling facilities; a railway network encompassing over 10,000 kilometres of track; 168,000 kilometres of roads which are being substantially upgraded; and, three international airports.

In addition, we offer a quality of life to which many countries aspire but cannot seriously expect until the next century when problems of overcrowding and pollution are resolved.

Right now we can offer the clean air, in a sub-tropical to tropical climate, abundant natural resources and natural attractions including the great barrier reef and its islands, 7400 kilometres of coastline with some of the world's best beaches, rainforests, large wilderness areas, mountain panoramas, national parks, and the vast open spaces of the outback.

The other speakers today will deal with the more detailed business factors which would influence you in considering investment in Queensland. I have sought to give you the broader reasons for doing so.

I would stress our natural complementarity: our resources can supply your industry; your marketing skills and capital can help us diversify. We can satisfy your aspirations for lifestyle and economic growth, you can satisfy our aspirations for development capital and expertise.

I invite you to share with us in developing Queensland's future.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

Opposition Leader's List of Increased Fees and Charges

Hon. K. E. De LACY (Cairns—Treasurer and Minister for Regional Development) (10.40 a.m.), by leave: Recently, the Leader of the Opposition released a document which he said showed that this Government had broken one of its election promises, namely, that it would not increase fees and charges above CPI. I have now had a chance to examine the document in detail and have reached one conclusion—that if this is the best the Opposition can do, we will be on this side of the House for a long time to come.

The Leader of the Opposition released a list of 572 fees and charges which he claimed had been increased above the CPI. In fact, most of the charges on his list were below the CPI, some of his claims were just plain wrong, and he engaged in a very selective listing of others. In other words, the Leader of the Opposition did not let the facts spoil a good story.

It is not my intention to take up the time of this House by responding in detail to the claims of the Leader of the Opposition. I therefore seek leave to table a detailed analysis of his claims.

Leave granted.

Whereupon the honourable member laid the document on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr LINGARD (Fassifern) (10.44 a.m.), by leave: In January this year, it was approved by the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association that I meet with the president of the CPA in London to have detailed discussions about the role of the CPA. I was also invited by the Speaker of the House of Commons to have detailed discussions with the Speaker and then join other visiting members of Parliament to have meetings about all aspects of the Westminster system.

At that time, I was president of the CPA in Queensland and retained that role until the election of the new Speaker. If honourable members look at the Queensland Constitution Act of 1959, they will see the special role that I played as Speaker until 24 February 1990.

Each year, Queensland sends a delegate to the annual CPA conference. One of the conditions is that the delegate travel to London to study the CPA and the British Parliament. In 1988, I went to Canberra as a delegate and, in 1989, I went to Barbados and, both times, I was unable to continue to London. In two terms as the Speaker of State Parliament, I was unable to accept invitations to attend seminars in London. Therefore, when this opportunity arose, I had discussions with the Clerk of the Parliament regarding CPA funding. People must understand the role that the Clerk of the Parliament plays in the interim period between an election and the reconvening of the Parliament. The Clerk of the Parliament plays a very special role in the CPA and is in fact in charge of the Parliamentary Service Commission until the Parliament reconvenes. He advised that, as long as approval for the tour was obtained from the Premier, the CPA would fund the costs of travel to London.

As I had only two days to organise this approval, I organised an urgent meeting with the Premier and had several discussions with his private secretary. On Tuesday, 23 January, the Premier's office gave verbal approval for me to travel to the CPA in London on 24 January. I emphasise "verbal approval" and point out that it related not just to me but also to other members of my staff. This was conveyed to Parliament. This approval was required for CPA funding, and tickets were then provided to me through the Clerk of the Parliament. It was also agreed that the Premier would support the conversion of daily allowance entitlements to daily overseas allowance entitlements. However, it was stated that Cabinet had to finally approve this request and that the Premier could not guarantee Cabinet approval.

I asked for written confirmation of these matters and received a letter from the Premier's office which stated—

"Dear Mr Lingard,

The Premier has approved your request to travel to the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association Secretariat in London on the basis of conversion of daily allowance entitlements."

I will table that letter with my report. I therefore travelled to London on 24 January, on the understanding that tickets had been provided by the CPA and that any costs I incurred on the tour would have to be paid by me and then claimed as a daily allowance.

I have already presented a report of the tour to the Clerk of the Parliament, and I will table that report. In summary, my report outlines the parliamentary business and other travel in which I participated. I had extensive discussions with the CPA in London, the Speaker of the Parliament, the Clerk of the Parliament and most officials of the British Parliament. I had discussions with other parliamentarians from the Liberal Party in Australia and with officials from Queensland House, Australia House and other State Houses. I travelled to Belfast at my own cost and had many discussions regarding difficulties in that country. I travelled by car to Paris, Rome and Athens in lieu of travelling by air, and then travelled to Singapore where I was a guest of the Speaker of Parliament in Singapore. I had discussions with parliamentarians in Singapore and studied many aspects of the Singapore Parliament.

I discussed this tour with several Cabinet Ministers before I left. There was never any secrecy and there was never any opposition or criticism at that time. The tickets were provided to me, and the CPA allocated funds for this cost. The funds are still just sitting there and will probably go back into consolidated revenue. Those funds were allocated by the CPA to cover the costs of my trip.

The Commonwealth Parliamentary Association is a non-party association. Each year, it is given a financial allocation to allow parliamentarians of the Commonwealth to attend similar seminars. I have paid all other costs. I have provided details to the Clerk of the Parliament and I have made an application for approval of daily allowances to cover these costs.

I have now received a letter from Cabinet and, I suppose, from the Solicitor-General that gives approval for daily allowances to be paid. Cabinet has agreed to it and has given approval for daily allowances, but it still will not approve payment of the costs of my trip. The Parliamentary Service Commission has been told to pay the costs of my trip. I show honourable members the letter I received this morning, stating that the Parliamentary Service Commission—a body of which the Clerk of the Parliament was in charge in January and which made the original decision—will have the matter remitted to it. The Parliamentary Service Commission is being told to pay the costs of the trip and then see if the costs can be recovered.

The situation in which I find myself is exactly the same as the situation any honourable member is in when he or she travels on parliamentary business throughout Australia, pays the costs and then claims daily allowances upon return. Because all the newspapers carry reports of legal action and court cases, the Premier has been forced to go soft on this issue. Quite obviously, he has been advised that Lingard is right, legally; but, politically, Cabinet will not agree to the decision and will exercise its political will by handing the matter back to the Parliamentary Service Commission. Cabinet wants to get rid of the matter and does not want to take any action. It wants to hand the matter back to the Parliamentary Service Commission to see what can be done.

This morning I received a letter approving all my daily allowances. This letter states that the Parliamentary Service Commission will pay the costs and will see whether or not it can get the money back. It is disgraceful.

Whereupon the honourable member laid the documents on the table.

QUESTIONS UPON NOTICE

1. Tertiary Entrance Score Review

Mr QUINN asked the Minister for Education—

"With reference to the public submissions on the proposals contained in the Viviani Report on tertiary entrance—

(1) How many submissions were received?

(2) What percentage of these expressed concern at the subject weightings and field positions?

(3) What changes does he propose to make to this controversial section of the student profile to overcome these expressed concerns?"

Mr BRADY: (1) Nine hundred and sixty-two submissions were received from a wide range of individuals, schools, parents' organisations, universities and other education bodies throughout Queensland. It is disappointing to have to report to the House that the member for South Coast did not even bother to lodge a formal submission on the Viviani report. Nearly 1 000 people from all over Queensland took the time and trouble to try to get the best system possible, and most of them entered into the process in a constructive spirit. However, the member for South Coast did not think that that was the way to go. Instead, he wrote to secondary school principals, whingeing about the system. Indeed, the only submission that came from any part of the Liberal Party came from the Young Liberals.

The member for South Coast seems intent on making this a points-scoring exercise instead of trying to refine a system that has already received substantial public support. The Liberal Party's policy on higher education has been devised solely for Opposition. It takes into account only what will happen in the next two years. Its policy of open-door admission to universities would have a disastrous effect on academic standards at universities—not to mention the effect on the State's Budget. Members of the Liberal Party are obsessed with quantity at the expense of quality.

(2) Without quantifying the exact proportion, a substantial number of the submissions dealt with the issue of subject weighting and field positions.

(3) As I indicated publicly yesterday, the Government has responded swiftly to the views of the community and has moved to change the field position structure to accommodate the concerns expressed. Specifically, an additional field has been created to cater for students in the creative arts and practical skills area, and changes have been made to Field B in the Viviani report to substantially improve the position of foreign language studies in tertiary selection.

As honourable members would be aware, the Goss Government places a high priority on the expansion of Asian and other language studies in our schools. After receiving numerous submissions on this issue, the Government has responded positively to ensure that students are encouraged to study foreign languages at senior secondary level. By amending the fields to take into account the broad range of opinions expressed in the public's submissions, the Government has acted in a true sense of genuine consultation and has ensured that, unlike the TE score, the new tertiary entrance system will have the confidence of the parents, teachers and students in this State.

Furthermore, yesterday, Cabinet agreed to the establishment of the Tertiary Entrance Procedures Authority, a new statutory authority to monitor and review the tertiary entrance system and to assist in forging better links between school and universities. The people of Queensland will at last have a body through which all interested groups in tertiary selection can properly communicate. I assure members of the House that the question of field positions will be among the first priorities on TEPA's agenda as it begins its program of long overdue reform.

2.

Student Education Profile

Mr QUINN asked the Minister for Education—

"With reference to the massive press and radio advertising campaign supporting the Government's education initiatives in connection with the new student profile for Year 12 students—

(1) What is the cost of this campaign to the Queensland taxpayer?

(2) Why was it necessary when all students and parents were informed of the proposals through their schools?

(3) What is the difference between this advertising campaign and those of the previous Government which the ALP so strongly criticised?"

Mr BRADY: (1) The cost of the public information campaign following the release of the Viviani report was approximately \$197,000, including production and placement of advertisements. Given that, yesterday, Cabinet made a final decision on the implementation of the new tertiary entrance system, some further public information material will be produced in the near future.

(2) As honourable members know, one of the greatest problems with the TE score was that a significant number of parents, teachers and students no longer had confidence that it was the fairest way to select students for higher education. Although the Government went to great lengths to ensure that all parents, students and teachers were provided with relevant information following the release of the Viviani report, it was felt that the public should be given every possible encouragement to have input into the new system.

It was therefore necessary to indicate clearly where the report was available and where to lodge public submissions so that each member of the community was given a chance to comment. Radio and newspaper advertisements are clearly the best way to reach this mass audience. I am pleased to report to the House that the advertisements had an enormous impact, with over 900 public submissions being received from areas all over the State.

In addition, the National Party has publicly acknowledged the need for a public information campaign. In the *Border Post* of 3 July, the Opposition Education spokesman, the member for Condamine, was mentioned in an article, which stated—

"Mr Littleproud said the State Government would have to embark on a major education campaign when the full report became available.

'A major problem with the TE score was simply its image,' Mr Littleproud said."

Through the advertising campaign, more Queenslanders were encouraged to obtain a copy of the report and gain a better understanding of the proposed system, unlike the member for South Coast, to whom I paid a special courtesy by arranging a private briefing with Professor Viviani on the day the report was released. I am quite sure that the campaign, therefore, raised the level of awareness of the tertiary entrance problem in Queensland and, in doing so, helped to lift the quality of public debate above the level set by the member for South Coast.

(3) There are a number of significant differences between this public information campaign and the overtly political advertising of the previous National Party Government. Firstly, unlike the taxpayer-funded propaganda of the National Party, there is no photograph of me or any other Cabinet Minister in any of the material relating to the tertiary entrance review. Further, unlike previous years, there will be no opportunity for a special appearance on the *Queensland 2000* television program, because that blatant misuse of taxpayers' funds was axed as soon as the Goss Government was elected.

In addition, as we have recently had the RNA show in Brisbane, it is worth noting that for the first time in years there were no photographs of any State Cabinet Ministers at any of the Queensland Government displays at the Exhibition.

Clearly, the public information campaign undertaken following the release of the Viviani report bears no resemblance to the sort of political gamesmanship displayed under the previous Government. The main emphasis of the advertising campaign has been to indicate where relevant information is available and to encourage members of the community to have their say on the new system.

By allowing such direct input, the Government is attempting to ensure that, unlike the TE score, the Queensland public will have confidence in the new method of selecting students for university study.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

Mr COOPER having given notice of a question—

Mr COOPER: I table the document to which I have referred.

Whereupon the honourable member laid the document on the table.

Transport Department's One-stop Shops

Mr PREST: I ask the Minister for Transport: is there any feedback on the public response to the Department of Transport's first one-stop shop that he opened at Tewantin in May?

Mr HAMILL: There has been very favourable public comment on the establishment of one-stop shops. The one-stop shop at Tewantin was the first of a number of such shops to be established. The second shop was established at Redcliffe. The department has a program to establish one-stop shops throughout the State to provide better customer services.

Given the shortness of the time available, I would be happy to provide the member for Port Curtis with a detailed account of the initiative that the Government has undertaken in this area. But the important point is that, with the amalgamation of the various divisions within the Department of Transport, the people of this State can now register their vehicle and their boat and also obtain a driver's licence at the same place. As the other regional offices of the Department of Transport come on line, that facility will be available for the benefit of people throughout the State of Queensland.

It is well known that the Queensland Government has a commitment to decentralisation. That can be seen to no better advantage than in the decentralised operation that is now taking place within the Department of Transport and its regional offices.

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

MATTERS OF PUBLIC INTEREST**Alleged Breaking of Election Promises by Premier**

Mr COOPER (Roma—Leader of the Opposition) (11 a.m.): Interestingly, earlier this morning the Treasurer made an announcement and tabled a document regarding taxes and charges—the document that I released last week and intend to table today. It will be very interesting to see just how the Treasurer manages to explain the 572 taxes and charges that have risen above the CPI. Approximately 412 of those have risen above the Australian inflation rate.

First of all, I want to read to the House a few lines from a certain speech made some months ago. It was a speech by which many Queenslanders set a lot of store. This speech is being proved more and more and day by day to have been a massive confidence trick on the people of this State. I refer to the now Premier's election campaign speech, in which he said—

"Extravagant promises and outrageous proposals are from the past.

Remember, when you hear politicians making wild promises at election time there are two alternatives.

Either the promises will be broken or State taxes and charges will have to be increased to pay for them.

Under my Government there will be no new taxes, and that means no fuel tax. It means no death duties. It means no new taxes."

He also said—

"Increases in all existing taxes and charges will be held at or below the inflation rate."

Mr Elliott: Does he mean the registration of trucks and that sort of thing, do you think?

Mr COOPER: They are included in the figure of 572.

The document that I am about to table shows very clearly that the very explicit promise in the Premier's speech that there would be no increases in charges above the inflation rate lies—I guess that is the operative word—in absolute ruin. It was not worth the paper that it was written on. It was an absolute con. It has been broken not once, not twice, not even 100 times but on 572 occasions since 2 December.

I seek leave to table that list of 572 charges increased by the Goss Labor Government above the inflation rate since 2 December.

Leave granted.

Whereupon the honourable member laid the document on the table.

Mr COOPER: The methodology behind the compilation of that list was very simple and makes it totally irrefutable, whatever the Premier and the Treasurer might like to say. The increases in charges were gazetted by the National Party Government last year. Further increases in those charges have been gazetted by the Labor Government this year. That is normal procedure. The increases in the charges can be obtained from the *Government Gazette*.

The difference between the two, in percentage terms, is what constitutes the document that I have just tabled. It is very simple and it is very accurate. For the purposes of the exercise, we established the inflation rate for the 1989-1990 financial year at 6.6 per cent. That was the inflation rate for Queensland, based on the all-prices Brisbane consumer price index. We thought that that was a very reasonable way of arriving at what we considered was the appropriate benchmark for these increases, that is, the Queensland inflation rate. The Treasurer, of course, took exception to that course. He thought that if he nominated the Australian inflation rate, which came in a bit higher, he might be let off the hook and he might be exonerated from blame for increasing all these taxes and charges. It is amazing how Labor Treasurers continually seek to escape the responsibility for their actions.

When a new set of figures on the trade balance comes out showing that this country is steadily heading towards banana republicanism, Keating urges everybody to wait. For years now we have been listening to him saying that the next set of figures will show that the Government is on the right track, that the turn-around is just around the corner or just around the next J-curve. It is always the next set of figures that will do the trick. We have been waiting and waiting. After years of listening to Keating, everybody knows that what he says is a lot of rot. The same obviously applies to the Queensland Treasurer. If the Queensland inflation rate is not the appropriate guide for Queensland charges, then I do not know what is.

Even if we let the Queensland Treasurer have the Australian inflation rate and give him 7.7 per cent and not 6.6 per cent as the benchmark for his increases, and we have another look at the figures in that light, what do we find? The figure of 572 increased taxes and charges shrinks. Maybe he can be given credit for being on to something because the figure shrinks to a mere 415. That is still an increase in 415 taxes and charges over and above the Australian inflation rate. Of course, we were told that there would be no increases in taxes and charges above the inflation rate. That is 415 that have been increased above the Australian inflation rate and 572 that have been increased above the Queensland inflation rate.

The Goss Labor Government has broken its promise to the people of Queensland that it would not increase taxes and charges above the rate of inflation, that is, the Australian inflation rate. It has happened just 415 times since 2 December! There is no way that the Treasurer can be exonerated. Obviously, the Government has been caught out completely. According to its own information, the Government has not increased 572 taxes and charges. The Opposition is saying that it has, and has proved it.

When I heard the Treasurer ducking and weaving over inflation rates, I felt a keen sense of déjà vu, and little wonder. It was shades of his 180 million dollar underlying Budget deficit in the State of Queensland, when there was the great press conference and the great expose. All of a sudden that turned into a \$4m surplus when little Cinderella trotted off to Canberra to do business with Hawke and Keating. Before that, of course, the Treasurer talked about Queensland's so-called massive State debt, which was a crippling burden on every man, woman and child in the State. Again, when the Treasurer went to Canberra, it was found that Queensland had the lowest per capita debt of any State. Queensland was the lowest-tax State and the State with the lowest per capita debt. The Opposition is glad that it is recognised that the National Party left the Queensland economy in very, very sound shape.

There is no mystery about the list of charges that I have just tabled—572 of them have been increased, or 415 if we use the Australian inflation rate. In the last week or so, we have heard all sorts of mumbo jumbo from the Treasurer about these various taxes and charges as he has tried to duck for cover. I believe that the people of Queensland are smart enough not to fall for that. They know full well that these taxes and charges have risen by the amount that I have said. One example is the increase in ambulance registration charges, which are up 250 per cent. Farm vehicle registrations have risen 750 per cent. Hoteliers will pay 116 per cent more in fees to obtain approval for major renovations to their hotels. That is certainly well above the inflation rate of either 6.6 per cent or 7.7 per cent. All of these promises have been broken.

One of the central platforms on which this Government came to power has been broken. During his campaign speech prior to the last election, Mr Goss said—

"Remember, when you hear politicians making wild promises at election-time there are two alternatives. Either the promises will be broken or State taxes and charges will have to be increased to pay for them."

Mr Goss said that there would be no new taxes and charges. Queensland already has a new tax, namely, the Footy TAB tax.

Mr Gibbs: You supported it.

Mr COOPER: We did not support the tax.

Mr Gibbs: You voted for the Bill, and it was clearly outlined in my notes to the House.

Mr COOPER: That was a totally different matter.

This Government said that it would not introduce new taxes. However, it has introduced the Footy TAB tax. As well, taxes will be introduced on poker machines. Even though Cain and Bannon would not have a bar of poker machines, this Government still wants to introduce them and slam a 10 per cent tax on hotels and a 5 per cent tax on clubs. This Government has broken its fundamental promise.

The Treasurer has tried to dodge the issue of new taxes and charges. His mumbo jumbo and his handling of the issue last week demonstrated quite clearly that he has no control over his portfolio or increases in taxes and charges. In fact, he did not know that they had increased until I told him so and referred him to the *Government Gazette*. The Treasurer has proved that he is an absolute failure, and this Government has done nothing but break promises.

Time expired.

Opposition Leader's Criticism of Government Performance

Mr HAYWARD (Caboolture) (11.10 a.m.): It is not often that a member of this House gets such a quick opportunity to debunk an argument. During the past few weeks, the Leader of the Opposition has been trying to whip up a story about this Government's performance in relation to taxes, fees and charges. Today, Mr Cooper claimed falsely

that this Government has broken one of its election promises, namely, that no fees and charges would be increased above the CPI.

During Mr Cooper's speech in this debate, when he was being done over by Mr Gibbs, he mentioned only two fees and charges. Mr Cooper is wrong, and an analysis of his claims proves that he is wrong.

A few weeks ago, Mr Cooper released a list of 572 fees and charges that he claimed showed increases above the CPI. Much of his argument this morning was based on semantics about the rate of inflation. The Opposition Leader's claims were based on the June to June Brisbane CPI figure of 6.6 per cent, which was released by the Australian Bureau of Statistics on 1 August 1990.

Obviously, Mr Cooper does not know that the fees he has compared were set on CPI figures that were available at the time that increases were scheduled. Mr Cooper spoke about the national inflation rate. However, he has completely missed the point.

Mr Stephan interjected.

Mr HAYWARD: Mr Stephan is still in the Chamber, but at least Mr Borbidge had the sense to leave after five minutes of Mr Cooper's diatribe.

It should be understood that the majority of increases have been based on the March to March Brisbane CPI figures of 7.8 per cent. If Mr Cooper and his researchers had done their work properly, they would know that. Even the more widely used national CPI figure for the very same March to March period was 8.6 per cent. As such, the bulk of Mr Cooper's list of fees and charges relates to increases of less than 8 per cent, which is less than the CPI figure.

Because a number of possible reasons exist for some of the selected increases that appear to be above the CPI, it is important that I mention some of them. Mr Cooper did not acknowledge the well-known factors but chose to publish a misleading and inaccurate list.

Mr Stephan: Are you in favour of those charges going up the way they have been?

Mr HAYWARD: Yes. The National Party is letting down its rural constituents by making inaccurate statements.

The first factor that should be acknowledged by Mr Cooper is the effect of rounding increases up to a convenient sum, which is usually in whole dollars. Mr Cooper has distorted figures and created an increase in the CPI figure. Rounding increases up to a convenient sum can marginally alter the percentage increases for individual items.

Mr FitzGerald: Why didn't the Premier say this in his campaign? He made the promise.

Mr HAYWARD: I ask the honourable member to listen to what I have to say.

Whereas that rounding-off was also the normal practice of the previous Government, Mr Cooper did not show fee increases in which the rounding off had been down to a convenient sum and the effective increases were below the CPI. Mr Cooper is not fair dinkum.

Mr FitzGerald: We are looking at the ones that go up. That is what the debate is about.

Mr HAYWARD: Exactly. However, the previous Government always rounded increases up to a convenient sum.

The second important factor is the effect of the State Government's rationalisation of categories of fees and charges in which average increases across a range of similar fees and charges have increased by well below the CPI. For example, from the 306 fees that were actually gazetted, Mr Cooper selected only 82 fees charged by the Justice Department. The average increase for the fees under the Justice Department was less

than 7 per cent. However, no mention was made of that by any member of the Opposition. It must be acknowledged that the new Government inherited what can only be described as a disaster in the entire system of fees and charges that are levied by the public sector.

After years of neglect the system is all over the shop—it is a mess—and this Government has started the big job of tidying it up. That is something that the Liberals and the Nationals never attempted.

Thirdly, Mr Cooper did not acknowledge areas in which increases had not been made for several years. He was conveniently silent on that. In fact, he did not talk about much this morning.

Mr FitzGerald: Read the promise.

Mr HAYWARD: The honourable member should listen.

For example, 10 of the items on Mr Cooper's list related to various housing application fees that had not been increased since August 1987.

Mr FitzGerald: Read the promise.

Mr HAYWARD: The honourable member should listen.

A case in point that illustrates what I am saying is the recent rise, from \$1.50 to \$2, in the toll on the Gateway Bridge in Brisbane. That is detailed. The fact is that the toll had not risen since the bridge was opened. It did not matter that the State was disappearing into debt on the bridge; that was irrelevant. Why had the toll not been increased last year? It had not been increased because the National Party Government did not have the guts to increase it in an election year. Now the National Party is in Opposition. That is the situation that this Government inherited.

The increase in the toll was in line with the rate of inflation over the years since the toll was set. But the Leader of the Opposition has referred to it as being more than the rate of inflation. That is ridiculous. That is the sort of detail that Mr Cooper chose to ignore when he compiled his list.

Worse than that, he has engaged in misleading propaganda by claiming that the rationalisation of concessions in areas such as registration fees for rural heavy vehicles represented fee increases. The Leader of the Opposition wanted to play to his supposed rural constituency. This is one aspect that Mr Cooper should steer clear of if he wants to retain some shred of credibility. As I said, as soon as the issue was raised, Mr Borbidge went straight out the door.

The facts are that, under previous Governments, the entire system of rural heavy vehicle concessions had not been examined in detail for more than 30 years. That is an absolute disgrace. It has to be understood—and this has not been mentioned—that that is despite the fact that the original reason for introducing the concessions was to offset the effects of road tax, which vanished in 1979. That was not explained by Mr Cooper. Even following the rationalisation undertaken by this Government, eligible producers still receive a 75 per cent concession on their registration fees. That was not explained.

The Leader of the Opposition referred to Footy TAB.

Mr Cooper: We will send your speech around your electorate. The people will love it.

Mr HAYWARD: The honourable member can send it wherever he likes.

The Leader of the Opposition has twisted the truth. In his public statements, he claimed that the turnover tax on Footy TAB somehow represents a breach of the "no new taxes" commitment. He has not acknowledged that Footy TAB is a new service; he has ignored it. Naturally, it attracts an appropriate return to the public purse. But the Leader of the Opposition got it wrong. In his document, he said that it was to be a tax of 10 per cent. He said that the tax would be 10 per cent in clubs and 5 per cent

in hotels. He got it wrong, because it will be only 3 per cent. He could not even get the figure right. Yet he supported the Bill.

I thought that Mr Cooper at least, even though other members of his party are equally responsible, would have got his facts straight before he opened his mouth. But it gets worse, if that is possible. Honourable members opposite should not be surprised. He ignored the fact that in some cases charges and fees are specifically linked to the cost of providing services or improvements in services. Let me return to the aspect of the rural constituency again.

The feedlot inspection fees that are included in Mr Cooper's list are scheduled to progressively move to full cost recovery over the next three years. That was a process instituted by his Government. In fact, what has happened now under the Goss Government is that, for some feedlots, the fee structure adopted by the Government will be lower than that proposed by the previous Government. Why does he not tell that to his rural constituency?

Let us have a look at where the Opposition Leader—or his researchers—got it wrong again. Three of the increases in fees and charges under motor vehicle regulations that he cited were way off beam. He claimed that the fee for the initial registration had risen 13.5 per cent, when the actual increase is only 5 per cent. He claimed a renewal of registration had risen 13.3 per cent. In fact, the actual rise is 6.25 per cent. The Leader of the Opposition got it wrong.

He claimed that a search and extract from the register of recreation vehicles had increased 50 per cent. The actual rise was 12.5 per cent. He cited seven cases of increases of 9.1 per cent under the marine regulations. The actual increase was only 7.1 per cent. He and his researchers are wrong. He referred to an increase of 66.5 per cent under the motor vehicle securities regulations for copies of or extracts from filed documents. In fact, the relevant fee has not been increased at all from its previous level of \$5.

Mr Cooper's list of fee increases does not provide any evidence of a breach in the Labor Party's pledge on taxes and charges. Try as he might, he cannot find a breach of that pledge.

Student Education Profile

Mr QUINN (South Coast) (11.21 a.m.): Yesterday, this Government introduced a new tertiary entrance scheme for Year 12 students in Queensland. The scheme is based on the Viviani report, which was presented on 27 June this year.

The basic problem is that, on the surface, the scheme looks great. But once one delves into the details of the scheme, one finds a flawed report. The 962 submissions that have been given to the Minister, based on that report, indicated the concern amongst school principals and professional educators over the contents of the report and the implementation of the scheme as it stands.

As an example, today in his answer to a question from me, the Minister said—

"The Liberal Party policy of open-door admission to universities would have a disastrous effect on academic standards at universities, not to mention the State's Budget."

In the Viviani report, exactly the opposite is stated. That is typical of the misleading information campaign that has occurred over the report and the Liberal Party's stance on it. Page 28 of the report states—

"In favour of this 'common first year' option, there is little doubt that it would have important educational advantages in schools and in universities. Schools would be freer to develop students' talents, interests and skills and students would have more opportunity to develop a love of learning for its own sake, not simply to get a high TE score. Universities could have better motivated students and a better chance for students to make good course choices at the end of first year.

. . .

The trend towards increasing wider entry for general courses is well established and will be reinforced by population growth, high retention rates in schools, and by more places for general courses."

That is exactly what is happening in Queensland high schools at the present—there is a high population growth and a higher retention rate. Obviously, Queensland needs more places in tertiary institutions. It does not need another system that denies access by Year 12 students to tertiary education when they are qualified to undertake courses that are available. The Viviani report merely places Year 12 students in a game of musical chairs.

Some students who would have gained tertiary entrance under the old TE system will not make it under the new Viviani scheme. The Viviani report contains no progress; it simply changes the number of students who will reach the tertiary institutions.

The cost of implementing the Viviani report over the next two years will be about \$21m. In subsequent years, a further \$14m a year will be required. As a result of spending \$14m per year, Queensland will have an extra 2 000 places in its tertiary institutions. Approximately 5 000 Year 12 students at the moment cannot obtain a place at tertiary institutions in Queensland. The proposed expenditure of \$14m by this Government will enable 2 000 Year 12 students to attend university. That will be the end result. A different TE scoring system is not proposed. Putting the money into tertiary places in Queensland is the real answer to this problem. After all, if the Government puts students on this sort of merry-go-round, it will result in disaffection and parent unrest with this system. Queensland will then embark again on another course of reform of the TE scoring system in this State. It will be a non-stop merry-go-round.

Mr Schwarten: What sort of system do you advocate? Do you prefer the old external examinations?

Mr QUINN: No. I have outlined the major problems that the Liberal Party believes the Government should be addressing instead of simply embarking on reform for reform's sake.

If honourable members look at some of the other material issued by this Government, they will see that it is a going on a misinformation campaign. For instance, Mr Braddy, the Minister for Education, is quoted in the *Sunday Mail* as saying—

"Under the TE system, science and maths subjects were 'weighted' and students felt they had to stick to those subjects to get a top score."

Page 17 of the Viviani report—the Government's Bible—states—

"On balance, it should be said that if a single rank order like the TE score is to be used to assign places in university courses, the one we currently use in Queensland is about as fair as it can be made, given the information and method used in its construction."

Page 94 of the Viviani report, which refers to bias, states—

"There is widespread belief among students that good results in Maths and Science deliver a high TE score, which will improve chances of entering not only into those high demand courses, like Engineering and Medicine that have these subjects as prerequisites, but also other high demand courses such as Law, which do not."

The report further states—

"The question of whether doing well in Maths and Science does deliver a high TE score is contested by measurement experts."

In other words, it is simply not true. Under the old TE scoring system, there is no weighting of subjects. The performance of students is weighted, not the subjects themselves.

The article in the *Sunday Mail* continued—

"This is a failing of the old system which Prof Viviani has been careful not to repeat here."

That is a reference to the weighting of subjects. If one turns to the back of the Viviani report, one finds that 44 subjects studied by Year 12 students are weighted to the hilt. Yesterday, the Minister for Education included another field to make the weightings more complicated.

I have in my hand the list of weightings. It is not an old lottery ticket or an old bingo ticket; it is a list of weightings. The subjects are weighted, and from now on that is what will drive the TE scoring system in this State. Previously, students in Year 12 would choose the subjects that they could do best because they had an aptitude for those subjects. However, those students will now turn to these weightings, look at the numbers and select their subjects according to the weightings. This is what will drive the system. It will have a backwash effect that no-one wants in any high school system. The curriculum-makers will start adapting the curriculum to suit the TE scoring system so that the courses are made more attractive to students and to encourage them to study the courses. Queensland could well do without that backwash effect.

The terms of reference of the Viviani report state that the new TE system has to be fair, equitable and easily understood by parents, students and teachers. Some weeks ago in this House, even the Minister for Education could not answer a question about the method of calculating a field position. Unless one is an expert who has read the report thoroughly, there is no way in the world one can understand this system. To ask students and teachers to make subject choices based on the recommendations in the Viviani report is totally ludicrous. The fact that it is not easy to understand has been the basis of many of the complaints submitted to the Minister.

One further recommendation of the Viviani report states—

"(e) avoid the necessity to rescale school assessments using procedures reliant on group performance;"

Professor Viviani laid that recommendation to rest quite nicely, because she recognised that without scaling students across the State, comparability between students could not be achieved. She further stated—

"It is impossible to accede to the pressures that one student's results should not be compared with another's (that is, the group) . . ."

That refers to scaling in the group and across the State. Professor Viviani had the foresight to see that there was no way in which to compare students studying 44 different subjects through every high school in Queensland without some sort of comparability test, and that is where the ASAT test came in previously. Under this scheme, the ASAT test is replaced by what is called the core skills test, which is another beauty. This scheme will cost \$3m to implement. The test will have to be constructed, tested and marked in Queensland. What are the differences between the ASAT test and the core skills test? According to Mr Braddy, the Minister for Education, there is a mile of differences. Queensland students in Year 12 are completely different from other students in Australia and Queensland will test them differently. Professor Viviani says differently. The report gives this description of the ASAT test—

". . . it is designed to access a variety of higher-order thinking skills important to this level of schooling."

It describes the core skills test as—

". . . a reasonable sample of the higher-order thinking skills expected in an educated senior student."

Those comments are exactly the same. Referring to the details for the ASAT test, the report states—

" Comprehend (facts, literal meanings, inferences, casual and other relationships)."

The core skills test states—

- "• comprehend (facts, literal meanings, inferences causal and other relationships)".

The next criteria of the ASAT test states—

- "• Judge (make approximations. . .)".

It goes on and on, virtually word for word. The difference between those two tests is minimal and not worth the \$3m that was spent reviewing the system.

Time expired.

Working Conditions for Queensland Nurses

Hon. K. V. McELLIGOTT (Thuringowa—Minister for Health) (11.31 a.m.): Tonight, in Brisbane, representatives of public sector nurses will meet to consider progress over a log of claims lodged in April with the Government. Unfortunately, some misinformation has recently been spread about supposed lack of progress to date on the introduction of better working conditions for Queensland nurses. I take this opportunity to set the record straight.

The Government has a long-standing commitment to provide a proper career structure and professional pay rates for nurses in Queensland—a commitment never made by members of the Opposition. In other words, during the 32 years that Queensland had either a National Party Government or a National/Liberal coalition Government, no move was made towards establishing a proper career structure for Queensland nurses.

Since the QNU log of claims was served on the Government, negotiations on a new career structure have been proceeding rapidly. Some of the misinformation that has been touted with regard to this matter revolves around that very basic point. When I said publicly that negotiations had proceeded rapidly and agreements had been reached, a representative from the Queensland Nurses Union claimed, for one reason or another, that that was not true and that the agreements were only on a without-prejudice basis. It was necessary that the negotiations were held on a without-prejudice basis. Neither the Government nor the representatives of the Government can accept negotiations on any other basis without reference to the proper decision-making processes of the Government. Similarly, the Queensland Nurses Union cannot accept negotiations without reference to their members. Therefore, the negotiations must be held on a without-prejudice basis.

I have taken a personal interest in these negotiations, and I have been kept informed of their progress. Again, the representatives of the Queensland Nurses Union have introduced the old clichés about the Minister not being properly advised. I put it on the record that I have been kept informed. I have been part of the decision-making process in respect of the negotiating position of the Government. Representatives of both the Public Sector Management Commission and the Department of Employment, Training and Industrial Relations have been present at most, if not all, of those negotiations. It is simply not true to suggest that, somehow or other, the public servants employed by the Government are not negotiating in an appropriate manner.

Unfortunately, because the Queensland Nurses Union decided to first insist on an agreement for interim salary increases, those negotiations were temporarily stalled. I had received a deputation in my office when I received from the QNU delegates an urgent message that indicated that they would not proceed with the negotiations on the career structure on that day unless I gave an unequivocal assurance about an interim wage increase. Obviously, I was not in a position to do that. When that message was conveyed to them, the union negotiators left the meeting.

That happened despite the fact that the QNU was aware that negotiations had to continue under the arrangements for the structural efficiency principle decided by the

State Industrial Commission and in accordance with the development of salary standards by the Public Sector Management Commission. Whatever the outcome of the proposal by the QNU for an interim salary increase, the career structure for nurses must be finalised. In the long term, halting the process would only act to delay full implementation of the new structure.

I am therefore pleased to inform honourable members that negotiations resumed yesterday and, in a five-hour meeting with the QNU, the Hospital Employees Union and the Queensland State Service Union, substantial progress was made. I have been advised that negotiations on the design of the career structure are well advanced and that only a few issues remain to be resolved. The discussions have focused upon the need to retain nurses in clinical roles to ensure professional patient care in Queensland's hospitals and health facilities. The career structure will also provide opportunities for nurses to pursue careers in management and education.

A timetable for trialling and evaluating the career structure in a number of health facilities is being discussed to ensure that nurses can see the light at the end of the tunnel and that the final career structure is appropriate to meet the needs of both quality patient care and the reasonable career expectations of public sector nurses. Later today, negotiations will resume. I am confident that, given good faith by all parties, the issue can be resolved through normal industrial relations practices.

I point out that the progress that has been made in negotiations far exceeds progress made towards a career structure under both the former National/Liberal coalition Government and the former National Party Government. It is on the public record that the former National Party Government refused to negotiate on any aspect of nurses' wages and conditions. Indeed, the extent of negotiations that have already been carried out in a relatively short period were never possible under the former National Party Government.

I can understand the concern expressed by nurses about the time the Government has taken to implement its policy commitments in regard to those matters. However, as a new Government, we were responsible for new structures that needed to be put in place. The Government had to consider and approve the establishment of the Public Sector Management Commission, which has a role to play in that area. Those matters did take time. I make the point very strongly that the negotiations that have occurred far exceed any negotiations that were ever carried out under previous Governments.

The Government acknowledges the right of the QNU to lodge an application at any time in the Industrial Commission for improved career and salary increases and to seek an interim increase if it believes that the evidence supports such an increase.

I again refer to the misinformation that has been peddled in a letter to Queensland nurses from the State secretary of the QNU. The secretary, Denis Jones, said—

"Assertions that the Union could have made such an application years ago ignores the historical opposition of the Department to wage rises for nurses, and, the absence of any willingness to negotiate."

In other words, the union chose not to make any application during the term of the former National Party Government because of that Government's reputation that it would not negotiate. If that is drawn to its logical conclusion, because the Government is willing to negotiate, the union suggests industrial action and so on to process its claims.

The Government believes that meaningful negotiations on career structures should continue simultaneously with the processing of any such application. I make the very important point that the QNU is yet to lodge an application before the Industrial Commission for an interim salary increase.

The Government's position is quite clear. It cannot and, indeed, will not commit itself to an unseen application. But, if one is made, we will move quickly to formulate a response and will not seek to delay its processing. The Government is, however, obliged by law not just to consider the claim for a special case, but also to ensure that

all the evidence put forward in support of the claim is accurate. In accordance with previously determined policy, the merit and level of any increase will be left to the Industrial Commission to determine.

The Premier has written to the QNU advising that, should the Industrial Commission determine that professional rates of pay are warranted, the Government will support the phasing in of any increase by three equal instalments spread over three financial years, but discounted by the amount of any interim increase which may be granted.

I make the point that this does not necessarily mean that it will take 36 months for the increases to be introduced. Again, as representatives of the union have indicated, increases could be phased in at different stages over those three financial years, and this would have the effect of reducing the total time span. In fact, if the union proceeds quickly with its application, it is possible that the increase under the first phase could be paid in this financial year.

The Government's message to public sector nurses who will meet in Brisbane tonight is very simple. They should resist the temptation to indulge in unnecessary and unwanted industrial action, particularly given the renewed vigour in negotiations. They should press their union-leaders to continue meaningful negotiations and to lodge an application in the commission as soon as possible. That is the only way in which public sector nurses can achieve the career structure and professional pay rates to which they aspire.

Both the Government and the community are aware of the important role that nurses have to play in the delivery of quality health-care services to the public. It is also generally acknowledged that Queensland nurses have long been disadvantaged in terms of salary and career opportunities when compared with their counterparts in other States. But the blame for that lies clearly with the National and Liberal Parties for the years of inaction of their part.

I repeat that, through the introduction of a proper career structure and professional pay rates for Queensland nurses, in consultation with the nurses unions, this Government is committed to righting the wrongs caused by those opposite. The opportunity is here now to work together to design a system which recognises this role and allows nurses access to a career structure which provides flexibility, job satisfaction and appropriate salary levels.

The only body with the power to be the final arbiter on these issues is the State Industrial Commission, and I cannot say that more strongly. This is the path that should be pursued in accordance with normal industrial relations practices and wage fixation guidelines. I look forward to the support and cooperation of Queensland nurses in ensuring a speedy outcome. In other words, the message is very clear. As I said yesterday, nurses have resumed negotiations on their career structure. Negotiations will continue today. Nurses should ensure that their union stays in that negotiating process.

Time expired.

Government Appointments to Community Corrections Boards

Mr GILMORE (Tablelands) (11.40 a.m.): This morning, I rise to bring to the notice of this House and the people of Queensland the wholesale sackings of members of community corrections boards in Queensland, as outlined in last Saturday's *Queensland Government Gazette*. When Labor Governments go bad, they go bad in a big way. This Government has already gone bad. It is into jobs for the boys, cronyism and nepotism such as we have never seen in this State.

Government members interjected.

Mr GILMORE: They can laugh. I have a little story to tell Mr Gibbs.

This Government has been in power now for eight months, and the snouts are in the trough so deeply that they can be heard sucking for five miles. Government lackeys are sucking, gobbling and getting right into it up to the armpits.

The whole sorry saga of community corrections boards began fairly recently in this House with some innocuous little amendments to the relevant legislation. They did not mean much. They were purely—

Mr Elliott: Machinery.

Mr GILMORE: They were machinery changes and they sought to do nothing more than appoint one member and to make the deputy chairmen of the corrections boards permanent members. They were cosmetic changes. We on this side of the House accepted and supported them. Little did we know that we were about to get the worst shafting of all time. I am glad to see that the Minister for Justice and Corrective Services is in the Chamber, because he has some answering to do.

What happened on Saturday was a personal and professional insult to the incumbents of the corrections boards in this State. These people who were appointed 12 months ago—their appointments appeared in the *Government Gazette*—had two years left to run, had established community corrections boards around the State and had worked very hard and diligently. They had done a tremendous job.

In fact, some of them had worked in their own time to develop a manual for the use of community corrections boards. I am sure that the Minister will be pleased to hand that manual to all the lackeys of the Labor Party who have been appointed and say, "This is how you handle this, gentlemen. This was put together by the people we saw fit to sack because we considered them to be incompetent." A fortune in taxpayers' money is being paid to Labor Party lackeys around the State. It will continue for years because these people have been appointed for three years. As I say, the snouts in the trough can be heard all over Queensland.

Let me deal quickly with these appointments. The other day, even the *Courier-Mail* was kind enough to recognise that there have been some Labor Party appointments. Of course, that newspaper dealt with the matter very kindly. It mentioned Mr Davis. Some honourable members remember Mr Davis—"Digger" Davis. He spent some 20 years in this place. I am sure that he will treat this job with objectivity! He was the most sensitive person to ever sit in this Parliament! He is a man who understands his fellow man! He will consider very carefully all the matters relevant to people who have spent five years in prison. Mr Davis will have to consider whether he will let them out on parole. All he is interested in is what he can get out of the Labor Party, and the Labor Party is pleased to supply it. He is not satisfied with his superannuation payment of \$400,000; now he wants to get his nose into the trough, and the Minister is pleased to let it happen.

The press reported—

"Mr Davis is a former State Labor politician and Mr Plunkett a former Labor political staffer. Some other appointees on both boards have had a close association with the Labor movement."

Goodness gracious me, the *Courier-Mail* was so kind to the Honourable Minister! I will have more to say about that newspaper in a few moments.

Let me examine the appointments to the community corrections board in far-north Queensland. The appointments involve two Labor lawyers, a Labor councillor and a Labor chook-farmer. These people are from the coast, not from the Tablelands. The Tablelands people have been ignored and sullied by this Minister and by this Government. They have been ignored professionally by the Minister and they have been made to feel bad about the work that they have been doing. They have put a lot of effort into that work, which is a sensitive and difficult task. The *Courier-Mail* stated—

"Parole will be 'depoliticised' under new arrangements to release prisoners to community-based supervision schemes."

However, the contrary is true. Instead of being depoliticised, the issue has been heavily politicised. The Minister has stated on ABC radio and in the *Courier-Mail* that this is not a case of jobs for the boys at all; it is just a wonderful appointment. Of course, it is jobs for the boys. The Minister stated—

"All the appointees are eminent persons who have a very considerable contribution to make."

To whom will they make that contribution? Will it be made to the people of Queensland? Are they serving the people of Queensland properly, or are they making their contribution to the ALP?

I will take a few moments to review the selection process that has been put in place by this Government in relation to the most sensitive and difficult jobs in this State. The process started recently when the member for Leichhardt, John Gayler—a Labor Party lackey and hack and a discredited person, if ever there was one—was ringing around his old partners and around Labor lawyers in Queensland, offering them jobs as chairmen and deputy chairmen on the far-north Queensland community corrections board. That is the way that this Government has gone about its selection process. It has been offering fancy jobs and money hand over fist.

Mr Borbidge: I'll bet he did not offer one to the Treasurer.

Mr GILMORE: No, he did not offer one to the Treasurer.

To add insult to injury, a couple of mistakes have been made. A couple of positions were offered to people by mistake and, because of the furore which erupted in the local ALP branch, the offers had to be withdrawn. The offers were subsequently made to some other Labor Party people, and one offer was taken up. The Government has indulged in an absolutely indiscriminate offer of favours throughout far-north Queensland. Obviously Mr Gayler was given that opportunity by the party to boost his image.

The Minister has set himself up to be the Rex "Bucket" Jackson of Queensland. He gives a word here and a quid there and says, "There you go; you'll have early release." From now on, people will have to call him "Buckets" Milliner, but he will have to be careful because he might be spending some of his time in prison. The Minister been involved not only in nepotism, jobs for the boys and cronyism on a grand scale throughout the State, but also in total and utter ineptitude. It is interesting that in the gazettal of the new community corrections boards throughout the State, the gazette states in relation to the North Queensland Regional Community Corrections Board—

"Bruce William Johnston who shall be President
Bernice Anning who shall be Deputy President."

As I said earlier, the Minister recently amended the Act, which now reads—

"Members of regional community corrections board. Each regional community corrections board shall consist of—

- (i) a retired judge of a court of a State or a Territory of the Commonwealth or of the High Court of Australia or a court constituted under an Act of the Commonwealth;
- (ii) a barrister or solicitor who has practised as either a barrister or solicitor for a period of at least five years;
- or
- (iii) a retired Stipendiary Magistrate."

I have in my possession a copy of page 652 from the *Australian Legal Directory*, which indicates that Bernice Mary Anning was appointed as a solicitor in 1987. The lady does not qualify under the Act amended by the Minister one month ago in this Parliament. The Minister is incompetent. He has indulged himself and has involved the Parliament in a disgraceful display of cronyism, nepotism and jobs for the boys. Moreover, he got

it wrong. He will have to go back to the Governor and say, "Governor, I am sorry. The gazettal was wrong and we are going to have to change it because we were incompetent and we will now have to find another lackey and party hack to fill this position." It is a disgrace. The Minister and the Government stand absolutely condemned. I believe that the people of Queensland will see to it that they are condemned.

Deregulation of Telecom

Ms ROBSON (Springwood) (11.50 a.m.): I rise to address an issue that I feel has been misrepresented in the community and about which insufficient relevant information has been produced. The issue I wish to address concerns the deregulation of Telecom.

The debate that is currently raging centres on the move that is afoot to reassess the value of Telecom and examine the best economic future for Telecom, OTC and Aussat. Some of the proposals that have been mooted by the Federal Government relate to selling off part of the Telecom network, namely, Aussat. The theory behind the proposal is that the sale of Aussat will assist in reducing a large debt about which the Federal Government is concerned at the moment.

I believe that it is generally accepted that the use of Aussat has been unsuccessful because it has never actually achieved what it was set up to accomplish in the first place. Part of the debate concerning the sale of Aussat and the amalgamation of OTC and Telecom relates to the cost of maintaining the satellite and the interest of outside entrepreneurs in entering into the Telecom network.

Telecom and the Overseas Telecommunications Commission form a very effective and efficient telecommunications network within Australia and overseas. The moves that have been put forward to combine the two organisations are palatable, although, in my opinion, the operation of Telecom as it presently exists is very efficient. The problems that I foresee in terms of the current debate are that the selling-off of Aussat is equivalent to the selling-off of a licence for individual operators to enter into the Telecom network. The history of the involvement of other operators in what I consider to be a very profitable and substantial national monopoly shows that the Government would be allowing operators to engage in profitable activities that Telecom has managed to generate in the business sector of Melbourne, Brisbane and Sydney.

The operation of those networks is the method by which cross-subsidisation of the remote areas is achieved by Telecom. People should be aware that the domestic use of the telecommunications system and its operation in remote areas, particularly in Queensland, is very much supported by cross-subsidisation.

If we allow the sale of Aussat—currently, the debate is about the sale of Aussat—we must be aware that we are actually selling access to a licence to enter into the Telecom network. Regardless of what many members of the public, and possibly members of this House, feel, the Telecom network is a very efficient profit-generator. The results of that profitability are spread across the nation by supporting remote and domestic consumer services. Statistics reveal that, without the cross-subsidisation that is offered through Telecom's profits, in Queensland we simply could not support the relatively low cost that is offered to consumers in remote areas and to domestic consumers.

It is important that members understand that point, because much mischief is occurring in terms of the public debate about Telecom. The mischief is obviously geared to an attempt either to force deregulation of the Telecom network or to enforce amalgamations which will not necessarily be in the long-term economic interests of the users of Telecom's services.

The cross-subsidisation that is offered by Telecom through its natural monopoly is probably one of the most efficient and effective business operations that is running currently, particularly at the national level. Given the impact that this issue will have on Queensland and the interest that we all have both as members of Parliament and as individual consumers of Telecom's services, we should keep ourselves informed.

Mr Borbidge: What is the Queensland Government's position?

Ms ROBSON: The Queensland Government has not yet stated a position. A debate is occurring which is misleading in terms of accurate community information. A debate has been raised; no definitive statement has been made by either the Federal Government or the State Government about the future of Telecom. Mischievous information is being reported in the media and is warping the debate and disadvantaging the honourable member's constituents.

I return to the natural monopoly which Telecom holds. It cannot be denied that, over a long period, Telecom has built up a very effective communications link across the nation. In Queensland, Telecom is allowed access to services which, because of the nature of cross-subsidisation, would probably not have been available to remote consumers or to domestic consumers at a reasonable cost for many years to come.

The notion has been espoused that Telecom should sell off the Aussat satellite and its licence. The licence is what people are interested in. Any smart operator would be happy to pay a substantial amount of money for the Aussat satellite to obtain that licence. It needs to be understood that at present Telecom operates with a sole licence inside the network. A business proposition to buy the Aussat satellite and its licence would be very lucrative, because it would allow the operator access to a secure network which has been well constructed and maintained by Telecom.

My point in this debate is that, as members of Parliament, we should be aware of the real facts, not what is being presented in a warped sense in the current debate. Decisions will have to be made. Strong representation from Queensland supporting the maintenance, the security and the intactness of the Telecom network is extremely important.

I urge honourable members to familiarise themselves with the literature that is available on the issue. An excellent publication by Jack Keavney talks of the experiences of the systems in the UK and the USA when their natural monopolies were deregulated. The evidence produced through Mr Keavney's research indicates clearly that in the short term, and also in the long term, the cost of operating and owning a telephone in a private residence and in business increases.

I urge members to familiarise themselves with the current debate and to contribute to it on a substantial and rational level.

PRIVILEGE

Speaker's Ruling on Relationship between Minister for Primary Industries and Mr L. Ainsworth and Mr E. Vibert

Mr BORBIDGE (Surfers Paradise—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (11.58 a.m.): I rise on a matter of privilege. I draw your attention, Mr Speaker, to the fact that on 7 June this year I directed a question without notice to the Minister for Primary Industries concerning his relationship with Mr Len Ainsworth and Mr Ted Vibert. I also referred to comments made by the Minister on 5 June in the House and tabled certain documents which, in my view, proved that the Minister had misled the Parliament. I requested that that matter be referred to the Privileges Committee.

Mr Speaker, you gave an undertaking to rule on that matter "at a future date". As 10 weeks have now passed and no ruling has been given, I respectfully request your advice on this most serious accusation against the Minister concerned which, in my view, was fully substantiated by the documents that I tabled.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I will check the records, but I am sure that I did make a statement here, that a motion was put and that the House decided that the matter was not a matter of privilege. I will check the records and give the honourable member an answer tomorrow.

ELECTORAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW COMMISSION**Report on Review of Guidelines for the Declaration of Registrable Interests of Elected Representatives of the Parliament of Queensland**

Mr SPEAKER: I have to inform the House that I have received the Electoral and Administrative Review Commission Report on Review of Guidelines for the Declaration of Registrable Interests of Elected Representatives of the Parliament of Queensland.

Ordered to be printed.

FAILURE BY LEADER OF OPPOSITION TO PROVIDE ELECTORAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW COMMISSION WITH DOCUMENTS RELATING TO THE 1985 QUEENSLAND ELECTORAL REDISTRIBUTION

Hon. R. J. GIBBS (Wolston—Minister for Tourism, Sport and Racing) (12 noon), by leave, without notice: I move—

"That this Parliament condemns the Leader of the Opposition for his failure to provide the Electoral and Administrative Review Commission with any documents relating to the 1985 Queensland electoral redistribution.

That this Parliament calls on the Leader of the Opposition to immediately take all steps to ensure that EARC has access to these documents and files, last held in his office prior to the State election, so that it can complete its examination of the zonal system in Queensland."

The very fact that these sensitive files have disappeared from the office of the Leader of the Opposition goes to prove beyond any shadow of doubt to this Parliament and to the people of Queensland that nothing has changed within the National Party, that nothing has changed in its approach towards the people of Queensland and, most certainly, that in the lead-up to the 1989 State election campaign, members of the National Party were as dishonest as they ever were.

I am amazed when I read through some of the press statements that have been made in the last couple of days by Mr Cooper and by people close to him. An article in a newspaper on Saturday, 18 August, states—

"A senior aide to the former Premier, Mr Cooper, has suggested the disappearance of the cabinet—which could also hold the National Party's 1985 submission—may be linked with the clean-out of Mr Cooper's office."

It goes on to say—

"Ms Armstrong indicated that she remembers the filing cabinet"——

Mr Cooper: Where are Ned Hanlon's files?

Mr GIBBS: The Leader of the Opposition interjects and asks, "Where are Ned Hanlon's files?" How very appropriate! How old and out of touch can one be!

As I was saying, the article goes on—

"Ms Armstrong indicated that she remembers the filing cabinet but does not know what became of it.

She suggested that the persons who cleaned out Mr Cooper's office after the December election may know where it is.

Mr Cooper yesterday said he 'wouldn't have the faintest idea' of its whereabouts."

An article in another newspaper states—

"Ms Wendy Armstrong who was one of Mr Cooper's staff said she remembered the cabinet but suggested cleaners may have removed it after last December's change of Government."

It gets better. The article goes on—

"The State director of the National Party, Mr Ken Crooke, said the party had no copy of its own 1985 electoral submission."

How can these people be believed? How can this Parliament and the people of Queensland honestly place faith in this disgraced, beaten party, whose members sit on the Opposition side with their tails between their legs, making feeble excuses such as, "We have lost the filing cabinet"? Mr Crooke is saying, "Our party has kept no copy of the 1985 submission."

Quite frankly, what honourable members are seeing here is a blatant snubbing of and disrespect for the Electoral and Administrative Review Commission by the National Party. Is it any wonder that members of the Leader of the Opposition's own staff are going around this State at this very moment saying that he is a man who is defeated, that he is broken, and that he cannot cop the pressure of being in Opposition? The performance of the man is pathetic, and that is clearly substantiated by those people.

The simple fact is that if these files cannot be found, it would be very simple and very practical for Mr John Andrews, who was the chairman of the commission, and/or his two fellow commissioners, to be called before EARC. They can obviously answer this great riddle as to what was contained in the 1985 submission by the National Party.

The 1985 redistribution was little more than a masterpiece in drawing not only electoral boundaries but also zonal boundaries for the benefit of a particular political party. Like a good wine, this redistribution improved with age so that, theoretically, by 1989 the Labor Party—which is now in Government—could have failed to gain Government in this State after polling 54 per cent of the total vote—

Mr ELLIOTT: I rise to a point of order. The honourable member is totally incorrect. The zonal boundaries did not even change.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Campbell): Order! There is no point of order.

Mr GIBBS: The contribution by the National Party to this redistribution remains a matter of conjecture because, as I have said, since 1971 the Nationals have kept their submissions to the electoral commission secret, to save the commissioners from being accused of bias if the redistribution happened to closely resemble any particular party's submission.

The *Melbourne Age* summed up the impact of the redistribution in an article on 16 December 1985, as follows—

"The effect of the gerrymander was to give (National Party) Heartland seven (7) seats more than its fair share and to deprive Brisbane and the other areas around it of seven (7) seats."

What better time to quote that master of intrigue, that person who was judged and considered by the National Party as its most outstanding spokesperson on the rigging of electoral boundaries in Queensland and on gerrymanders? I refer to Mr Don Lane himself, the former member for Merthyr. When he was explaining the strategy to the Cabinet, Mr Lane said that the political objective in the first instance was to have a small enough quota in the south-eastern corner so that non-Labor seats in the city could be preserved and extra seats on the north and south coasts could be created to the National Party's advantage. He pointed out that a smaller quota for south-eastern zone seats would not contrast as starkly with that for seats in the adjacent country zone where the quota is small to meet statutory requirements. He said that the real purpose of the 1985 seat increase proposal, then, was to protect the number of seats in the western and far-northern zone—where, of course, the Nationals are very strong, or were very strong—while at the same time taking political advantage of the population increase which had occurred in both the south-eastern and country zones.

Mr Lane said that by coupling the 1985-86 distribution with an increase in the number of seats, the National Party benefited both ways. Although the percentage

of voters living in the western and far-northern zone had reduced as a percentage of the total number of voters Statewide, the increase in seats in the Parliament allowed the Government to maintain the number of electorates in that zone. Indeed, the former Government, under the guise of preserving the quality of representation available to the people of that area, proceeded a step further by actually increasing both the number and proportion of electorates in that zone. That shows that the zonal concept has changed dramatically.

Lane said also that, on the other hand, in the south-eastern zone the National Party could point to the changing demographic relativities between Brisbane and the near coastal region to justify the abolition of several seats in the metropolitan area and that, for the same reason, it could justify the creation of new seats in the expanding coastal and adjacent hinterland areas where, not coincidentally, the National Party had cultivated its political support.

Those comments are damning enough. However, when one considers the report of the Electoral and Administrative Review Commission titled *A History of the Queensland Zonal Electoral System (Draft Only)* dated August 1990, one would think that members of the Opposition—who are supposed to respect EARC—would have the common sense and the courtesy to take note of the report and its contents.

I believe that it is proper for me to bring to the notice of this House some of the contents of that report. It is damning for any former Government if the front page of a commission's report states—

"It has not always been obvious that the Electoral Commissioners were independent of the Government. Submissions and other material upon which the Commissioners have proceeded have been secret. The Commissioners did not report to Parliament, but to the Premier."

The press reports of the past week and the statements by the former Premier of Queensland, Bjelke-Petersen, must lead one to ask: who is telling the lies? Bjelke-Petersen says that he was never consulted about electoral redistributions in Queensland and that he never saw the party's submissions to redistribution commissioners. Quite frankly, judging by his track record, I certainly do not believe that statement by Bjelke-Petersen. I believe that the man is telling deliberate lies and that he was aware of the contents of that submission. I believe also that members of the National Party who were members of this Parliament at that time or were active in the National Party would have had full knowledge of the contents of the submissions.

The situation worsens when one considers that the report states—

"The Commissioners themselves decided not to make the submissions available to the press or the public."

Why not? The past submissions of the National Party were never made available for scrutiny by the media or the public because of the blatant and ruthless interference by the National Party Government in the activities of those people who were supposedly impartial commissioners. The former National Party Government was able to influence those commissioners in the same corrupt way as it indulged in the malpractices that were revealed by the Fitzgerald inquiry.

The report states further—

"EARC has not been able to obtain all the relevant documents previously held by the Department of the Premier and therefore has been unable to compare submissions with the final electoral boundaries. Officers of that Department have not been able to locate the filing cabinet which held the working papers of the 1985 Electoral Districts Commissioners. It has been confirmed by the Director-General of the Premier's Department that the cabinet was moved to the Premier's Office before the December 1989 election. The National Party and the previous Premier, Mr Cooper, have, however, indicated that they have no knowledge of the whereabouts of the filing cabinet or its contents."

The relevant correspondence between EARC on the one hand and the Premier's Department on the other is outlined in the report.

The Leader of the Opposition has a lot to answer for. How can anybody really believe that the beaten, defeated and disgraced former Premier, Mr Cooper, had no knowledge of what happened to a document that was held in his electorate office? Because Mr Cooper was a hands-on Premier, one would expect him to know what was contained in his office. However, an entire filing cabinet disappeared without his knowledge. Is it the case that somebody has deliberately distorted the truth or is it the case that this man stands revealed for his total incompetence and lack of accountability to the people of Queensland?

I have already made a small reference to the former member for Merthyr, who was a Minister of the National Party Government. However, that reference was only minor in comparison with the revelations about Mr Lane. I refer again to the EARC report which reveals without doubt or fear of contradiction the absolutely corrupt practices that were indulged in by the National Party and, in some cases, the Liberal Party's tacit support for those corrupt practices during those years that it was in coalition with the National Party. Members of the Liberal Party were spineless, afraid to speak their minds and were prepared to be trampled. The Liberal Party in this House is now two short of an egg carton.

The EARC report stated—

"Lane has described the approach as corralling the Labor vote into safe Labor districts . . . The letter provides details of how this was done. For example:

'You will see that the proposal leaves the districts of Mt. Coot-tha and Toowong basically as they are—strong anti-Labor districts; extends the district of Ithaca into the Gap so strengthening its non-Labor vote; consolidates Ashgrove as a Labor district; abolishes the district of Windsor, currently held by Labor; strengthens the district of Merthyr by an extension into the Clayfield area;' "

coincidentally, a concerted enrolment drive by the former member for Merthyr—

" 'retains Nundah as a winnable district for its incumbent Sir William Knox;' "

that is history—

" 'abolishes Brian Austin's district of Wavell and replaces it with one we have called Marchent taking half of Aspley and replaces Aspley with a new district based on the western parts of Aspley, Stafford Heights, and the semi-rural area of Everton. The district of Stafford itself becomes a Labor district, whilst Brisbane Central is a dumping ground for Labor votes in the centre of Brisbane'."

All of this was contained in a letter to Sir Robert Sparkes and Charlie Holm. It is there for all to see; it is out in the open. The people of Queensland know beyond any shadow of a doubt and to their total satisfaction that the decision they made on 2 December last year was the correct one. They elected a Government that is accountable and honest, and they reduced to an absolute almost-rural rump the disgruntled and disgraced pack of political dinosaurs sitting on the other side of the Chamber.

In his interview with EARC, Lane says also that the end product of the electoral commissioners was very close to the National Party submission. He is talking there, of course, about 1985.

The final matter in this draft report to which I want to refer is contained in chapter 7 on page 43 at the conclusion, where it states—

"Documents from the major political parties and other sources, to the extent that these were made available to EARC, are insufficient to allow a detailed investigation of the zonal system, the reasons for it and more importantly, the closed processes which created and sustained it. Even amongst Government records there is little archival information dealing with this important aspect of Queensland's political history. EARC's investigation of the system has been adversely affected to a significant extent by the lack of recorded information and the non-availability of the material before previous distribution Commissioners.

This lack of records should be the cause of some concern."

My challenge to the Opposition is this: why can the National Party not produce its 1985 submission to the electoral commissioners? Where has it gone? Was it shredded in a frenzy to get rid of it?

Mr FitzGerald: Do you want my copy?

Mr GIBBS: Yes.

Mr FitzGerald: I'll give you my copy, if you want it.

Mr GIBBS: If the honourable member has a copy, I would love him to produce it and to table it, because neither EARC nor the press has been able to get hold of a copy of it. Former commissioners appointed by the National Party were able to get hold of a copy. But nobody else has been able to, because the copies disappeared mysteriously on the night of 2 December 1989, along with thousands of pieces of other documentation that was shredded secretly by former Government Ministers.

I guess that one can really sum up the disappearance of these documents and the attitude of the National Party in Government by referring to some of the extracts from what is probably a most excellent report, the recently prepared Cribb report into the National Party. It is one which the National Party itself welcomed and went behind closed doors to debate it secretly.

I will tell honourable members what the Cribb report found out about the National Party and its attitude towards accountability. Under the heading "General", the extract states—

"I found also a most disturbing divisiveness within the Party as a whole, expressing itself in various kinds of factionalism"—

isn't that dreadful, factions within the National Party—

"in personality differences, in the settling of old scores and in other manifestations of disunity."

Those sorts of things continue today. One has only to see the disgruntlement, the disloyalty and the sweating by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition as he sits like a bird of prey every question-time waiting and savouring the continuing political stumblings of his leader, as he exhibited this morning in question-time and as he will undoubtedly exhibit when his leader stands up again.

What does the Cribb report say about the parliamentary National Party? It states—

"Based on the evidence gathered in the course of the Review, this Report agrees that widespread criticism of the Parliamentary leadership and of the Party exists in the Queensland branch."

That was a reference to the Queensland branch of the National Party.

Mr BOOTH: I rise to a point of order. I do not think that the Minister moved that he intended to discuss the Cribb report. He has now decided to discuss it.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Campbell): Order! The honourable member will be able to participate in the debate later on. If he wishes to question matters raised by the Minister, he may do so in his speech.

Mr GIBBS: I thoroughly appreciate your protection, Mr Deputy Speaker.

The report continues—

Mr BORBIDGE: I rise to a point of order. Mr Deputy Speaker, for the information of honourable members on this side of the Chamber, can I take it by your ruling that this is to be a wide-ranging debate?

Mr Stephan: We can talk about the Cooke report.

Mr GIBBS: That is fine. I welcome that. I think the Deputy Leader of the Opposition has become so sensitive that if he were to fall over he would break his hair.

The report continues—

"It found, behind the brave public front, a thoroughly demoralised and destabilised Party, deeply divided within itself, not just over one issue, but over a considerable number.

...

It (looking after constituents) can be most demanding, though some M.L.A.'s have comparatively few constituents to care for."

These are extracts from the National Party's own report.

What about these little gems—

"As the members of the opposition are the only front-line troops that the Party can put in the field at the moment, each needs to perform to the limit of his/her abilities if he/she is to retain the confidence and support of Party members and the voters."

God help the National Party and the demoralised people that it comprises at present.

The extract continues—

"The parliamentary party must be invigorated by further additions of capable and intelligent people who are prepared and anxious to master fully their briefs and to fulfil their various roles with energy and skill."

Can honourable members imagine anybody with intelligence, skill and energy wanting to join this mishmash of a political party, this disgraceful rump? On the Opposition Leader himself, the report states—

"The Opposition Leader must constantly work to extend the depth and breadth of his knowledge of issues of policies. He needs to use skilfully all the resources of parliament to create a sound, positive image of his party."

Well, all the best of luck to him. This Government looks forward very much to his using his incredible electoral skills and his marvellous ability to communicate with the electorate to get over being saddled with the dying old men sitting on the Opposition front bench. Honourable members should look at poor old Bill Gunn sitting there rotting away in frustration, unable to make a contribution now that he has no speech notes or research officers to do the work for him. Is it any wonder that the filing cabinet and what was contained in it disappeared? It is totally understandable. The filing cabinet and its contents, whatever it may have held, like the former glory days of this disgraced party, have gone into political oblivion.

I confidently predict that this House will see that this Leader of the Opposition will not lead the National Party at the next election and that, when the member for Surfers Paradise becomes the Leader of the Opposition, it will be his last term in this Parliament as well. At the next election, the National Party will be reduced to the rural rump it deserves to be. I challenge the member for Lockyer to table the 1985 report in this Parliament today if he has it.

Hon. D. M. WELLS (Murrumba—Attorney-General) (12.25 p.m.): When the Government first heard that the files relating to the 1985 Queensland redistribution had gone missing from the former Premier's office, it really should not have been too surprised. The mass evacuation of much of the material held in the office now occupied by the Premier was well known. The former Government moved in the shredders and the removal trucks, and it moved out the evidence.

What happened during the weekend following the election of this Government was nothing less than a mass fraud perpetrated against the people of Queensland. Why should not EARC have access to documents that had a direct bearing on the rights of the people of Queensland to participate in the democratic process? How could the former Government believe that it had the right to censor what information should or should not be available for scrutiny by EARC? How could the former National Party Government try

to interfere with the history of democracy in Queensland in this most dishonest and most deceitful way?

The honourable Leader of the Opposition should be thoroughly ashamed of himself. Again, Queensland has an example of the selective memory of members of the former Government. This House has seen many instances here and in another place of people having a recall problem. Some of those people who have had this recall problem, this selective amnesia, have been members of the former Government, and here honourable members see it again. They just cannot remember.

Honourable members may recall what part this type of selective memory, this type of selective amnesia, played during the processes of the Fitzgerald inquiry? It is shameless that on an issue of such vital importance to the people of this State, an issue that is so fundamental to democratic processes, it should be so fundamentally mismanaged by the people who sit opposite.

In the search for what actually happened, honourable members should take a closer look at what was involved. I am talking about not the odd sheet of paper or the odd manilla folder of documents, I am talking about a filing cabinet. A whole filing cabinet is supposed to have been mislaid. It is not as if it would be difficult to remember where one put it. It is not as if it was camouflaged, unless it was wrapped up in the traditional National Party brown-paper bag. It is not an easy task to misplace a filing cabinet. It could not just surreptitiously be slipped into a waste-paper bin or be picked up by somebody or by accident be carried out of the office. Indeed, the media report suggests that one of Mr Cooper's senior assistants indicated in a letter to EARC that the people who cleaned out Mr Cooper's office may have had some knowledge of the whereabouts of that filing cabinet. Mr Cooper has not volunteered to trace that source of information.

In his report, Mr Sherman states—

"Ms Armstrong indicated that she remembers the filing cabinet but does not know what became of it. She suggested that the persons who cleaned out Mr Cooper's office after the December election may know where it is."

What was the honourable the Leader of the Opposition's response to this suggestion? He shrugged his shoulders to something that Mr Sherman said should be a cause of some concern.

Mr FitzGerald: How many filing cabinets do you have in your office? How many are there? Come on—quickly. How many filing cabinets are in your office?

Mr WELLS: Does the honourable member want an answer?

Mr FitzGerald: How many filing cabinets are in your office?

Mr WELLS: If the farmyard babble from the other side of the House will die down, I will answer the question. One fool at a time, and the member for Lockyer is speaking.

Mr FitzGerald: How many filing cabinets in your office? I will take the insults that you want to heap on me. How many filing cabinets are in your office?

Mr WELLS: I believe that it is 10 and none of them contain this sort of surreptitious, disgraceful, sneaky material that this filing cabinet contained.

Mr FitzGerald: What do they all contain, please?

Mr WELLS: The honourable the Leader of the Opposition stated that he did not have the faintest idea of the whereabouts of the filing cabinet. He did not have the faintest idea, just as the honourable member for Lockyer would not have the faintest idea about anything.

Did the honourable the Leader of the Opposition appear concerned about this consequence—not at all. The consequences are quite serious. The report stated that

EARC's investigation into the State's electoral system had been severely hampered by the lack of material available.

Mr HARPER: I rise to a point of order.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! There is a point of order and I recognise the member for Auburn.

Mr HARPER: I rise on a point of order because I find that the Attorney-General in this Parliament is bringing into disrepute the high office of Attorney-General under the Westminster system by politicising his role in entering a debate of this nature.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! All members of this Parliament have a right to participate in this debate. I call the Honourable the Attorney-General.

Mr WELLS: At the moment, I am speaking as a member of this Parliament.

Mr HARPER: I rise to a further point of order. Mr Deputy Speaker, you very clearly called on the member "as the Attorney-General". That is on record in *Hansard*. The honourable member is speaking as such.

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

Mr WELLS: In every Parliament that operates under Westminster system, the Attorney-General is a member of Parliament. He is a member of a political party. I am speaking as a member of the Government in censure of the actions of the former Government. If that is not an appropriate role for a member of Parliament, the honourable member opposite is totally unaware of what the role of a member of Parliament involves. I did not notice the member for Auburn when he was Attorney-General—

Mr Harper: You should know better.

Mr WELLS: I do not know how much the former Attorney-General knows about the circumstances in which an Attorney-General is supposed to act impartially, but I do know that he knows a lot about bringing officers into disrepute.

Mr HARPER: I rise to a point of order. I find the remarks made by the Attorney-General offensive and I ask that they be withdrawn.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member has asked for those offensive words to be withdrawn. The Attorney-General will please withdraw them.

Mr WELLS: I withdraw the remarks and, in all contrition, I say that the honourable member opposite would not know anything about either of those things.

The report said that the EARC's investigation into the State's electoral system had been severely hampered by the lack of material available. It is odd that those documents disappeared in such circumstances. Because the former National Party Government was in the very process of setting up the EARC, it knew that the EARC would carry out that kind of investigation, yet even in those circumstances, the National Party lost track of a whole filing cabinet full of hot, top secret documents. That a shrug of the shoulders should be the response of National Party members to an act that severely hampers an independent inquiry into the redistribution of the State's electoral boundaries must come as no surprise to political observers in Queensland.

So what was in the filing cabinet that the former Government was so determined should never see the light of day? Could it have been suggestions about how boundaries could be drawn to effect a certain result. Could it have been communications with the electoral commissioners that the former National Party Government would have preferred to remain secret? The tragedy is that the people of Queensland will never know. Even Richard Nixon eventually produced the Watergate tapes. Perhaps that is the reason why National Party members cannot find that filing cabinet. Perhaps they just forgot to delete the expletives.

In support of the motion, I observe that a shrug of the shoulders is a typical, but far from appropriate, response from the Leader of the Opposition in this matter. He should have immediately offered his assistance to the EARC in an endeavour to track the missing filing cabinet, if indeed the files do exist. The Government believes that it is important for the democratic processes that the EARC be able to complete its inquiry into the State electoral boundaries by reference to all the available data.

That shameful negligence or that deliberate act—whichever it was—was made possible by the odious legislation under which the former National Party Government conducted its redistributions. The Electoral Districts Act 1985 and its forerunner, the Electoral Districts Act, 1971-1977, are two of the most odious pieces of legislation ever to be brought before any Parliament operating under the Westminster system. Section 12 of the Electoral Districts Act 1985 sets out a number of matters to be considered in distributing zones, including the following—

- "(a) community or diversity of interest;
- (b) means of communication;
- (c) physical features;
- (d) the boundaries of Areas of Local Authorities and Divisions of Local Authorities;
- (e) distance from the seat of government;
- (f) density of population;
- (g) demographic trends".

Having stated that, in the following paragraph, the section states—

"Suggestions in writing with respect to the distribution of a Zone prescribed by this Act into the number of electoral districts prescribed therefor by this Act may be lodged with the Commissioners not later than one calendar month after the date of the appointments of the Commissioners under and for the purposes of this Part, and the Commissioners may consider suggestions so lodged."

All that this Act requires of the commissioners is that they may consider an application. There is no further requirement of publicity or that any of the matters being considered by those commissioners should ever see the light of day. There is no indication that the people of Queensland had any further role to play after the National Party Government appointed its hand-picked commissioners or that any concession to the democratic basis of Queensland's social system should be recognised in the electoral system. There is no indication of any of those matters. The legislation states only that the commissioners may, if they wish, consider recommendations made to them. Whether they did or not, we will never know because the National Party has lost the brown paper bag containing the filing cabinet that contained the hot documents.

The forerunner to that Act, the Electoral Districts Act 1971-1977, is largely in the same terms as the Act under which the most recent redistribution was conducted. Because of the interest in history shown by members of the National Party—that is the only place where they will ever make a mark—I will refer to that previous legislation. It states—

"If . . . in the opinion of the Governor in Council, it has become necessary to make—

- (c) a complete redistribution . . . or
- (d) a partial redistribution . . .

The Governor in Council may, according as he deems necessary in the circumstances, cause all or any of the Zones prescribed by this Act to be respectively completely or partially redistributed."

The words "Governor in Council" are a code for the "National Party Cabinet". Under that legislation, it was possible for the National Party Cabinet to conduct a partial redistribution. In other words, the subservient Parliament of those days—the Parliament that was under the thumb of both the National Party and the Liberal Party—voted away

its right to determine its destiny. Except for the present Parliament, no Parliament in recent times has been the master of its own destiny because there was always a little safety valve so that, if the going got too rough in the House, Executive Council could do a partial redistribution and fix things up so that the National Party got back in.

Mr FitzGerald interjected.

Mr WELLS: I pause to hear the response from the honourable member for Lockyer.

Mr FitzGerald: You'll do the numbers in the House, won't you, if you want to fix it up?

Mr WELLS: The people of Queensland have done the numbers in this House. The people of Queensland have done the best numbers job possible to those on the honourable member's side of the House.

There is only one other interesting piece of information in this odious legislation to which I draw the attention of the House at the moment and by which honourable members may be amused. It goes back to the days of the brown-paper bag. It was back in the days when things were done with a certain degree of nonchalance and the sort of traditional shrug of the shoulders that was fashionable in those days and is still indulged in by the Leader of the Opposition. I cast no aspersions on anybody. The very language of the Act is very redolent of all that we remember the National Party for. Section 8 (2) reads—

"Each Commissioner shall receive such payment by way of salary or allowances, or both, as the Governor in Council thinks fit."

Those Acts under which the National Party Government brought in the gerrymander and the redistribution and which this House and the people of Queensland had to labour hard to overcome are among the most disreputable pieces of legislation ever introduced.

I return to the question of the missing files. Why is it important that those files be found, if they can be found? Let me outline the abuse that they would explain. The abuse is the gerrymander and the electoral malapportionment which flourished under the previous National Party Government. The 1977 redistribution figures were relevant to the 1977—

Mr Elliott: If this gerrymander was so terrible, how come you managed to get so many seats?

Mr WELLS: That is a very good question from the honourable member for Cunningham. The reason we got so many seats was that the National Party had organised things so that there were very few marginal electorates it could lose. The only way we could win Government was to win the seats that were not marginal. If the honourable member for Cunningham cares to glance towards the back of the Chamber, he will see honourable members who had to obtain a 50 per cent or 60 per cent swing to win. That is how the electoral gerrymander operated. That is how the malapportionment operated. That is why we won so many seats.

Mr Hayward: We don't all fit on this side.

Mr WELLS: I thank the honourable member for Caboolture for pointing out that Government members overflow onto the other side of the House. So great was their gerrymander, so great was our victory.

I shall indicate the disparity in the sizes of seats even in 1977. South-eastern zone electorates had an average of 16 368 voters; provincial cities, 15 952; western and far-northern, 8 586; and country, 11 515. I repeat that that was back in 1977. The proposition that the purpose of the electoral malapportionment was to ensure some recognition of distance from the metropolitan area is threadbare.

If a person had set out to travel overland, for instance from Mount Isa to Brisbane, he would have found that, the closer he got to Brisbane, the larger the seats in terms

of population. First, he would have entered Flinders, which was smaller than Mount Isa in terms of population. Then, if he took a slight side trip because he liked the country, he would have entered Peak Downs, which was smaller than Flinders. Then he would have gone to Warrego, which was smaller still. When he entered Roma, which is held by the Leader of the Opposition, he would have been in a seat which was smaller than any of the three preceding seats mentioned.

Mr FitzGerald interjected.

Mr WELLS: The closer he got to Brisbane on this imaginary trip, the smaller the seats. So, what becomes of the threadbare proposition that it was designed to protect people who lived a great distance from Brisbane?

Opposition members interjected.

Mr WELLS: It was not; it was designed and worked very well for some considerable time to keep in Government the disreputable, raggie-tailed, interrupting bunch on the other side of the House.

Mr FitzGerald: Does that mean that *Hansard* will take the interjections that I threw at you because you referred to me and which you would not answer?

A Government member: You are the gaggle he referred to.

Mr FitzGerald: I said will you—

Mr WELLS: I thank the honourable member. He has identified himself by use of the word "gaggle". I would like to make it perfectly clear that I was not including the honourable member in the term "gaggle".

Mr FitzGerald: What are you going to say? Come on, insult me.

Mr WELLS: How could I refuse? "Gaggle" does not adequately describe the honourable member for Lockyer. "Disreputable gaggle" would be much better than "gaggle".

It would be possible to continue for some considerable time outlining the abuses that existed under the present gerrymander and electoral malapportionment. One could talk about Wujal Wujal and how that was actually taken out of one area and put into another, and the way it was physically surrounded by one lot of territory but put into another area in order to shore up the electoral prospects of a particular member. It would be possible to talk about the electorate of Pine Rivers in south-east Queensland that is now represented by my friend and colleague, the honourable member for Pine Rivers. The electorate was drawn very carefully so that a nice slice was taken out of the electorate of Murrumba. It is not possible to drive from Bald Hills, which is located in my electorate of Murrumba, along Strathpine Road to Lawnton, which is also in my electorate, because Strathpine has been taken out.

The electoral commissioners of the day had to take a slice of that urban area out of Murrumba and put it into Pine Rivers in order to create an electorate of a reasonable size for the former member for Pine Rivers. What were they going to take out? They could not take out Bald Hills because Bald Hills had previously been part of the Pine Rivers electorate. They wanted to get rid of that area because its Labor vote was just too solid, which would have made life very uncomfortable for the former member. They were not going to take out Lawnton because to do so would have had much the same effect as taking out Bald Hills. What did they do? The flatland areas of Bald Hills now are not part of Murrumba, but part of the Pine Rivers electorate. This very neat plan was not quite as outrageous as the Wujal Wujal plan, but what messed it up completely was the capability of the present member for Pine Rivers who won the vote at Strathpine and Bray Park. In every case, the honourable members who now occupy the seats of this Parliament have overcome the obstacle that was presented to them by this sneaky, disreputable, dishonest, unfair and grossly undemocratic redistribution. They now occupy the seats of this Parliament on behalf of the people of Queensland.

The days of secret little men in secret little rooms being able to sit down and draw up a redistribution to pervert the processes of democracy are now gone.

Mr FitzGerald: Who created EARC? Come on, tell us that!

Mrs Woodgate: Fitzgerald.

Mr FitzGerald: Come off it! The National Party Government created EARC. Come on, give us some credit!

Mr WELLS: Mr Deputy Speaker, I will take the interjections by the member for Lockyer. I congratulate the former National Party Government for doing one of the few things that it was actually compelled to do. It introduced the legislation for establishment of EARC. I congratulate members of the former National Party Government for doing with their right hand what they ought to have told their left hand about. The people who created EARC ought to have told those who were shredding the documents that some of those documents could have been used by the body that the former National Party Government set up.

The days of secret little men, appointed by frightened little men, sitting in secret little rooms——

Mr Welford: With secret documents.

Mr WELLS: . . . with secret documents while protected by a wall of silence are gone. From now on, the destiny of the people of Queensland will be worked out in daylight and in the open air. The Electoral and Administrative Review Commission will be working out the next redistribution in the full light of day.

Mr Borbidge: Will you or will you not accept it if it is not one vote, one value? Yes or no?

Mr WELLS: Yes, we will accept the recommendations of the Electoral and Administrative Review Committee which will be presented to the Parliament.

Mr FitzGerald: Will you resign if it is not accepted by the Labor Party?

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Campbell): Order!

Mr FitzGerald interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! It is not parliamentary practice to question members when they are making a speech. The Attorney-General should be allowed to make his speech.

Mr Cooper interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I warn the Leader of the Opposition under Standing Order 123A. He has interrupted me. I ask members of the Opposition to allow the Attorney-General to finish his speech.

Mr WELLS: Mr Deputy Speaker, those days are gone.

Mr FitzGerald interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable member for Lockyer under Standing Order 123A.

Mr WELLS: As I was saying, those days are gone. In future——

Mr Borbidge: You didn't answer it.

Mr WELLS: I will always act in accordance with the Westminster system.

Those days of secrecy are gone. From now on, the people of Queensland will be able to control their own destiny. They will have a Parliament that is tailor-made, not

by members on the opposite side of the House and not by the National Party but by their own democratic determination. They will have a Parliament which will project into the future the wishes of the people of this State. They will not have to vote at the rate of 50 per cent, 55 per cent or 65 per cent in order to elect a Parliament that reflects their wishes. The days of National Party surreptitiousness, intrigue and dirty dealings are gone. The days of the paper bag, the shredding machine and the removal truck at dawn are gone. The people of Queensland are now looking to the days of democracy in Queensland, to the days when they can obtain freedom of information, enjoy openness in public discussion and democratic control of the nature and content of the Parliament of this great State.

Mr COOPER (Roma—Leader of the Opposition) (12.51 p.m.): I am very pleased to take part in this debate. I move the following amendment to the motion—

"Delete all words after the word 'House' and insert—

'calls upon the Government to give an unequivocal undertaking to implement the recommendations of EARC review into the Queensland electoral boundaries in line with the commitment given by the previous National Party Government.' "

I present that as a challenge because, as far as members of the National Party are concerned, this Government has not given any commitment at all in relation to the electoral system; nor has it given a commitment that it will abide by the boundaries as drawn up by the independent body, EARC. The whole tone of this debate is marked by absolute hypocrisy. Quite obviously, this debate is a furphy. In the last few months, the Government's stocks have been low. Many backbenchers know that. There is more backbench talent than there is on the front bench. Those who occupy the front benches know that the backbenchers on the Government side are way out in front. I wonder when the Government will trot in Geoff Smith and really inject some zest into this debate. Instead of doing that, it trotted in probably the greatest thug in Cabinet.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr COOPER: That is so. If he can give it, he should also be able to take it.

Mr Prest: That's the trouble with you; you haven't got any punch.

Mr COOPER: The honourable member knows that. The honourable member comes straight from the Prest charm school. I suppose that he will be the next speaker in this debate. Look at old dirty, muddy-mouth going red.

Mr Prest interjected.

Mr COOPER: He is going well. Shortly, we will see the froth around his mouth. He should go back to Gladstone. However, they do not want him back there. When the people of Gladstone know that a parliamentary session is commencing, they thank God that they will get rid of him again and are pleased that he will be coming to Brisbane. We do not want him in Brisbane, either. He is a poor simpleton and a poor moron. The Labor Party does not want him here, either. Has he been given a guernsey? Where is the list of speakers?

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Campbell): Order! The Leader of the Opposition will return to his speech to his amendment.

Mr COOPER: The Government has not given the honourable member a guernsey. I am sorry about that; it would have been good if we could have heard from him. He has been a member of this House for a long time and cannot get into Cabinet. And isn't he dirty? He cannot stand that. Fortunately for the people of Gladstone and the electorate of Port Curtis, the honourable member will not be around for too much longer.

I will return to the subject. It is an exercise in utter hypocrisy for the Government to bring on a debate such as this when there is a great deal of legislation on the books

that should be dealt with. It is an abuse of the parliamentary system. The Government supposedly rode to power on a promise to deliver open and accountable government and to deal with the business of the House, yet it has brought on this furphy in an attempt to hide or cover the mistakes and dreadful decision-making that have occurred over the past few months. It is trying to hide its shocking economic performance and the number of projects that have been lost. The list is endless. This debate is a smokescreen that has been set up by the Government.

I was very happy to talk to Mr Sherman about the missing files on the electoral zones. He asked me if I had any idea where the files going back to 1985 were. Of course, Government members would not know the number of filing cabinets in the Executive Building. It was impossible to know what was contained in all the filing cabinets. Whenever I have left a ministerial office, as I did as Minister for Police, every filing cabinet has remained in place. When I ceased being Premier, all the filing cabinets remained in place. As I knew that Mr Sherman was attempting to write the history of the zonal system, I offered him every assistance. The zonal system affects Government members, Opposition members and everyone in the State.

I do not believe that there is any mystery about the filing cabinet. The commissioners received submissions from every political party, including the National Party. The commissioners acknowledged that the National Party submission was very good. Records would be available. There is no reason on earth why the commissioners could not provide those records to EARC, instead of allowing the Government to attempt to make a great scene and a pantomime out of it in this House.

Every day throughout the State we hear of the level of effectiveness of the Government. It is obvious that the Government has brought on this unnecessary debate in order to hide its own failings. The Government rode to power on a promise to be the shining white knight of democracy. Today, after nine months, we are talking about its failure. All we have seen is abuse after abuse after abuse of democracy.

Even the Government's supporters—including many academics—are saying that, within the short space of nine months, the Government has failed. They are saying it in the board rooms. They are whispering it behind Government members' backs. Government members might think that they are saying nice things to their faces, but in the board rooms they are saying that the Government has failed and that it will be in office for only one term.

Sitting suspended from 12.58 to 2.30 p.m.

Mr COOPER: As I said prior to the luncheon recess, this debate is a charade. It is a smokescreen to hide the absolute failure of this Government to perform over the last nine months. The rural sector found that out in one fell swoop, and it is quite happy to tell the Government what it thinks of it. One has only to consider the meetings that are taking place regarding the sugar industry, daylight-saving, the transport industry, the rural crisis and so on. The list goes on. That proves quite clearly that people have had a gutful. Nothing original has come out of this Cabinet in the last eight or nine months except, of course, the hike in taxes and charges, which showed absolute contempt for the electors who put the Labor Party in Government.

I believe that this is a flexing of the Government's muscle, if you like, to demonstrate to EARC that it had better do the Government's bidding or else——

Mr Foley: Not so.

Mr COOPER: I repeat that this is a case of muscle-flexing. The Government is effectively saying to EARC, "You will do what we want or else."

Dr Clark: That is a shameful accusation.

Mr COOPER: The Government should not have brought on this debate. There was no need to bring on this debate at all. It is an absolute charade.

While I am on the subject of EARC and its recommendations, I challenge the ALP to accept the recommendations of EARC on the electoral boundaries. The Labor Government has never given a really clear commitment to do that. I also challenge the ALP Government to accept a majority Government, if that arises—that is, if the result is 50 per cent plus 1. I have issued the challenges; we will see how the Government responds to them.

My Government was responsible for the introduction of the EARC legislation. My Government introduced that legislation with every intention of ensuring that it had adequate related powers so that it could conduct itself in a completely open and fully accountable manner. It was the National Party Government that introduced that legislation. The National Party showed that it was a leader in reform. I doubt very much whether such legislation would have been introduced under the present Government. As everyone knows, George Street is alive with frustration about recommendations that have been made by the CJC. The ALP is worried that EARC will also cramp its style. The ALP should welcome the reforms and the decisions of these bodies. At least those bodies are making decisions, unlike the Government, which is simply pilfering the ideas of the former National Party Government.

In moving this motion, this one-term Government overlooked a very critical factor, that is, that knowledge relating to the 1985 redistribution would not be lost. The commissioners and others would have knowledge of the submissions from all political parties regarding the 1985 redistribution. I really cannot see what all the fuss is about. There seems to be a fascination on the part of the Government about the 1985 files. What about the files relating to the 1949 Labor redistribution? Perhaps there could be a search for those. What about the 1958 files and the 1971 files? I just wonder whether they are generating the same interest. Apparently they are not. If there is to be a full and complete history of all the working papers—

Mr Ardill: They are all in the archives; where are yours?

Mr COOPER: "Bottlebrush" should pull his head in—the poor little fellow.

As everyone knows, it was the Labor Party that established the zonal system in 1949. History simply would not be complete without an examination of the working papers. I believe that there should be a full examination of Hanlon's redistribution working papers. An examination of the minutes of the discussions held in those smoke-filled rooms would probably be a darned-sight more interesting than an examination of any other working papers.

It is the current electoral review that I think is the most important. The National Party was the only party to forward to EARC a submission suggesting reforms. All the Labor Party did was to parrot one vote, one value—that gerrymandered system that has failed in the south. It also threw in 10 more seats for good measure. It even had people racing around this Chamber with tape measures seeing whether 99 members would fit in the place. That is how seriously the ALP took its submission. I do not think that the people of Queensland would be interested in seeing another 10 politicians in this place, whether they were members of the Labor Party or the National Party. In my opinion, there are already enough politicians to represent the people of this State.

The National Party's answer to question No. 4 asked by EARC gives a very clear indication of the openness and accountability to which the National Party subscribed in its submission. Question No. 4 reads—

"Should Parliament be able to reject or change the electoral boundaries proposed by an independent authority?"

The National Party's answer to that was—

"No, but the proper performance by that authority, which should be the Electoral and Administrative Review Commission, of its duties should be ensured by:

(a) Publication of all submissions received by it.

- (b) Publication of reasons for decisions on objections to its provisional determination of boundaries when publishing its final determination.
- (c) Grant of standing to any elector to challenge lawfulness of final boundaries in the Supreme Court and,
- (d) Requirement for a further redistribution immediately upon an election in which a majority of electorates are won by a party which does not obtain a majority of the votes on a two Party preferred basis."

That is what the National Party stands for. No-one seems to be very interested in talking about majority Governments.

At page 40 of the report, Mr John Andrews said that the commissioners started with an independent view and drew up notional boundaries, which were not compared with submissions until preliminary boundaries were almost finalised. Mr Andrews went on to say that he was surprised by the thoroughness of the National Party's submission. He said that it was by far the most thoroughly documented submission. However, he said that the commissioners did not follow the National Party's submission, but were constrained by zonal boundaries in the relevant Act.

I perceive this motion to be a cover-up for the Government's failure to perform and an obvious waste of the time of this Parliament. I also see some vengeance from that classic example of jobs for the boys, Professor Coaldrake.

I reiterate that I have no knowledge of the existence of any files. I would certainly produce them if I did. I believe that information relating to the redistribution could be obtained from the relevant persons. What is the fuss? The ALP is demonstrating a massive hypocrisy in relation to the zonal system. For many years it has continued a public relations campaign to link the so-called gerrymander of the zonal system with the National Party. The fact is that the zonal system is a product of the ALP, which thought that the system would ensconce it in power forever.

I turn now to the rural vote, which was very strong for the Labor Party when it was last in Government. It was very convenient for Labor to introduce the zonal system. The ALP claimed that the zonal system was introduced for reasons other than to cater for the loyal AWU and unionist workers, including railway fettlers, shearers and associated rural employees who were in strength at that time. The Labor Party felt justified in introducing that system. However, as Mr Hanlon said, the Brisbane representation should not overshadow country representation.

The worm has certainly turned. Labor has been well and truly rejected by people in rural areas. As a result, the Labor Party has said, "The bush can go to hell." The ALP is hell-bent on grinding rural voters into the dust. After 32 years of having little idea of what a Labor Government is really like, people in regional cities and towns are now discovering the truth. People in Maryborough, Gladstone, Townsville and Cairns——

Mr Dollin: All happy in Maryborough.

Mr Nunn: All happy in Hervey Bay.

Mr COOPER: Like hell they are! Give them some more daylight-saving!

Members who represent those electorates are under threat and should enjoy themselves while they can. For the first time, their constituents have seen what a Labor Government can do and they do not like what they see, namely, a one-term party of cronyism and incompetence.

The ALP wants a gerrymander that corrals a disproportionate number of votes into the south-east corner of the State. Members of the Labor Party use the term "one vote, one value" as some sort of a mantra—a cure-all or a panacea for the ALP's electoral problems. There is no doubt that the ALP wants to rig the electoral boundaries with another system. However, because an independent body will not bow to the wishes of members of the ALP, one senses their frustration and anger.

It is important to note that the zonal system has worked for Queenslanders. The redistribution and decentralisation of political power has meant that the entire State has received reasonable political representation and development. Because the ALP obtained 50.7 per cent of the primary vote and gained about 60 per cent of the seats on 2 December, any discrediting of the zonal system as being a gerrymander was blown out the window.

The gerrymandered one vote, one value system has kept the Labor Party in power in South Australia with 48 per cent of the vote. Although the conservative coalition forces obtained 52 per cent of the vote, Bannon still rules. For almost a decade the Victorian Government has remained in power with a minority vote. The economy of that State is completely ruined and that Government simply should not be there.

In the Federal sphere, Hawke is in power with 39 per cent of the vote. If Government members think that system is fair, they can have it. A gerrymandered system that keeps minority Governments in power is quite wrong. As to the current electoral review, the only party that offers Queenslanders the ability to have a Government that has a majority of the vote is the National Party.

Honourable members are aware that the ALP would dearly love to close down the Cooke inquiry. Today, we are discussing honesty and accountability in elections. However, I shall cite some examples of elections that Government members will not want to hear about. Last month, Mr Goss and the president of the ALP, Mr Ian McLean, addressed the central and southern branch of the Federated Clerks Union, which sought affiliation with the ALP. The meeting was stacked. They voted to let the branch council of the union decide the issue of affiliation. Previously, the membership was promised a plebiscite, but that went straight out the door. The Socialist Left leadership voted for affiliation with the ALP. Mr Goss and Mr McLean helped the Socialist Left to overpower the democratic rights of the members of that union. I wonder why. What was in it for them? Let me talk about brown paper bags or even red paper bags containing \$20,000, which was stolen directly from the pockets of union members. When this Government talks about honesty and accountability, it should get away from the double standards.

As to due process in elections—most decent people would say, "Don't make me laugh." Labor's attitude to another election was much more interesting. I refer to the 1986 Liquor Trades Union ballot, which was rigged. Honourable members have probably read about that. Brian Elton, the secretary, and Colin Hardy, the assistant secretary, were convicted of electoral fraud.

Empty ballot-boxes were picked up from hotels and taken to smoke-filled rooms. I wonder who the biggest fan of Elton and Hardy was. It was our friend opposite, a Minister of the Crown, the Minister for Tourism, Bob Gibbs, who very openly and very vigorously backed them and took from them election funds. That was illegally obtained money because at that time the LTU did not have a political objects fund.

What was Labor's honest, open and accountable answer to this? It changed the law. That is what our friend the Minister for Industrial Relations did recently. He changed the law and made everything okay so that that illegal donation was retrospectively legal. That is another example of one law for the Labor Party and another law for the rest of the community.

That is not the end of Labor's deceit in relation to that election, because our good friend the Minister for Tourism is not a bad driver. He was the chauffeur for Hamish Linacre. He drove him around to pick up the empty ballot-boxes and take them to the Melbourne Hotel. Linacre had been involved in helping the union with some computerisation work. He ended up being the campaign manager for Elton and Hardy. I wonder again who their good mate was. It was the fourth musketeer, our good friend the Minister, Bob Gibbs.

A fellow named Mal Francis knows all about it. He was to give evidence at the Cooke inquiry. Unfortunately, he suffered a memory lapse, one of those things that happen when one is asked not to perform or not to appear. He suffered a memory lapse

because he did not want to appear before the Cooke inquiry. I wonder why. It was a pity. I do not suppose he can actually be blamed.

Do honourable members remember John Curtis, the returning officer who actually blew the whistle on the rigging of that election? He suffered enormous harassment. He received more than 100 nuisance phone calls; his home was broken into twice; and a fire nearly destroyed his home. When asked at the Cooke inquiry who was responsible for that, he said that he believed it was people connected with Elton and Hardy. What really fine company our good Minister opposite keeps! He keeps good company with house-breakers, arsonists and abusive phone-callers.

Mr Gibbs interjected.

Mr COOPER: That got him going.

As I was saying, he kept company with abusive phone-callers and convicted ballot-riggers. It was a ballot that he helped to rig, because he was the driver. Let us remember the driver.

Mr Gibbs: Tell us about the call girl you had upstairs.

Mr COOPER: Listen to it. He loves to get down into the gutter.

Mr Gibbs: The one you sent the roses and chocolates to.

Mr COOPER: He loves to get into the gutter. We are getting close to home.

Let us not talk about rigged elections, missing documents, missing filing cabinets and all those sorts of things. Members opposite are not what they claim to be. They say one thing and do another. Earlier, the Opposition pinged them off in relation to taxes and charges. They lied to the people. The list goes on forever. Yet one of the people involved in the Ministry of this so-called very open and accountable Government was a driver for the hit men. About four or five of them can now be lined up on this question of accountability. It means nothing to this Government. There is one law for them and another law for the rest of the community.

If the Government requires information about the location of the redistribution working papers or documents from 1985, I simply say: ask the people who have a direct knowledge. Ask them, and stop all the fuss. Also, at the same time, look for Ned Hanlon's 1949 working papers. Let us keep it all nice and fair. The Government started it; let us finish it at the other end all nicely wrapped up, with the history of everyone who is involved.

Clearly, the National Party's submission is the only truly democratic proposition that is before the EARC commissioners at this time. The National Party has said—and said it very simply—that no Government should be elected in Queensland unless it enjoys majority support, that is, 50 per cent plus one. I do not think anything could be more democratic than that.

Finally, I challenge the ALP to support the Opposition's amendment. It will have great difficulty doing so. I also challenge the Government to state whether it supports majority government. There is nothing wrong with that. The Government should be able to move away from the aspect of minority government and support something that is truly democratic. In addition, I challenge the ALP to support EARC's recommendations on the electoral system.

Mr BORBIDGE (Surfers Paradise—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (2.51 p.m.): It gives me great pleasure to second the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition. When the time comes for us to vote on this amendment, honourable members opposite have a simple choice to make. They can decide whether they want to play politics by refusing to accept the word of the Leader of the Opposition or they can support the amendment and give an unequivocal commitment to implement the electoral redistribution proposed by EARC in accordance with the commitment given by the National Party when it was in Government.

I want honourable members opposite to be perfectly clear about the proposal before them. The Leader of the Opposition's amendment means that the motion would read—

"That this House calls upon the Government to give an unequivocal undertaking to implement the recommendations of the EARC review into Queensland's electoral boundaries in line with the commitment given by the previous National Party Government."

It will be very interesting if today, or at some other time if the debate is adjourned, we witness the Government voting against the amendment proposed by the Leader of the Opposition. I will back our commitment to Fitzgerald reform against that of the Labor Party any day. We were the people in Government who were prepared to bite the bullet. We knew what had to be done. Regardless of the political repercussions, we went ahead and did it because we knew it was right.

Today, what does this House see in this farcical motion proposed by the Minister for Tourism, Racing, Sport and apparently other things? Leading the debate today was a discredited Minister, who has devalued the Goss Government's accountability and integrity to the level of a political peso, fresh from a ministerial tour of the Rugby internationals in New Zealand, which no doubt is completely in accordance with the guidelines for ministerial expenditure that the Premier of this State keeps hidden.

Mr GIBBS: I rise to a point of order. In the member's own interests, I advise him that last Friday evening I returned to Brisbane on a plane that landed at 5.15. I did not attend either of the Rugby internationals in New Zealand.

Mr BORBIDGE: I welcome the assurance given by the Minister. I understand that that was not his original intention. If he had a pang of conscience and decided to do the right thing, I welcome that and I look forward to reading in detail the report of his latest overseas ministerial expedition.

Mr Stephan: He may have been called back.

Mr BORBIDGE: He may have been called back, as the member for Gympie suggests.

The simple fact is that the Minister who led for the Government in this debate is the man who has the spectre of Mr Elton and Mr Hardie and the corruption of the Liquor Trades Union in Queensland threatening his very political survival. That is common knowledge and members on this side of the House know all about it. The Minister, who has been given the licensing laws to look after by Wayne Goss and Peter Coaldrake, is a man who, by his own admission, has associated with corrupt union officials in the Liquor Trades Union. This paragon of virtue sitting opposite decided to attack the Leader of the Opposition who, because of his short period of time on the fifteenth floor of the Executive Building, was unaware of where certain files may or may not have been located.

What is on trial today are the double standards and the hypocrisy of this Government. It has denigrated the CJC, but it seeks to embrace EARC and, in the process of embracing EARC, it interferes with it. When the CJC report into poker machines was released the Government did not want anything to do with it because its recommendations were not in accordance with the Labor Party's policy or with its grand plan. The Government rubbished the CJC. I understand that the Minister who led today's debate referred to that report as a Dickie report. I do not know what he will christen the EARC report when it is released.

Today, the Government has sought to interfere in the proper functioning of the Electoral and Administrative Review Commission. How? I will answer that question.

If EARC is so concerned about the missing files and the response given by the Leader of the Opposition, the executive director of the National Party or anyone else, the avenue is open for the commission to take the matter further. Is this House debating this matter today because EARC asked the Government that such a debate be brought

on? No. Today, this House is debating this matter as some sort of cheap political point scoring because Queensland has a Government that cannot get its act together. This morning, honourable members saw that sort of thing again. The notice paper contains 20 Bills. It is now 3 o'clock. Honourable members have not started work. This morning, honourable members saw once again the farce that is question-time. This House sees a Government that is——

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Campbell): Order! I believe that is a disgraceful comment against the Chair. This morning, a motion of condolence took up most of question-time, and to insinuate that the Chair or the Government had anything to do with that motion of condolence to avoid question-time is totally out of order.

Mr BORBIDGE: Mr Deputy Speaker, I was not reflecting on the Chair or the Speaker. I was referring to the ministerial statements that consumed the little bit of question-time that was left after the motion of condolence, and my comments did not reflect on the Chair. The Leader of the House was the subject of my attack and I ask you, Mr Deputy Speaker, to accept that assurance.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you.

Mr BORBIDGE: While I am on the subject, I would like to talk about the Labor Party's alleged commitment to electoral reform. The Opposition seeks from this Government an unequivocal assurance that it will implement the EARC redistribution no matter what it might be and that it will not discard that report as it has discarded the CJC report just because it is not consistent with this Government's policy. There is ample cause for concern. I will give the House a couple of examples.

I cite the comments made by the member for Albert, Mr Szczerbanik, in the *Gold Coast Bulletin* on 19 January wherein he stated that he would be in Government for a long time "after we get the boundaries right and get rid of pockets such as Runaway Bay and Paradise Point." That comment, made by the member for Albert on 19 January, has so far not been repudiated, rejected or challenged by the leader of his party, the Premier of Queensland. As at 21 August, no correction has been issued. No-one has said, "You are wrong. You are new. You should not say things like that." I pose the question: was the member for Albert really posing the Labor Party's real attitude towards the redistribution?

Recently, honourable members heard the incredible statements of Mr Hampson, the State secretary of the Australian Labor Party who went on Rod Henshaw's program——

Mr Beattie: He is a good man.

Mr BORBIDGE: A good man according to Mr Beattie.

Mr Hampson went on the Rod Henshaw program and stated——

"We are not standing in Landsborough or Sherwood because those seats will not exist after the redistribution."

How does he know?

To add insult to injury, after the Landsborough and Sherwood by-election results, in a rather uncommon token of congratulations to anyone who does not share his political philosophies, the Premier stated——

"I congratulate the Liberals on their victory, but it doesn't matter much because the seat won't be there after the redistribution."

The Premier's comments are totally consistent with the comments made by the member for Albert earlier this year. Now the Government has a chance to put the record right. I hope that every honourable member took notice of the quite honourable stand made by the Attorney-General when at least he was prepared to put his ministerial neck in

the EARC noose by indicating this morning that if the Government did not implement the redistribution——

Mr FitzGerald: Lock, stock and barrel.

Mr BORBIDGE: Lock, stock and barrel as it comes out of EARC, then he would do the right thing by the Westminster system.

A Government member interjected.

Mr BORBIDGE: Does the honourable member deny it? I can understand why there are a few white faces amongst Government members. The Attorney-General made that comment. I would be very interested to know, if the Cabinet decided not to implement the recommendations of EARC—if its recommendations were either not one vote, one value or otherwise not consistent with Labor Party policy—whether the Minister for Tourism would give the same commitment and do the honourable thing and resign. I do not hear an answer to that. Surely the subject of this debate is not redistributions in the past but redistributions in the future.

In order to put up a smokescreen, the Government wants to return to 1985 and search for missing pieces of paper. There is sufficient circumstantial evidence from the Premier and from one backbencher—and, as indicated by his silence, from the Minister for Tourism—that their commitment to implement EARC recommendations, if they are not to their liking, is more than a little wanting. Where is this Government's commitment not to interfere in the next electoral redistribution? The amendment proposed by the Leader of the Opposition gives the Government the opportunity to do that. It will be a very interesting political exercise if it decides to vote against the motion.

The debate has been brought on as an exercise in cheap political point-scoring. Twenty bills are listed on the notice paper and 11 Government members are listed to speak in this debate. Honourable members hear great cries from Government members about the evils of the gerrymander. Government members seem to have forgotten that, with 50.9 per cent of the primary vote, they are sitting in the Parliament with 60 per cent of the seats. Although there are issues of real moment that need to be addressed, the Government is employing diversionary tactics in order to disguise its inability to govern and to get on with the job.

As honourable members are debating redistributions, surely the first issue of real moment should be an unequivocal commitment from this Government that it is prepared to implement the recommendations handed down by the Electoral and Administrative Review Commission. Honourable members are waiting for that assurance. That is the question before the Parliament and before the people of Queensland. If it suits the Government to adopt a recommendation of the EARC report, it will do that. However, when the other child of Tony Fitzgerald, the Criminal Justice Commission, handed down a report that Government members did not like, they vilified the person who wrote the report. They placed the Chairman of the Parliamentary Committee for Criminal Justice in an invidious position, and they went all out to denigrate the report.

I reiterate that, if EARC is unhappy with the National Party's response, that is a matter for EARC. It is not a matter about which the Government can use its numbers to attempt to unduly influence or direct EARC. The actions taken today and the comments made by the Minister for Tourism and the Attorney-General impinge upon the independence of the commission. I challenge Government members to support the amendment proposed by the Leader of the Opposition. It is all very simple. Government members have only to say, "We support whatever those recommendations might be in regard to the new electoral system in Queensland." When the National Party was in Government, its members were prepared to do that. We were quite happy to give that absolute, unfettered commitment. Very often, the rhetoric spoken by Government members is empty and a long way from the decisions that they take around the Cabinet table and in the caucus room.

The motion moved by the Minister for Tourism is nothing more than a political stunt. The amendment proposed by the Leader of the Opposition attempts to provide the opportunity for members of the Government to give the same commitment to the people of Queensland that the former National Party Government was prepared to give last year.

Mr ELDER (Manly) (3.05 p.m.): Let us return to the subject of the debate, which is the mystery files. Honourable members have heard the ramblings of both the Leader of the Opposition and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, yet they have not addressed the issue. Where are these mystery files? At this stage, no one—including the Leader of the Opposition, who is now leaving the Chamber—knows of their whereabouts. In the popular press, the matter is being referred to as the case of the mystery files. It has well proved to be a mystery. It looks and reads more like the chapters of an Agatha Christie novel than a request for official documents from the Chairman of EARC.

The cast list of suspects is endless. One red herring after another is being drawn across the trail. Each character throws suspicion upon the next. For example, when Mr John Greenway, the senior project officer of EARC, asked Mr Kross of the director-general's office for the files, Mr Kross advised him that they had been sent to the Premier's office after the electoral commission had finished its work in 1985.

Mr Graham Hartley, secretary of the 1985 electoral commission, confirmed that the filing cabinet, which was full of papers detailing the redistribution process, had been given to Mr Brian Pendrigh, who was a senior public servant in the Premier's Department. Mr Pendrigh said that he recalled the filing cabinet but was unaware of its whereabouts. He then suggested that Ms Wendy Armstrong, who is now an aide to the Leader of the Opposition and was a principal player in the 1985 electoral redistribution, may have further information. Ms Armstrong suggested that persons who cleaned Mr Cooper's office after the 1989 election may know the whereabouts of the filing cabinet. Mr Greenway also contacted Mr Peter Anemaat, who was previously the principal private secretary to Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen. He also recalls the missing cabinet but does not know of its current whereabouts. Mr Anemaat suggested as a last resort that maybe Mr Eric Rigby, the secretary and clerk of Executive Council, may just know. Unfortunately we have not, even in today's proceedings, got any warmer.

Sir Joh says that he knows nothing about the missing files. The Leader of the Opposition says that he did not even know that the files existed, so he is supposedly clean. Honourable members have picked up the vital clue, of course, because Miss Armstrong points the finger very clearly. In this case, since it is not the butler who did it, it has to be the cleaner. In this case, the cleaner has to be the Namco napper.

Indeed, according to the scenario we have had from Opposition members, somewhere in Queensland a little old lady is blissfully using the top two drawers of a filing cabinet to house her excess linen and in the bottom two drawers are the missing files that are the subject of this Statewide Clayton's search by the National Party. I do not know that they are searching at all. I seriously doubt it.

In 1983, the National Party won power in its own right for the first time. It was regarded as a freak result. Many of the political pundits of the day said that it would never be repeated. But the National Party at the time had a big ace up its sleeve which was, of course, the 1985 redistribution. The purpose behind the National Party's submission for the 1985 redistribution was twofold: as National Party member and strategist, Don Lane, said in his report, to corral Labor votes into safe Labor districts; and to reduce further the Liberal Party's chances of increasing its representation.

The National Party did not shirk the use of Government departments to compile a cute proposal to put to the electoral commission. The south-east redistribution team, which comprised Don Lane, Brian Austin and Jenny Russell, explained in December 1984 in a letter to Sir Robert Sparkes, as appears in the report, that the findings were as accurate as humanly possible because they had used a computer print-out obtained from the State

electoral roll. Indeed, the whole strategy for the south-east redistribution team was based on bringing about a reduction of quota in the south-east zone in order to maximise non-Labor seats that could be won. Of course, history shows that the proposal was successful as the number of seats was increased from 82 to 89.

An example is Brisbane Central. It is indicative of the way they went about their business. As the Minister for Tourism, Sport and Racing said, Brisbane Central is summed up in the way in which Sparkes and Holm were told by Lane, Austin and Russell that, in the redistribution, it would become the dumping ground of Labor votes in the centre of Brisbane. That was not bad, I suppose, for the person who was member for Brisbane Central. Lane worked out that, to produce the largest number of anti-Labor seats in the Brisbane area, it was necessary to increase the number of seats from 47 to 51. Despite that fact, the Nationals felt somewhat cheated by this increase, so two seats were added to the country zone and one to the outer zone as compensation. It was good old National Party politics. There was nothing about democracy or fair representation. So much for their lofty ideals.

I should also like to refer to Redlands. I would be very interested to read the submission to see how much fine-tuning took place after the former Attorney-General, Paul Clauson, narrowly won the Redlands by-election by 213 votes. It has always been an accepted principle that, in properly drawn redistributions, natural boundaries and community of interest would be determining factors. Because the old seat of Redlands was considerably over quota with some 36 000 voters on the roll, it was believed—certainly by us—that it would be split in the coming redistribution and that, most likely, the natural boundaries would be used, and they were Hilliards Creek on one side and Tingalpa Creek on the other.

This would have created two seats within the old Redlands electorate, both situated within the Redland Shire, and would satisfy the natural boundary and community of interest criteria. However, the boundaries would have unfortunately placed the newly elected Paul Clauson in an area which consistently returned a strong Labor vote, so the boundaries were drawn up on the artificial and gerrymandered Redland Shire Council division boundaries. The suburbs of Capalaba, Alexandra Hills, Thorneside and Birkdale were placed in the same seat with the bayside suburbs of Manly and Lota. This created the new seat of Manly, which I now represent. That occurred despite the fact that Capalaba and Alexandra Hills were among the fastest growth areas at the time and that the seat of Manly, on its creation, was in fact the largest seat. So it is obvious that a fair amount of fine-tuning was done. Members of the National Party must thank Don Lane. He was brilliant at fine-tuning. They must give him that.

Mr FitzGerald: Which was the fastest growing area? Was yours the fastest growing? No!

Mr ELDER: The fastest growing districts were those in the Redland Shire, and they were pushed into Manly just to help Paul Clauson to get over the hurdle on the next occasion, which he did, but only by a couple of hundred votes.

More than 50 submissions were made to the 1985 electoral commissioners. Both the Liberal and Labor Parties made their proposals available to the media. At the time and subsequently, many others became public submissions when the Federal Government called for submissions on electoral equality prior to the 1988 referendum. A number of those organisations that lodged submissions in 1985 lodged them again in 1988. The National Party, however, has not made its submission public and it now appears that it will never be made public because the files have gone missing. Can honourable members believe that the most professional political organisation at that time did not keep a copy of its 1985 redistribution submission?

Mr Beattie: It is impossible to believe, isn't it?

Mr ELDER: It is impossible to believe. According to the "I don't know, I wasn't there" National Party director, Mr Crooke, he is unable to find a copy in his files, so obviously a copy was not kept. Opposition members are trying to tell us that the National

Party did not keep a copy of its 1985 submission. All other parties kept a copy of their submissions, because they were used again for the 1988 referendum proposal. It stretches the imagination just a tiny bit.

Mr Barber: His name is Mr Crooke.

Mr ELDER: Mr Crooke. It would appear, however, that all is not lost. We can rely on the words of our old "friend", Mr Don Lane, who said of the report—

"The end production of the electoral commissioners was very close to the National Party's submission."

Mr FitzGerald interjected.

Mr ELDER: I want to make sure that the member for Lockyer heard what I have to say, so I will repeat it. Don Lane said that the end product of the electoral commissioners was very close to the National Party's submission. A member of the National Party would have to congratulate Mr Lane who, together with his south-east redistribution committee, certainly did a good job.

The missing documents are not the property of the National Party. They are important historical records. They were, and are, public documents. Not only is their disappearance an obstruction to EARC and its investigation of electoral laws and electoral reform in this State, but it also strikes at the very heart of the most important reform recommended by Tony Fitzgerald—to stamp out, once and for all, electoral corruption. As Leader of the National Party and Premier at the time when the files disappeared, Mr Cooper must be prepared to accept responsibility and public condemnation for the loss of those documents. It is not sufficient for a man in his position to claim that he did not know the files existed, much less that they were missing.

Miss Wendy Armstrong admits that she knew that the files existed. She is now Mr Cooper's close aide, and she admits that she knew the files existed. Indeed, over a number of years she had a close interest in the files in the filing cabinet. I wish to comment on what was said about Miss Armstrong. She is referred to occasionally in comments made by Peter Coaldrake, who states—

"Armstrong, a research officer. . . was formerly employed at National Party headquarters. After joining departmental staff, she maintained a close working relationship with Sir Robert while also coming to be regarded as one of the members of Sir Joh's 'kitchen cabinet'."

He is talking about Miss Armstrong who is a close personal friend of Sir Joh's and part of his kitchen Cabinet. Professor Coaldrake goes on to state—

"Armstrong, who remained with the Premier's Department following Bjelke-Petersen's demise, is employed as a contract public servant, but in her role in the department is widely regarded as directly political.

Armstrong enjoys access to the contents"—

or did enjoy access—

"of the cabinet bag and is a person in whom both government ministers and backbenchers"—
although they have dropped off a lot—

"turn to for advice and assistance, especially when they are in trouble."

Miss Armstrong is someone who is now employed as an aide and who, at the relevant time, had about as much clout as most former National Party Ministers. The book actually states that in the working of the system, she had access to Cabinet bags.

Mr FitzGerald: Who wrote that?

Mr ELDER: I told the honourable member earlier—Peter Coaldrake. The honourable member is not listening.

Professor Coaldrake goes on to state—

"Armstrong, who in the past has worked at National Party headquarters,"—

I like this bit, which states—

"is reported to have played an important part in revising zone boundaries across the State."

Not only does she look in Cabinet bags; she also has responsibility for redistributions in this State. Heavens above!

Mr Gibbs: Would you say she was a good chance of being a recipient of flowers and chockies from Mr Cooper?

Mr ELDER: And valentines.

Mr FitzGerald: Cut it out! Cut the bloody rot out, you mob of mongrels. Mr Deputy Speaker, this is despicable, this type of innuendo about the Leader. You can't allow this. You can't have this in this House. That is not on. We can't cop that in this place. They are nothing but a mob of mongrels.

Mr ELDER: The member for Lockyer should listen to this.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Hollis): Order!

Mr ELDER: I am disappointed that the member for Lockyer is interjecting, because I would like him to hear what I have to say.

In 1987, Miss Armstrong requested that the old filing cabinet be removed to the office of the former Premier, Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen. After the demise of Sir Joh, the cabinet was taken back to the 3rd floor of the Executive Building. Almost immediately, it was again returned to the office of the Premier on the 15th floor. Guess who ordered that? It was done at the direction of Wendy Armstrong.

It would appear to be almost unbelievable that, having demonstrated such a single-minded interest and concern over the whereabouts of this cabinet and its contents for a number of years, Miss Armstrong lost total interest in its whereabouts and its contents after the defeat of the National Party Government. Indeed, one would be inclined to wonder whether or not the allegations contained in Peter Coaldrake's book *Working The System* were true. If this were the case, perhaps Miss Armstrong, along with Mr Cooper and other members of the National Party, has a strong vested interest in seeing that the filing cabinet is never recovered and always remains undiscovered.

In order to fully implement the spirit of the Fitzgerald recommendations in relation to electoral reform, the redistribution must not only be fair but also be seen to be fair. All submissions must be laid open to public scrutiny. Mr Cooper and his National Party colleagues stand condemned not only for their action but also because it leads to a total disregard of public accountability, particularly in relation to these documents and the filing cabinet.

Put simply, we are talking about public documents and the working papers concerning the 1985 redistribution in Queensland, which include the National Party's submission. As I said earlier, surprise, surprise—the National Party has not kept copies of its submission! Mr Cooper is trying to pretend otherwise, but this is a serious matter. Mr Cooper is implicated in the disappearance of these documents because, as a former Premier, they were in his office at one stage. At all stages of the process, that fact is verified by Miss Wendy Armstrong, who says that she certainly has no doubt in her mind about the crucial points in relation to this disappearance. The documents were in former Premier Cooper's office on the 15th floor of the Executive Building and they were there up until the day after the election.

At this stage, EARC has produced a draft report. The chairman, Mr Sherman, has indicated that release of the material in draft form will enable the commission to consider comments from individuals and organisations with particular knowledge of the issues

involved. Of course, this gives members of the National Party who have knowledge of the issues involved a chance to come clean. Either the documents are hidden or they have been lost, stolen or destroyed. Members of the National Party have a chance to clear the matter up "lock, stock and filing cabinet".

The last reference that I wish to make is to a recommendation in the Fitzgerald report dealing with public accountability and the lack of records. Mr Fitzgerald pointed out—

"The ultimate check on public maladministration is public opinion, which can only be truly effective if there are structures and systems designed to ensure that it is properly informed. A Government can use its control of Parliament and public administration to manipulate, exploit and misinform the community, or to hide matters from it. Structures and systems designed for the purpose of keeping the public informed must therefore be allowed to operate as intended.

Secrecy and propaganda are major impediments to accountability, which is the prerequisite for the proper functioning of the political process. Worse, they are the hallmarks of a diversion of power of the Parliament.

Information is the lynch-pin of the political process. Knowledge is, quite literally, power. If the public is not informed, it cannot take part in the political process with any real effect."

The Leader of the Opposition should explain why the files are missing and where they are.

Mr BEANLAND (Toowong—Leader of the Liberal Party) (3.23 p.m.): It is well known that the Liberal Party stands for genuine, open and accountable electoral reform. During the redistribution in 1985, the Liberal Party made public its electoral submissions. At that time, after a number of public statements, the Liberal Party was unable to persuade the National Party to make its submissions to the electoral commission public. Recently, the Liberal Party met with officials from EARC and gave to that commission the party's submissions, maps and other information that was required.

Recently in this country, there has been a history of public accountability with submissions relating to electoral redistribution. Submissions to electoral commissions have been made public. Those submissions should be made public so that the world at large is aware of the views that are being put forward on electoral boundaries and redistribution. After all, what is the secret in relation to those matters? They hardly deal with individuals' financial affairs; they deal with matters of which everyone should be aware. People should argue their case before the commission and they should reveal to the public what is contained in their submission.

In the 1985 redistribution, the Liberal Party made its submission public. However, at that time the ALP presented a Clayton's submission. I am pleased to see Mr Beattie in the Chamber. He was the draftsman of that Clayton's submission. At the time, he was the secretary of the ALP. In that submission, Mr Beattie carried out a tirade against the existing boundaries, the existing system and the existing Government. It was not a very in-depth submission; it contained only a couple of pages.

Mr Beattie: A brilliant submission.

Mr BEANLAND: There was no gloss attached to it at all. It was a shameful performance by Mr Beattie. It showed that the ALP could not care less, because it was in the business of playing politics. It was not making a serious submission. However, at least it was made public, for what it was worth. It was not worth very much, as Mr Beattie knows, and as do the rest of the community who cast their minds back to that period.

There is no point in Mr Beattie or other members of the ALP talking about their submission to the 1985 electoral commission.

Mr Beattie interjected.

Mr BEANLAND: It is not a laughing matter; it is serious. The submission reveals that the ALP did not want to show its hand at that time; it wanted to hide behind a curtain and not indicate to the public generally where it stood on that important issue.

I turn to the current situation that has brought this issue before the Parliament. One cannot help but notice that Mr Cooper was the Minister who had the files under his control. Today, he indicated that he has no knowledge of where the papers might be. Whether that is the case or not, nevertheless, he was the Minister responsible for them and it is disappointing to hear the remarks that he has made about the matter.

I cannot work out why the filing cabinets were being moved from one floor to the other in the first place. The submissions belonged to the Government, not merely the political party in power at the time. They ought to have been with the other Government records. They did not belong to the Premier or to a particular Minister. However, the Premier at the time, Mr Cooper, was responsible for the files.

In the EARC document titled *A History of the Queensland Zonal Electoral System* dated August 1990, a letter to Mr Finger from Mr Sherman, the Chairman of EARC, dated 18 April states in the fifth paragraph—

"Mr Pendrigh has indicated that he recalls the filing cabinet but is unaware of what had happened to it. He suggested that Wendy Armstrong, currently at the Office of the Leader of the Opposition, may have further information. Ms Armstrong indicated that she remembers the filing cabinet but does not know what became of it. She suggested that the persons who cleaned out Mr Cooper's office after the December election may know where it is."

That statement speaks volumes. I do not believe that people who clean offices remove records such as that. Those were Government records and should not have been in a position in which they could be destroyed in the first instance. The explanations offered today have been disappointing. Why was the filing cabinet on that floor in the first place? Elsewhere in the report, it is revealed that the cabinet was on floor 3, it went up to floor 15, back to floor 3 and then back up to floor 15.

I have some knowledge about the way in which Government should be run. These submissions are not the personal possession of any particular Minister or Government. They belong to the Government of this State—the people of this State.

I also found it a little strange that the National Party itself has no records of the submissions. As I have indicated, the Liberal Party had no difficulty making its submissions available to EARC. It did that quite freely. The Liberal Party's submissions were also made public at the time. I have commented on Mr Beattie's submissions on behalf of the ALP. Despite the paucity of them, I am sure that those couple of pages have been made readily available—

Mr Beattie: A brilliant couple of pages.

Mr BEANLAND: I am glad that Mr Beattie agrees with me that it was only a couple of pages. That is hardly a worthy submission to EARC.

Mr BEATTIE: I rise to a point of order. I simply want to say that I—

Mr FitzGerald: You have no right to make a speech.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Hollis): Order! I wish to hear the honourable member's point of order.

Mr BEATTIE: I take exception to the remarks insinuating that I or the Labor Party at that time was not serious about the redistribution submission. That suggestion is totally untrue and I ask that it be withdrawn.

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

Mr BEANLAND: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. I am disappointed that the honourable member has wasted some of my time.

I will return to the serious aspects of the matter. I have referred to the flimsy submission that was made by the ALP at that time. I think that the people of Queensland want to see EARC get on with this inquiry, since it has been charged with that responsibility. I will say more about that shortly. Unlike the National Party and the Labor Party, which have said that they will abide by the recommendations of the EARC, the Liberal Party has never given any such indication. The Liberal Party has always indicated that throughout the State it wants a system of one zone with one quota and a plus or minus of 10 per cent outside that quota. I will deal with that more fully in a moment. That is where the Liberal Party differs from the ALP and the National Party. That position is well known. It has been the position of the Liberal Party for many, many years.

The record of the ALP in relation to public inquiries is hardly pristine or pure. A lot has been said about the Cooke inquiry report. One Cooke inquiry report related to the FEDFU. That report was censored at the time by the ALP—

Government members interjected.

Mr BEANLAND: I can understand why I am getting so many interjections. Many members have referred to that already.

Had the previous Government censored the Fitzgerald inquiry, one could understand what would have been said by members of the ALP inside and outside this place. They would have been calling for demonstrations and riots in Queen Street and right throughout the State. That is exactly what would have happened. Honourable members will remember the commotion that was kicked up as it was, and the continual requests by the ALP for the Government to agree to every single item contained in the Fitzgerald report. The ALP wanted the Fitzgerald report to be accepted lock, stock and barrel. The Premier of the day accepted it lock, stock and barrel. However, I have noticed how quiet the present Labor Government is when it comes to accepting the recommendations of the Cooke inquiry lock, stock and barrel. Not a word is said. The silence is deafening.

It is fine for members of the Government to publicly belittle the commissioner. Other Ministers in other States in this nation have been called to account for abuse of commissioners of inquiry. In fact, it has been said that they may be in contempt of the commission of inquiry. I believe that some of the remarks that are being made by Ministers of this Government are certainly in contempt of the inquiry. They are making every effort to bully the current Cooke inquiry. Efforts are being made to belittle the commissioner at every turn. The Government is even trying to turn off the financial tap to the commissioner by making public statements about matters that would normally be dealt with in a private context. Everyone knows that the Government is doing that because the Cooke inquiry is an inquiry into the ALP, into election-rigging and into ballot-boxes. The Vice-president of the ALP, Mr Goodhew, has appeared before the inquiry. It is known, for example, that while the State election was being held, he delayed the matter before the courts for a couple of months so that it would not blow up in the ALP's face.

Apart from being an inquiry into the Labor unions, the Cooke inquiry is also an inquiry into senior officials of the ALP and senior officials of Labor unions, who in turn have a very close relationship with the ALP. That is the truth of the matter. The timing of the appeal to the Federal Court by Mr Goodhew fits perfectly; it ensured that those matters would not come before the Cooke inquiry until after the election results were known. That was done to ensure that those matters were swept under the carpet for those couple of months. That is a very serious matter.

The Cooke inquiry is also examining the Liquor Trades Union. I understand that the Liquor Trades Union has a close relationship with the Socialist Left. That union will be a major beneficiary when poker machines are introduced. I again challenge the Minister and the Premier to give a categorical undertaking—one of those lock, stock and barrel undertakings that they wanted of the previous Government in relation to the Fitzgerald inquiry—that this Government will implement the recommendations of the

Cooke inquiry lock, stock and barrel. So far we have seen anything but that. Mr Cooke spoke about the need to set up special accounts—special funds—regarding political objects. The Hanger report also wanted a separation of union funds that could be used for campaign or political purposes. That has not been done. That has all been swept under the carpet. Of course, the ALP has moved on.

There has been a concerted attempt to browbeat the commissioner and the Cooke inquiry generally. The same thing happened with the CJC when it produced its report on poker machines. In fact, on the day the report was released, or the day after, I well remember Mr Goss saying, "We will have to have a look at this report. We might not proceed with poker machines. It will take us some time to consider the matter." The next day, the Minister for Tourism was saying that poker machines are a great thing and that we must have them, and he was supported by Mr Goss. He obviously got done over totally in the factional brawl, because the Socialist Left won again.

The ALP has done nothing but bully the CJC, which has been attacked at every turn. As many members would be aware, the CJC was attacked to such an extent that motions were moved in this House in support of the chairman of the Parliamentary Committee for Criminal Justice. If this Government does not agree with the recommendations from public inquiries, it attacks, rubbishes and bullies the commissioners at every turn.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Hollis): Order! The Leader of the Liberal Party will return to speaking to the motion, which does not relate to EARC and the CJC.

Mr BEANLAND: For many years the Liberal Party has made clear its position on the issue of electoral reform. It is no secret. The summary of the Liberal Party's recommendations to the EARC states that the Liberal Party recommends the abolition of the zonal system and its replacement by a system that is based on a single average enrolment. The Liberal Party believes that the size of the Queensland Parliament should be set at 82 seats. Neither in 1985 nor since then has the Liberal Party supported an increase in the number of members in the Queensland Parliament. However, the ALP wants an additional 10 members.

The Liberal Party recommended to EARC that a redistribution be held when more than one quarter of the electorates have enrolments of more than 10 per cent outside the quota, and that subsequent redistributions should not be held until each particular set of boundaries has remained in force for at least two elections. The number of seats in the Parliament should remain at 82 until the average enrolment increases from 20 000 to 30 000. A review of the number of seats should occur at that time. The Liberal Party recommends also that the maximum variation from the quota should be 10 per cent. The Liberal Party believes that enrolled electors rather than population should be the basis for this and future redistributions and that EARC should undertake the redistribution to come into effect from the election that is due in 1992. As well, the Liberal Party supports an independent commission to undertake future redistributions.

The Liberal Party has never said that it will support totally any recommendation of EARC in relation to the electoral system. Although the Liberal Party supports the review of the boundaries by EARC, I make it clear that—certainly prior to 1985—the Liberal Party has always supported a single zonal system and one quota for the whole of the State. The maximum variation from the quota should be no more than 10 per cent. If the EARC recommends another system such as a multiconstituency system or a two-zonal system, I wonder what other parties in this Parliament will do. The Liberal Party certainly does not support such proposals.

The Liberal Party has always strongly supported the contention that members in country areas should receive additional assistance. I refer to 008 telephone numbers, two or three electorate officers and assistants, additional charter flights and additional funds.

The Cook electorate in far-north Queensland is almost eight times as large as the Roma electorate. It contains more electors than does the Warwick electorate, which is

within a couple of hours' drive of Brisbane. I wonder what the ALP will do if this Parliament does not obtain an additional 10 members. Honourable members do not want to see the electoral boundaries rorted again.

Mr Welford: We will support you.

Mr BEANLAND: I hope that members of the Government will support the Liberal Party's strong position. I welcome the honourable member's support. Honourable members should remember that, in 1949, the ALP introduced the zonal system. We should not return to that system simply to keep the factional players happy.

Less than three weeks ago, the Premier, Mr Goss, indicated that the electorates of Landsborough and Sherwood were going to be eliminated; that he had prior knowledge and that he would interfere with the independent commission. I understood explicitly what Mr Goss said on the radio. He was trying to express definite views to the commission. However, I know that the commissioners will remain independent and above the attempts of the ALP to bully them.

The Liberal Party does not support the amendment. It does not intend to agree with whatever recommendation the EARC makes. The amendment calls on this Parliament to support the electoral boundaries review system in view of the commitment that was given by the previous National Party Government. The National Party might be giving that commitment, but the Liberal Party has never done so, nor does it intend to. I repeat: the Liberal Party does not support "lock, stock and barrel" or in any other fashion whatever EARC might decide. The Liberal Party's position has been quite clear. If EARC recommends such a system, the Liberal Party will certainly support it. If EARC does not, the Liberal Party certainly will not be supporting it. I make that perfectly clear to everyone in this place.

The Liberal Party's position in relation to the missing files was made perfectly clear last week when I issued a press statement and spoke to some of the media. It is important that my remarks be placed on the record because this is not something that the Liberal Party has just come up with because the National Party has moved an amendment to a motion in relation to it.

In my press release I stated—

"It is simply not good enough for such important evidence to just vanish into thin air.

I fear that this evidence may have been destroyed. If this is the case, then EARC should launch an investigation into who destroyed these important files."

I said that on Friday when this matter was first brought to my attention. I believe that EARC should pursue that particular course of action.

I think the Liberal Party's position has been made quite clear on this issue. It is not much use the ALP doing a lot of crowing about this, because its position in relation to public inquiries, the Fitzgerald reform process, the CJC, the Cooke inquiry and so forth is hardly one to crow about or shout about. In fact, nothing could be further from the truth. The ALP does not have a very good record in relation to such matters. I hope that it improves.

After all, but nine months ago the ALP gave a clear commitment to the people of Queensland that it would adhere to the Fitzgerald reforms and ensure that the Fitzgerald reform process was carried through. If the ALP were given no other mandate for any other election commitment, it was certainly given a mandate to ensure that the Fitzgerald reform process was carried out. It was certainly "the" issue of the last State election.

Mr FOLEY (Yeronga) (3.47 p.m.): We must never again allow crucial electoral redistribution evidence to go missing. This sorry event is powerful evidence of the failure of the state of the law in 1985. Whatever be the deliberations, we must ensure that we put in place a structure of law which does not allow the vital electoral redistribution evidence to disappear into thin air.

Elections are of fundamental importance because they are the means by which the will of the people is converted into the structure of Government. That process requires a just approach, and publicity is the very soul of justice. The electoral process must be public if it is to be just.

The Electoral Districts Act of 1985, under which the redistribution in question was carried out, failed to provide the structure of law necessary to ensure that this extraordinary absence of evidence could not occur. In that Act the duty of the commissioners is set out at section 16. Their duty entails the making of a complete or partial redistribution in the manner provided by that Act.

Furthermore, under section 23 of the Act in operation, the commissioners reported not to the Parliament but to the Premier. What a remarkable contrast with the provisions of the current legislation under which the Electoral and Administrative Review Commission is proceeding.

Under section 2.23 (2) (b) of the current Act the duty of the Electoral and Administrative Review Commission includes a duty to make available to the public all submissions, objections and suggestions made to it in the course of its discharging its functions and otherwise act openly if to do so would be in the public interest and fair. That is to say that we will not have to wait five years merely to discover that the electoral evidence has gone missing; the people of Queensland have the chance to see the submissions to that commission as they are being made.

In whatever future structure may be established, if it be an independent electoral commission, as has been suggested, we must guard jealously the law requiring publicity of submissions, for without that we come to repose in some public officer—in this case, the Premier—a responsibility which can be grossly abused.

History is entitled to judge the process of electoral redistribution that occurred in 1985. Yet the citizens of Queensland are denied access to the vital evidence.

Mr Booth: Why is it vital? You said it was vital evidence. You tell me why it is vital.

Mr FOLEY: The evidence in the report from the honourable member's former colleague Mr Lane suggested that the end result was very close to the submission. It follows by way of inference that it is likely to have been instrumental in the developing of the final submission. It follows as a plain matter of inference, and that we are grateful for, because were we not to have the benefit of that oral presentation from Mr Lane we would be completely in the dark as to what the nature of the submission was.

It is very important that the open, accountable approach be enshrined in any future system of law. I commend the motion to the House.

Mr FITZGERALD (Lockyer) (3.52 p.m.): I join in this debate with deep regret. This House has not sat for a couple of weeks. When it resumed today it dealt with a condolence motion, ministerial statements, answers to two questions, the Matters of Public Interest debate and then this motion, to which an amendment has been moved, was moved by the Honourable Bob Gibbs and seconded by the Attorney-General. The issue raised by Mr Gibbs and Mr Wells has been well canvassed in the press. The only person in this House to whom that question was directed was the Leader of the Opposition. He made a statement, which he stands by, regarding those missing files. I believe that this debate is just a cheap political stunt.

I know that when members of the Opposition were in Government in the past, the Government would decide to attack the Opposition and give it a belting when Parliament was recalled. It gave the Government a warm inner glow but, when that action was looked at in the cold light of day, the Government did not really score too many points.

The Government has instituted this debate. It has a stack of legislation on the books, but all it is doing is trying to give the Opposition a belt. The Opposition moved an amendment that has become a problem for the Government. Should it or should it

not accept the Opposition's amendment? That is the political game that the Government is playing. It is a game of political point-scoring.

The members of this House owe more to the people of Queensland than to come into this place and undertake this point-scoring exercise. That is why I say it is regrettable that the House is debating this motion at this stage.

Referring again to the filing cabinet—the Leader of the Opposition has stated that he does not know where it is. I certainly do not know where it is. I asked the Attorney-General.

A Government member interjected.

Mr FITZGERALD: I did not say that.

I said to the Attorney-General, "How many filing cabinets are in your office?" He has a reasonably small office but he still said, "I don't know. I think there are about 10." He did not know. How does he expect a former Premier to know how many filing cabinets were in his office.

I offer, with a couple of my colleagues from the Opposition, to go up to the Executive Building, provided the Premier gives us the keys, and we will have a damned good look in all those filing cabinets to see if we can find the damned thing. If it is of such great moment, I am sure that in a couple of days a couple of us might be able to find some interesting things in those filing cabinets and, in all honesty and integrity, we will report our findings back to this House.

This debate is just a joke. The previous occupant of the chair allowed this to turn into a wide-ranging debate. When the Government decided to range wide and far in the debate, a point of order was taken from this side of the House and Mr Deputy Speaker, Mr Campbell, stated that he would allow a wide-ranging debate. In other words, he would not put the reins on because this House at times has had wide-ranging debates.

Honourable members only have to pick up the newspaper to discover what issues should be debated in this House. I cite an article from today's *Australian* headed, "Whole world held hostage by Hussein". How will that affect Queensland? What does this mean for Queensland, and for oil exploration? Why is this clown—this criminal—allowed to dictate to the world where the oil will be produced from? He is holding hostages. What impact will this have on the State? The Minister for Resource Industries should be speaking about encouraging oil exploration in this State. Today, those are the issues that members of the House should be debating.

Another issue that should concern members is the newspaper article entitled "Cuts loom in beef exports to Japan". Today's *Australian* contains to the side of the previous article a small article that might be of interest to the members of the Labor Party. Mr David Smith is now Sir David Smith, Knight Commander of the Royal Victorian Order. I know that that would not be a very nice subject to debate if one happened to be a Government member, and was soon to be an Opposition member.

Today's *Australian* contains the lead article headed, "Iraq shields army bases with hostages". It is a despicable act to use citizens of Australia as hostages. How many Queenslanders are in Iraq? Surely those issues should be debated in this House. The views of honourable members would be of interest but, alas, members are looking for a piece of metal. I admit that the Opposition is looking for the filing cabinet and Opposition members would like EARC to use all its powers to look for that filing cabinet. However, the members of this House should not be wasting time on that issue. EARC has all the necessary powers to do that.

Another issue I want to raise is that this House should be discussing the Australian article entitled "ACTU to oppose Mobil deal." Esso, which is a world-wide company and is a subsidiary of Exxon, has decided to get out of the oil industry in Australia. It has decided to sell its service stations and refinery establishments to Mobil. Bill Kelty, the secretary of the ACTU, is upset about this proposal.

Mr Gibbs: What has that got to do with it?

Mr FITZGERALD: What has this got to do with it! These are the issues that this House should be debating. The Minister is trying to defend Bill Kelty, his mate. Bill Kelty stated—

"I think we are then quite entitled to ask the Government why should we reform the waterfront . . ."

In other words, he thinks that issue should be negotiated again.

Mr Beattie interjected.

Mr FITZGERALD: I say that these are the issues that members should be debating.

I will refer to a couple of other points in this debate. The Opposition has asked the Government whether it will accept the findings of EARC. The Government went on at great length about how it supports electoral reform and criticised all the past redistributions, but one thing that must be remembered is that the former National Party Government established the Fitzgerald inquiry. When it was in Government it introduced the EARC legislation into this House and that established the mechanism for the current electoral review. No Labor Government could honestly claim that it had anything to do with the establishment of EARC at all. This Government cannot claim any of the honour or the glory.

At present, one Minister has said that he will resign unless the Government backs the findings of the EARC commission.

Mr Gibbs: He did not say that.

Mr FITZGERALD: I will have a good read of *Hansard* because I believe that the Minister did say that. Mr Speaker pulled me into line when I asked the Minister that question. As I had received a warning under Standing Order 123A for persistently interjecting—the Minister was not warned—my colleague beside me interjected. The Minister for Tourism keeps interjecting but never gets warned. When I kept on interjecting, as the Minister did, I got warned. One rule applies to this side of the House and another rule to the other side of the House. When somebody on this side of the House is talking members opposite never shut their mouths, yet they never ever get warned. Members on that side of the House have the protection of the chair, and they know it.

A previous speaker, the honourable member for Manly, maintained that it was a submission from the National Party that recommended during the 1985 redistribution that the number of seats in this House should be increased from 82 to 89, and the first election after that redistribution was in 1986. He cast some aspersions about the motive behind that move. He said that it was done to keep the Government in power and that that was the reason why the number of members in the House was increased by seven. I take his word for that.

If the member for Manly believes that is true, he would obviously understand that that is the reason why the Labor Party submitted that in a future redistribution, the number of seats should be increased from 89 to 99. Obviously, he is quite convinced that the reason why the National Party increased the number of seats by seven was to enable it to stay in power. However, the Labor Party wants to increase the number of seats by 10. What the member for Manly said was despicable. He should remember that, when he cites figures, they will come back to haunt him.

Mr Elder: That was a comment in the report.

Mr FITZGERALD: If the honourable member wishes to interject, he should do so from his correct seat.

The member for Manly also referred to a book entitled *Working the System*, which was written by Professor Coaldrake. I do not know the gentleman very well, but I have heard of him. If anyone was well and truly qualified to write that book *Working the System*, it was Professor Coaldrake.

It was despicable that the member for Manly attacked a public servant. The old ALP is coming to the fore. If members of the Labor Party do not like a report, they shoot the messenger, or the public servant who is responsible for it. Public servants cannot reply to or answer criticisms made of them. Government members should be very, very careful before they attack defenceless public servants, some of whom hold very high office.

The Leader of the Opposition has moved an amendment which calls upon the Government to give an unequivocal undertaking to implement the EARC review into Queensland electoral boundaries in line with the commitment given by the previous National Party Government. I support the amendment.

Dr CLARK (Barron River) (4.03 p.m.): I join my colleagues on this side of the House in condemning the Leader of the Opposition for his failure to provide documentation relating to the 1985 electoral redistribution. Unlike the member for Lockyer, I do not think that this debate is a waste of time. Any time spent on a debate that focuses on the need for electoral reform in Queensland is time well spent.

I have a particular interest in that infamous 1985 electoral redistribution that resulted in the Aboriginal community of Wujal Wujal being removed from my electorate and included in the electorate of Cook. Wujal Wujal now exists as an island in the northern part of my electorate. It now appears that I will never have the opportunity to scrutinise the rationale that was presumably put forward by the National Party to the electoral commissioners who were responsible for drawing up those boundaries. It is inconceivable that any independent body could have accepted an argument that the Wujal Wujal community should be part of the electorate of Cook. There are no cultural or economic reasons or any other reasonable, logical grounds whatsoever for including the Wujal Wujal community in the electorate of Cook.

The people of Wujal Wujal belong to the Kukulanaji tribe, as do the people of Mossman, which is to the south of my electorate. The centre of spiritual significance for those people in both the Mossman and Wujal Wujal communities is in the vicinity of the Roaring Meg Falls, again within my electorate. Another area of significance to the Wujal Wujal people who live within the electorate of Barron River is the old gazetted town of Degarra where burial sites are located. No such cultural links exist between the Wujal Wujal people and the Aboriginal people who live in the Cook electorate, nor are there located in the electorate of Cook any sacred sites that are relevant to the Wujal Wujal people.

In the absence of any anthropological evidence for the relocation of Wujal Wujal into the electorate of Cook, I ask: why did this happen? I can only imagine that it happened because the National Party directed the electoral commissioners to draw up the boundaries. Of course, that is why the National Party does not want the Government to know what happened to those missing files.

Why did the National Party direct the commissioner to remove Wujal Wujal from my electorate? If one refers to the debate in 1985 on the Electoral Districts Act Amendment Bill, the answer is not too difficult to find. There was much debate about Wujal Wujal. I congratulate the member for Ipswich, who in that debate had this to say of Mr Tenni—

"He does not want them, because his electorate is a marginal one and he knows that his performance as the Minister for Environment, Valuation and Administrative Services, particularly in relation to the fire levy, has brought total discredit upon his administration of that department. He knows that his electorate is waiting for the opportunity to throw him out, and he does not want to let the people of Wujal Wujal be a part of that joyous day at the next election when he gets booted out of this Chamber."

The member for Ipswich was correct in everything but the last supposition. In fact, Mr Tenni had to wait an extra election before that joyous occasion occurred.

Mr Bredhauer: And they celebrated.

Dr CLARK: I am sure that they did celebrate.

In that debate, there was much discussion about the actual result in Wujal Wujal. I looked at the results for that area, and the member for Ipswich was correct. Mr Tenni received only 33 per cent of the votes in that area. I looked for other reasons, too, for the changes that occurred in that 1985 redistribution. When honourable members consider Mr Tenni's record in this House and his utterances over the years in relation to Aboriginal people, they could only regard those statements as anti-Aborigine and racist in the extreme. If any honourable member wants to challenge me on that point, I have many examples to support what I am saying.

However, Wujal Wujal was not the only focus of Mr Tenni's attention. It is interesting to refer to the voting at all the polling booths. At that time, electors at 11 of the 33 polling booths voted Labor. After the redistribution, only three of those booths were left, one of which was at the Cairns Hospital. He did a very convincing job of transferring certain of those polling booths to the new seat of Tablelands, some to Cairns and Wujal Wujal to Cook.

I place on record that, even in the light of what happened in the Wujal Wujal community and the treatment those people received from Mr Tenni, I have been working steadily with the honourable member for Cook, Mr Steve Bredhauer, and the people at Wujal Wujal to address their concerns, and it is my hope and my intention that the people of Wujal Wujal and Mossman, at some time in the near future, get title or access to those sites of spiritual significance for them at Roaring Meg.

I finish by placing on record that never again must the National Party or any other party have its hand on the pen that draws electoral boundaries in Queensland. The Labor Party is on record as supporting an independent electoral commission and I look forward to the establishment of such a commission which will have the confidence of the people of Queensland to act impartially at all times to preserve democracy in Queensland.

Mr STONEMAN (Burdekin) (4.09 p.m.): I rise to express briefly my disappointment that the Government has steamrolled this motion before the House. As my colleague the honourable member for Lockyer put so eloquently and quietly, the motion has turned round and bitten the Government, and it will bite others as well. I refer particularly to the speech of the Leader of the Liberal Party, to which I will come in a moment.

It is of grave concern that this opportunity has been taken not only to steamroller the Opposition but also to dig the dirt out of the gutter and roll Opposition members in it. I believe in the spirit of the Fitzgerald report which, it has been noted, was set up by the National Party. It certainly would not have been set in place by any other party. Its recommendations have been followed to the letter by the National Party.

The Government, however, is trying to demean the processes that Mr Fitzgerald envisaged by creating a situation of committee member versus committee member concerning a process that is yet to come before the House. The honourable member for Barron River dealt in detail with something in her electorate. That is all very well, but we are talking about history, something that has gone. We are talking about a tin box.

Before I get onto that matter, however, I say that the Government has shown a great degree of contempt for the House by using the Minister for Tourism, Sport and Racing as the driver of this vehicle. To my mind, that is very strange because this matter does not come within his area of responsibility, his portfolio. We have, I guess we could call him, the thug of Cabinet in terms of his bullying tactics initiating this debate and exhibiting a demeanour that saddens all of us. That is a fact that we cannot walk away from. This man has used the forum of Parliament over the years, and particularly since becoming a Minister, to put people down publicly and to call their character into question without giving them the right of reply. Quite frankly, he is becoming increasingly disliked throughout the length and breadth of the State because of his bully-boy tactics.

The honourable member for Barron River would know, from the representations made to her about the way in which the Minister is carrying on, that he is tearing the racing industry apart and is tearing the community apart. Today he is being used again as the "bovver" boy to thump Opposition members and generally demean the processes of this Parliament.

Would he give to people such as the Mayor of Thuringowa, Dan Gleeson, respected and well-known businessman in north Queensland, David Carmichael, former member of the Harness Racing Board, Kevin O'Keefe and the people on the board of The Willows Racing Club, the same sort of opportunity that he has taken today to abuse the processes of this Parliament? I think not! He will not do it except in cowards' castle. Unfortunately, the Government has signalled its contempt for the processes of the Fitzgerald inquiry by putting forward this Minister as its lead speaker in this debate. It is unfortunate that this debate is taking place. As it is, it should have been introduced by the Premier, the Attorney-General or another Minister whose portfolio has some relevance to the debate, including the references to the Fitzgerald inquiry. Instead, this Minister, whose portfolio has no relevance to the debate, has been given the opportunity to bucket not only his colleagues on this side of the House but also the processes of Parliament.

It is a pity that this debate has been allowed to degenerate and to become so wide—again serving no useful purpose concerning the Fitzgerald process or the processes that are being undertaken by the Electoral and Administrative Review Commission. There is no doubt that this will make the commission's task much more difficult.

As the honourable member for Lockyer said, we are talking about a tin trunk and mystical documents. Certainly, those documents would be of historical significance. I have no way of knowing what was contained in the documents in the tin box, but I believe that their historical importance has been turned into a hysterical debate. That is most unfortunate. This is a charade adopted by the Government to take up the time of the House. Certainly, I could be told to sit down but I point out that I do not intend to take all of my allotted time. However, these things need to be noted. It is sad that the result of the moving of this motion has been committee member versus committee member and process versus process. That is not a healthy structure at all.

My colleague and friend the member for Yeronga, Mr Foley, is now using Mr Lane as a reference in his attempts to validate the debate. I am intrigued, because he has chosen a man who is reported to be the man most despised by the ALP. Mr Lane is suddenly being presented by Mr Foley as a reference, in spite of the fact that when he was a member of Parliament—both inside and outside Parliament—Mr Lane was subjected to a great deal of abuse by members of the Labor Party.

It also saddens me to mention the comments made by the Leader of the Liberal Party, Mr Beanland. In spite of the amendment moved by the Opposition, which calls on the Government to give an unequivocal undertaking to implement the recommendations of EARC's review into electoral boundaries in Queensland, Mr Beanland has walked away and has taken the Liberal Party with him. This is a sad day for this State. What he is really saying is that, because he does not have the numbers to change it, he will accept EARC's review and that, if and when the Liberal Party gets the numbers, everybody had better watch out. I made a note that Mr Beanland would not have wanted to have made those remarks during his recent visit to Ayr. Out of a spirit of parliamentary cohesion, I attended the luncheon at which Mr Beanland spoke, and I must say that he spoke very well.

Mr Beattie: You are not switching over, are you?

Mr STONEMAN: No. I am about to say what would have happened if Mr Beanland had made in Ayr the remarks that he has made during this debate. The point I make is that the Liberal Party's submission advocates the abolition of 11 country electorates. The Liberal Party proposes that country electorates be enlarged so that they will contain 24 000 voters and that there be no change in the boundaries until the number of voters reaches 30 000. It is also proposed that the south-eastern zone be increased by four

electorates, which will combine with other electorates to make a total of 82. Because it would bring about enormous changes, I believe that the average person in regional and rural Queensland would not be able to comprehend the Liberal Party's submission. If the Liberal Party's proposal were accepted, it would effectively disfranchise people who are least able to stand up for themselves.

The National Party's submission to EARC cited the electoral structure that was proposed by the Liberal Party in South Australia to illustrate its claim that the Parliament should be made up of the party that wins the majority of votes on a two-party preferred basis. I believe that the National Party was the only party that made the claim and that no individual made the claim, either. The last occasion when a majority Government was not in power in Queensland was 1950 following the imposition of the infamous gerrymander. I would have to describe it as a "gerrymander", because it gave power to the party that did not achieve a majority of the votes. It is interesting, because some of the other areas in Australia in which the principle of one vote, one value is applied automatically have imposed on them a minority Government—unless, of course, there is an absolutely vicious expression of electoral will at the ballots. The position is that a minority Government is able to twiddle the dials and load things in its own favour and against rural electorates.

The electorate of Kennedy is a case in point. It is certainly one of the largest electorates in Australia. It is represented by a Labor member, and that is fair enough because that is the way the vote went on a previous occasion. However, it certainly will not go that way next time. The thrust of the Liberal Party's submission is that it wants Kennedy-type seats imposed on the State Parliament. The end result will be that rural people will effectively be disfranchised. Even the Labor Party, in its token submission and the somewhat tongue-in-cheek proposition that it presented, would not have dared to enlarge the size of electorates to more than 20 000 voters, because, if its submission were accepted, the Labor Party's own members would be wiped out. I believe that it is hoping for a default by which the same process of disfranchising rural people will apply. I certainly believe that that is the Labor Party's intention. Where are the additional members going to sit in this Parliament? If the ALP's submission is accepted, it will necessitate having to knock out the walls or put in a mezzanine floor.

The fact of the matter is that the present climate in the community indicates that people do not want big government. They will accept a continuation of the present level of representation and would probably even accept the Liberal Party's proposition that there should be 82 representatives in Queensland's Parliament. However, if that proposition is taken to its logical conclusion, it could be that the people will not want any members of Parliament. It is a fact that because of the manner in which they treat the community with contempt, members of Parliament are becoming increasingly disliked. That is what is happening in this debate today. The community is treated with contempt because parliamentary processes are being abused. This charade that we are going through and have to become part of means that time, which could have been better spent on important issues, is being wasted. I suggest that throughout the rest of the year members of this Parliament will be debating this issue for weeks, because it involves consideration of local government boundaries and State boundaries. All these issues will be rehashed and there will be an increase in the vitriolic exchanges that occur across the Chamber, which will lead to a greater fragmentation in the Parliament than has ever been seen before. I say that in the light of Mr Beanland's statement that the Liberal Party is not going to accept the findings of the EARC review. He said that, because of the numbers, the Liberal Party has to accept the position now, but that in the future, this will not be the case.

Under the terms that the Liberal Party has put forward, one vote, one value means 11 seats will be removed from regional and rural Queensland and four more will be included in the south-east corner. That process is a modern means of rotting the electoral system.

Last week, I received a telephone call from a former Liberal Minister of the Western Australian Government who was carrying out research into the electoral system. It was

interesting that he contacted me rather than one of his fellow Liberals. He said that the great problem that they are facing in Western Australia is that the Liberals and the Nationals have 52 per cent of the vote and the Labor Party has 48 per cent, yet it has a resounding majority. That is not acceptable in any reasonable community. It is a gerrymander of the worst type. It is a gerrymander of the type that we have not had in this State since 1950. The last time that there was a Government in power in this State without a two-party preferred majority of votes was after the first redistribution carried out by the Hanlon Government. In other words, a system encompassing 50 per cent plus one has worked under the zonal system.

In its submission, the National Party indicated that it believes that time has passed the zonal system by. I do not walk away from that. I am proud to be a member of the party that has been able to come to grips with such things as the electoral commission, the Fitzgerald inquiry and the undertaking to implement those processes. I am proud of the support that the National Party has given, and will continue to give, to those processes.

The zonal system has served this State well. I agree that anomalies have occurred at places such as Wujal Wujal. However, this Parliament debated and put in place the zonal structure. The commissioners were then bound to draw the boundaries within the four zones. It was a simple process. The zonal structure was debated in this Chamber. People talk about things not being open, but, because it was the subject of debate for many hours, that process was absolutely open. There was no problem. The records are there. The cards were laid on the table. The zonal boundaries put in place that structure.

Over the years, the boundaries created under any type of zonal system have tended to become a bit too constrained. They have not matched the needs of modern society in terms of its expansion and its uneven development. In the past I have mentioned that in the Cairns, Gold Coast and north coast areas the demands of population increase should have been met and adjusted by a more sophisticated model. Under those terms, the National Party, in its wisdom, appears to have walked away from having a clouded idea or from being stuck with one vote, one value. It is prepared to look at a fresh system, one that is recognisable, that works and that guarantees that the majority party on a two-party preferred basis is the Government.

The National Party has used all manner of debate and reference. It has consulted members of the Labor Party. It is interesting to note that an acknowledgment was made on the telephone by a defeated Labor candidate who raised the proposition with me. After I spoke to him, in a great bipartisan spirit, he forwarded to me written information for my assistance. That is the sort of process that we must undertake. We do not need divisive debate such as we have had today. We need a cohesive spirit that, as Dr Clark said, gets sticky fingers off the handle of the electoral process, gives it to an independent commission, which all parties have supported, and ensures that everyone abides by the system that is devised.

The commissioners must live with the result of their deliberations. That is why I am sure of their integrity. Those people are not about to commit public suicide in terms of credibility. They will have to live with what they recommend. I believe that their recommendations will be considered to be fair and are something that the Parliament must accept.

If one vote, one value is recommended, we must abide by it. Unfortunately, the Liberal Party is saying—and the Premier will not give an undertaking on it, either—that, if the recommendation is not to its liking, it will not accept it if it ever achieves the numbers in this House. Under those terms, I assure them that they will never get the numbers to govern this State. The people of Queensland will not accept that proposition. On the other hand, in the next Government, the Liberal Party will share the wisdom of the senior party, the National Party—assuming that it does not quite obtain the numbers on its own—and a wise Government will return to Queensland.

It is said that a week is a long time in politics. Unfortunately, three years of a Labor Government will be almost too much for this State to absorb. The community is starting to wake up to what the Government has done. I do not cast a reflection on individual members of the Government; they simply do not know about management and about government. They do not know about the balancing processes that brought this State over 32 years of wise government to a position of pre-eminence in financial and fiscal terms. They do not understand that, and it is sad. I repeat that I do not cast a personal reflection on Government members. They are captives of an ideology that has been proven not to work. When honourable members look at Western Australia, South Australia, Victoria, New South Wales under Wran and Unsworth, and the Federal Government, they will realise that all those models have proved to be wrong. They cannot work. Over the years, they have tried to redistribute—that is the socialist aim—the economy of the country by distributing the money equally in people's pockets. That is a disincentive and, in doing that, those Governments have plundered the public purse.

I do not want to take up too much of the time of the House. However, I believe it is necessary for someone to set the record straight. My colleagues have done so eloquently, to the great embarrassment of the Government. I suggest that the Government must now be starting to wonder about the wisdom of this tactic. Honourable members will remember the tactic, "Let's give them all the questions and they will run dry." Was that not a marvellous day? Members of the Government fell flat on their faces. There was embarrassment all over the Government side.

I believe that we should get back to the central issue, that is, why would the Government bring on such a debate when there are two pages of legislation on the notice paper? The Government has talked about the need to amend legislation and so on, yet today it has brought on a debate that is a total waste of time. It is a cheap grab for headlines. I do not think that this debate will take Paul Keating's photograph off the front of tomorrow's newspapers. In fact, the majority of people in this State probably will not even know about today's debate. That is the sad part. The Parliament could be getting on with the nuts and bolts of government, but it is not. Why is the Government doing this? One has to wonder. Is it so that it can slide out of a commitment to implement the recommendations of the EARC? That seems to me to be the reason that is emerging.

Although I disagree with the Leader of the Liberal Party, Mr Beanland, at least he waved a flag and said, "We are not going to cop it. We are going to change it when we get into power."—if ever that happens. The Labor Party is increasingly trying to hide behind a veneer of respectability. It has wrapped itself in a cocoon. It says, "Aren't we holy? Aren't we great?" The fact is that there is a hidden agenda. There has to be. What other form of foolishness would have led to the Government bringing on this debate?

I believe that the Government is setting the scene to slide out from underneath a commitment. It has probably started to work out that the commissioners are genuine and sincere, that they have integrity, which they want to take with them to their graves, and that they are not the sort of people who are going to come up with a party-political document. There is no way in the world that the commissioners are going to do that. I am absolutely confident about that. Whatever they do, they have to rationalise to the community. They will be judged throughout the world because, as far as I know, there has never before been an opportunity such as this anywhere in the world.

A few weeks ago, when my committee colleagues and I travelled to New Zealand, we spoke with that man of eminence over there, the former Prime Minister Mr Lange. He agreed that the opportunity that has been given to the commission in Queensland is unique and that it is a model that will be watched all over the world. That model was created by the National Party—

Mr Beattie: It was created by Tony Fitzgerald.

Mr STONEMAN: For the benefit of the honourable member, I will go back through the steps.

The Fitzgerald inquiry was put in place by the National Party. Mr Fitzgerald was appointed by the National Party. The report was handed by Mr Fitzgerald to the National Party Premier of the day and his Ministers. The legislation under which the CJC and the EARC are structured was introduced by the National Party. I was proud to be a Cabinet Minister at the time, and I look forward to regaining that position in just over two years. I was proud of all of those processes. For the member for Brisbane Central, Mr Beattie, to interject and say that it was put in place by Fitzgerald is quite plainly ludicrous. The report was handed down by Mr Fitzgerald. The research was done by Mr Fitzgerald, with the help of people who were supplied to him at his request. Every time Mr Fitzgerald wanted the Act opened up a bit, the National Party Government allowed it to be debated some more and gave him some more leeway. That is on the record books of this State and this nation. No-one can deny that.

The attempt by the Government to gain respectability as a result of the Fitzgerald inquiry just will not work because it came in too late. The position is the same in regard to economic management. The National Party left the coffers full. The other day I was talking to a shop-keeper in Home Hill, which is one of the greatest towns in this State—if not the greatest. The member for Nicklin comes from Ayr. I understand that he was born there. He would be able to verify what I am saying about the area. That shop-keeper's shop is right next to the highway. A visitor from New South Wales called in to his shop. He said that as he drove along the roads of coastal New South Wales, he was hassled. As he travelled into Queensland, the place looked brighter and the roads were better. He told the shop-keeper, "If this is what corruption does, give me corruption."

The fact is that the corruption has not been in the management sphere. If there has been corruption, it has been—as it is throughout society—in a limited sphere. This debate is not going to help eliminate corruption in any shape or form. The economic management of this State is something of which conservative Governments down through the years can be very proud. Unfortunately, it is a legacy with which the Labor Party has been left to tinker for a couple of years. Hopefully, it will not learn enough to mismanage in that time. Labor Governments are automatic mismanagers. The proof is there in every other State in the nation and federally. I suggest that honourable members watch Paul Keating deliver the Federal Budget tonight. It will be interesting.

What is the real reason behind this debate? Why is the Government trying to drive a wedge between members of committees and between the processes laid down by Mr Fitzgerald and their adoption in broad terms by the Government? Why is the Government trying to demean that process by bringing on this debate? I repeat that it is because the Government wants to use its numbers to slide out from underneath that process. Why would the Government let the Minister for Tourism lead this debate? He is a man who has no credibility in the community or whose credibility is decreasing, if he ever had any. The Government has tossed the ball to him and allowed him to lead this debate today. It is most unfortunate that the Attorney-General had to play second fiddle. This shows that the process is being attacked. Mr Beattie has felt the thrust of it.

Members of the Opposition support the work that Mr Beattie did. When he tried to be an honest broker, he felt the barb of his own party. The message was made clear to him: "If you don't play it our way, you are in trouble." That message, which I believe is being made clear today, should be heard by the people of this State.

The Opposition challenges the Premier of this State to give an unequivocal undertaking that he will implement the findings of EARC. As members of the Government have indicated, the commission is important to the future of this State. The Premier must give that assurance.

With a great deal of pride, I support the amendment and call upon the Premier similarly to support it.

Mr BEATTIE (Brisbane Central) (4.39 p.m.): I support the motion. As the member for Toowong said, when I was the party secretary I was one of the authors of the Labor Party's submission for the 1985 redistribution. I recall very well that those parties that had nothing to hide and were the honest brokers publicly released their submissions. The Labor Party released its submission quite openly at a press conference and stood the test of examination both by the media and the people of Queensland. Even the Liberal Party released its submission openly and honestly. My colleague Gary Neat, for whom I have some respect, openly released the document, as did the Australian Democrats. However, which party did not release its submission? The National Party! Why did it not release it? The answer is very simple, namely, because the boundaries that were determined bore an uncanny resemblance to those boundaries that had been submitted by the National Party.

For some time I have been involved in redistribution recommendations at Federal and State levels. It is of no surprise to me that the National Party has decided to hide its submission. I am greatly disappointed, because I have been waiting years to read it. I am intrigued to learn what role Don Lane played. Members of the National Party, including Mr Stoneman, the member for Burdekin, have asked, "Why have this debate?" Page 43 of the report of the Electoral and Administrative Review Commission titled *A History of the Queensland Zonal Electoral System*. states—

"This document has drawn on information from a variety of sources to piece together a descriptive history of the Queensland Zonal Electoral System. However, the information detailed is unfortunately sketchy because there is a dearth of publicly available information about the rationale and processes which established, maintained and modified the system."

It is unavailable because much of it was in the hands of the National Party and it has gone missing. The report states—

"Documents from the major political parties and other sources, to the extent that these were made available to EARC, are insufficient to allow a detailed investigation of the zonal system, the reasons for it and more importantly, the closed processes which created and sustained it. Even amongst Government records there is little archival information dealing with this important aspect of Queensland political history."

What a surprise! The report states further—

"EARC's investigation of the system has been adversely affected to a significant extent by the lack of recorded information and the non-availability of the material before previous distribution Commissioners."

The bulk of that information was in the hands of either the National Party or previous National Party State Governments. The import of that is that EARC has been deprived of important information which it needs to make considered decisions because the National Party has either deliberately lost or mislaid it; certainly it has not made it available to EARC.

As a former party apparatchik, I find it absolutely extraordinary to find attached to the report a letter from Mr Crooke in which he says that no record is kept at National Party headquarters. On 12 July 1990, Ken Crooke, the State Director of the National Party, wrote to Tom Sherman and said—

"My enquiries have ascertained that no copies of the 1985 material are held at this office."

What an extraordinary set of circumstances!

No political party in the western world would be so incompetent and hopeless that it did not keep a copy of a submission that it made to the redistribution commissioners. I would bet that, if any member of this House went to Labor Party headquarters, Liberal Party headquarters or the headquarters of the Australian Democrats, a copy of such a submission would be located. However, the party that was in Government for 32 years conveniently cannot find the submission that was put to previous commissioners.

I do not believe that any sensible, objective, logical, intelligent person in this State would accept the explanation that has been given today in this House by the National Party. It is a disgrace that the file and its contents have gone missing. It is a disgrace that the National Party cannot find its files. If that is not a cover-up, I do not know what is. That is a clear example of a cover-up. I believe that those files have been deliberately put in a position where they are not available.

I turn now to the contribution made by the learned member for Toowong, Mr Denver Beanland, who, as usual, got it wrong. The temporary Leader of the Liberal Party, my close colleague and the man for whom I have such enormous respect, got it wrong again. He made deliberate references to the submission made by the Labor Party in 1985 and referred to my contribution to it. Naturally, I take strong exception to that.

If Mr Beanland had bothered to understand what took place in 1985 and had read the simple material that was provided, he would know that the Electoral Districts Act of 1985, which was introduced by the National Party, was so rigid and limited that it made a joke of the submissions from parties that were not part of the process, namely, the Labor Party, the Liberal Party and the Australian Democrats. The only submission that had any credence was that of the National Party.

What did that 1985 Act do? It provided for the zonal system. It created Wujal Wujal, which we have talked about. The Act was such a rort that parts of the electorate of Cook were placed in the adjoining electorate. What an extraordinary set of circumstances! It fitted the classic definition of a gerrymander. I can see my colleague from Southport looking red and embarrassed—and well he should—and he is a large embarrassment when one looks at him.

That was the reason why the Labor Party made a very direct submission. It said that it was totally opposed to the zonal system. It was absolutely clear. It was a very strong statement of principle which, if the member for Toowong had had the common sense to read and understand it, was a substantive submission. It stated clearly that the Labor Party does not believe in rorted electoral boundaries and it does not believe in the zonal system but that it believes in one zone, one vote, one value and the Federal system of a 10 per cent tolerance.

Mr Ardill: He never lets the facts get in the way of a good story.

Mr BEATTIE: I take the interjection from my learned colleague from Salisbury. He is right. The member for Toowong has never let the facts get in the way of a good story.

Let me return to the point at issue. The member for Toowong has read neither the Electoral Districts Act of 1985 nor the Labor Party's submission. Had he done so, he would have known that the Labor Party had made substantive submissions attacking the zonal system, to which the Labor Party is totally opposed.

Let me deal now with the Liberal Party, to some extent. Mr Beanland did not read the submission terribly well, either. The thing that I find really intriguing about the Liberal Party is that it is pretty choosy about who it accepts as part of its flock. When its members are suddenly defeathered or whatever—and there are a number of ways in which that can happen—the party suddenly decides that it does not want to claim them.

Don Lane was a well-known member of the Liberal Party. Indeed, he represented the Liberal Party in this House for some time. Page 35 of the document from EARC contains comments relating to that long-term Liberal Party member of this House. I am disappointed that the member for Toowong did not make reference to him. Point 6.10 states—

"Don Lane, the MLA for Merthyr, had been Minister for Transport from 1980"—
of course, in 1980 he was a member of the Liberal Party—

"and gained considerable expertise preparing Liberal Party submissions to the 1971 and 1977 Electoral Commissioners."

At that time he was a Liberal member of this House. The paragraph continues—

"In November 1984"—

he continued these habits—

"the National Party Redistribution Committee which comprised senior National Party officials asked Lane and Austin"—

two former Liberals—

"to work with the Party's Research Officer, Jenny Russell, compiling a proposal for redistribution in relation to the South-Eastern Zone."

Mr Gibbs: They left poor old Beryce out.

Mr BEATTIE: Indeed, they left poor Beryce out.

The point I am making is that the member for Toowong can be choosy if he likes, but that is the history of the Liberal Party when it comes to redistributions in this State. When it came to electoral redistributions, Don Lane was the hitman for the Liberal Party. Let us have no more of this nonsense from Mr Beanland about the Liberal Party's knight in shining armour on whatever horse it was. I would hate to think what sort of horse it was.

The reality is that the Liberal Party has had its hands in the murky seas of redistributions for a long time. Don Lane had a consistent involvement in it that started in the Liberal Party and continued for a short time in the National Party.

Although the last couple of paragraphs of the submission may not be as interesting, they are relevant. It is disappointing that the member for Burdekin is not listening intently to this because it relates to what he said. Point 6.11 on page 35 states—

"Lane determined that to produce the largest number of anti-Labor districts in the Brisbane area"—

and he dealt with Brisbane because that is where his Liberal expertise was—

"the quota in the South-Eastern Zone had to be reduced."

This information came from an interview with Don Lane. The paragraph continues—

"A letter which the south-east redistribution team sent to Sir Robert Sparkes and Charles Holm in December 1984 reveals that they had already outlined the strategy of a reduction in the South-Eastern Zone quota to about 18,500 electors which required an increase of four districts from 47 to 51 in that Zone. The letter explained that for the sake of accuracy, the preparation of the proposal 'necessitated the counting of the number of electors almost street by street right across the area' and that the findings were 'as accurate as humanly possible' because they had used computer print-outs obtained from the State Electoral Office."

Now isn't that interesting! The print-outs were not available to the Labor Party. Although the National Party in this place bleats about fairness and equity, it used the State Electoral Office as an extended wing of the National Party. It did that for years.

Mr Gibbs: You noticed the name, of course, of one of the commissioners—Mr Colin Pearce.

Mr BEATTIE: Indeed.

And that use was consistent. At no time did the Labor Party have access to such information. At no time did the Labor Party receive computer print-outs of the electoral rolls. The Labor Party received the computer print-outs of the electoral rolls at the last election only as a result of a legal challenge. Let me put the facts clearly on the table. For years, the National Party has been responsible for rorts in this area. It is about time that this debate has occurred and that the National Party sustains the necessary embarrassment as a result.

On page 36, the EARC states—

"The letter to the Redistribution Committee"—

this is from the National Party—

"constitutes the first phase of preparation of the National Party submission to the Electoral Commissioners four and a half months before the Electoral Commissioners were appointed on 29 April 1985. Lane has described the approach as corralling the Labor vote into safe Labor districts."

I should say as a passing reference that the one good thing that was done by the National Party was the creation of the electorate of Brisbane Central. Other than that, the position was quite clearly one that was unacceptable.

Point 6.13 states—

"At the time of writing this report EARC has not been able to examine the final National Party submission to the 1985 Electoral Commissioners. Don Lane"—

the former Liberal—

"informed EARC that there was negative reaction from the country interests regarding the increase in urban districts so, after some negotiation, two districts were added to the Country Zone and one to the Western and Far Northern Zone as compensation."

This is what are called impartial independent commissioners. What a joke! It was a National Party debate and a National Party wheeling and dealing about where seats were going to be. That is the way the National Party treats redistribution commissioners.

The report further states—

"The details of some of the northern areas were determined by other Party members. Then, according to Lane, the amendments made and the zonal boundaries were drawn up to become the basis of the Schedule to the Bill before any discussion had taken place in Cabinet."

Clearly, Queensland has a long history of the National Party rorting itself internally. That is why this motion before the House today is important.

I will conclude on page 36 with reference to point 6.14, which states—

"Because the final National Party submission was completed some time after the letter quoted above, there were some minor changes in the submission to cater for increased enrolments. For example, the proposed electorates reflected the quota in the South-Eastern Zone which was 19,357 and the electorate of Stafford was not to be abolished."

I am sure the member for Stafford is delighted about that. This point is important—

"However, the principles in the National Party submission remain the same as those expressed in the letter of 12 December 1984."

That came from a discussion with Don Lane on 12 July 1990. Today, the members of the National Party should hang their heads in shame, because it is appropriate that this debate should take place. The fact is that suddenly the Government cannot find certain documents, and EARC, that independent body which the members of the National Party in this House applaud, is not being provided with that information. The hypocrisy and the double standards of that attitude are very clear to anyone.

Recently, the member for Burdekin referred to EARC, an independent commission. He even had the audacity to claim credit for establishing EARC, when in fact all members know that that was forced on the previous Government by the Fitzgerald process. Public opinion would not have allowed the previous Government to do otherwise. He claimed credit for that and yet, at the same time, conveniently, the National Party loses important information that EARC wants in order to complete its report for this House and for the people of Queensland. If that is not dishonest behaviour, and behaviour that deserves to be condemned by the members of this House and the people of Queensland, then there is no behaviour that deserves to be condemned. It is totally unacceptable behaviour.

I recall that after the 1985 redistribution, the Labor Party started a campaign to get fair boundaries and it had a slogan that stated "Fair go, electoral boundaries. Sheep shouldn't vote". After listening to the member for Toowong, I am sure that, in terms of sheep, that slogan should be extended to the Liberal Party. I believe that, after all this time, it highlights that the Liberal Party has made no significant change in its attitude. It only utters more platitudes. It is not even prepared to accept the EARC recommendations. Tomorrow in the press the members of the Liberal Party will stand condemned before the people of Queensland for not accepting what the independent umpire—the independent commissioners—is prepared to put forward.

Returning to the 1985 redistribution, I will point out why it is so important that that material be provided to EARC. I will cite for members some press reports that appeared after the boundaries were released, because those press reports reflect the deliberate savagery with which the National Party maintained its place of power. I will not quote myself in those reports. I will endeavour to refer to what is supposedly an independent view.

I cite a story headed "Outcry over new seats" that appeared in the *Daily Sun* on 6 November 1985. This was the assessment of the rorted boundaries, the corrupt boundaries that were brought down by the National Party. The report states—

"The proposed new boundaries would ensure the Nationals at least four of the seven extra seats."

Honourable members should consider those seats. The old biblical reference, "Beware, your sins will find you out", really applies in this instance. That is what the former Government was endeavouring to do. It wanted the proposed new boundaries to ensure that at least four of the seven extra seats would be won by the National Party.

Honourable members should consider those four extra seats. They were: Currumbin, now held by the Liberal Party; Nerang, now held by the Liberal Party; Glass House, now held by the Labor Party; and the seat surrounding Nambour, which is now held by the Liberal Party. Talk about poetic justice! That is what the rort was about. That is what happened in 1986, but, because the previous National Party Government took that corrupt course of action, the people in those electorates quite rightly rejected the National Party candidates.

I will refer to the rest of this attempted rort. The article further states—

"Present marginal national seats such as Redlands and Maryborough would be safer for the government."

What a joke! Those seats were going to be safer for the Government, but it did not realise how intelligent the people of Queensland really were. Looking at my Labor colleagues, it is good to see intelligent people representing the electors. However, the saga gets worse. The article further states—

"All six Brisbane Liberal seats would be safer, and the party could also pick up the new Brisbane seat of Springwood."

I am delighted that in fact that did not turn out to be right. The electors of Springwood are represented in this House today by the Labor Party.

The article further states—

"The Nationals would lose only one seat, Wavell, held by Health Minister Mr Austin. The independent seat of Ithaca held by Mr Col Miller would disappear."

Ithaca became Mount Coot-tha and today the electorate of Mount Coot-tha is represented by the Labor Party, too. However, the story gets worse—

"Under the system, Queensland is divided into four zones with each of the 65 south-east and provincial city seats holding about 20,000 voters.

The quota in the 17 country zone seats is only 9386 and in the eight west and far northern zone seats 13,131.

Seven new seats have been created in the south-east zone with a quota of 19,357 voters.

The country zone has been increased from 15 to 17 seats."

About that time in November, the *Australian* reported on the same issue. It stated—

"The draft, which will be available for inspection until December 11, is based on quotas that effectively give voters in some electorates up to 2.5 times the voting strength of others."

That draft was subsequently confirmed.

I supported and agreed with the comments made by the Director of the Liberal Party at that time, Gary Neat. He said that the electoral system recommended by the National Party stank. Of course, he was right. At that time, Senator Michael Macklin of the Australian Democrats called the boundaries "an embarrassment to Queensland and the nation".

I am pleased to see in one of the quotes that the former Labor Prime Minister, Gough Whitlam, said, in effect, that the electoral boundaries brought in by the National Party would in fact be its downfall—and was not Gough right! He really was a modern-day Nostradamus. He got it dead right; that is exactly what happened.

However, what did the beloved Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen, the Premier at the time, have to say? I have a quote from the *Sun* at about that time. He said—

"In Queensland, the electoral system has been based on giving fair representation to non-metropolitan areas."

He did not care about anyone who lived in Brisbane or in provincial cities along the coast of Queensland, nor did he care about the people in the country. Sir Joh said further that, on the latest media reports, even the Labor Party's senior national officials, including the Prime Minister, gave Labor no chance of winning the next State election

or successive elections. He proved to be dead wrong.

I refer to something that I consider to be important, the myth of the gerrymander. It has been a significant myth that the gerrymander, or the malapportionment, was created to give people in country areas a better say. That is clearly not right. It has simply been a desperate, selfish bid by the National Party to cling to power. On page 37 of the EARC report, paragraph 6.19 states—

"Given that the existing system favoured the Country Zone—particularly that area within three hours' drive of Brisbane"—

that is fundamentally important—

"and that two of the seven districts would also be within that zone, it was clear that the proposed legislation had little to do with overcoming problems of isolation or of allowing more effective representation."

That clearly highlights the fact that both the National Party and Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen have lied. For years, the National Party organisation and the former National Party Government misled the people of Queensland by arguing that the malapportionment—the redistribution, the gerrymander—was designed to look after country people. It was not, because the rotten boroughs—if I can use that British term—which formed the buffer for the National Party seats in this Parliament were all within two to three hours' drive of the city. They were not based thousands of miles away. The National Party was not trying to help the people of Mount Isa or the people of Cook.

Members of the National Party spoke about the size of seats. If they are talking about the size of seats, they should consider the size of the electorate of Cook. Imagine how hard the Labor members for Cook have had to work and are still working. Quite frankly, it is a deliberate lie. I am delighted to have the opportunity to say, with the support of the independent Electoral and Administrative Review Commission, that for all those years, both Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen and members of the National Party, have

lied. Any person who lives within two to three hours' drive of Brisbane is not suffering from major isolation.

An honourable member referred to the 1949 zonal system that was introduced by the then Labor Government. Government members accept that that is true. I am happy to say that it was nowhere near the perfected rort that was developed by successive National Party Governments in this State. The 1949 zonal system was what one could call a mild dose of the flu compared with the pneumonia that we got from the electoral redistribution under the former National Party Government.

The Labor Party is not at all proud of what happened in 1949. We in the party have clearly stated on the public record our policy of one vote, one value. Our bona fides are very clear, and they have been shown at the Federal level. The Labor Party has two fundamentally important principles, the first of which is that independent commissioners draw up Federal electoral boundaries based on the one vote, one value principle. The 10 per cent tolerance is supported by all the major parties at the Federal level. The Labor Party, the Liberal Party and the National Party all support the fair system that operates at the Federal level. The bona fides of the Labor Party with regard to redistribution are very clear. Therefore, it can quite happily distance itself from what happened in 1949.

The National Party was able to create as much mischief and destruction as it could amongst its political opponents. There is no doubt that the amalgamation of Kurilpa and South Brisbane, which resulted from the 1985 redistribution, was clearly designed to create political difficulties for the Labor Party. Two excellent members of the Labor Party were forced into a contest for the one seat. That was done deliberately by Don Lane and his National Party cohorts because they knew what would happen. When faced with two good representatives from an Opposition party, what did the Government do? It pitted them against one another. That was very unfortunate. In common with other Government members, I am delighted to see both those members back in this House. We are all proud of that.

Mr Tony FitzGerald—I am not talking about Tony FitzGerald, QC—suggested——

Mr Borbidge: The honourable member for Lockyer.

Mr BEATTIE: Yes, indeed I am talking about the member for Lockyer. At one stage, he suggested that there should be a representative sent up to the Premier's office to have a look through the cabinets. I offered—but he did not take it up—to appoint the member for Lockyer. In order to find the missing files there could be another FitzGerald inquiry headed by the member for Lockyer. Perhaps he could start looking at National Party headquarters. Why should he start anywhere else? Honourable members could have a FitzGerald inquiry with a bipartisan approach. The Government could appoint Tony FitzGerald, the member for Lockyer, to find out what happened to the missing files.

Members of the National Party wonder why this debate is taking place. They should turn to page 43 of the EARC report and look at what the independent commission has said. The independent commission has said that the lack of information made the compiling of that report very, very difficult. That information rests clearly in the hands of the National Party.

Mr STEPHAN (Gympie) (5.06 p.m.): I also wonder why we are debating this motion when there is so much business on the notice paper and when so much filibustering has gone on. For example, the first piece of legislation on the notice paper is the Motor Vehicles Safety Act Amendment Bill. The Government, as it is want to do, is wasting time and looking for a scapegoat—somebody else to blame for its own inadequacies and shortcomings. It certainly behoves the Government to consider its own members and to look ahead rather than to look back. Government members should bear in mind some of the statements that were made by their own leader at the by-elections that the seats of Landsborough and Sherwood would cease to exist. I wonder whether he is telling the truth when he claims that he is standing back and making no input into the final

outcome. The honourable member for Albert went out of his way to say that that seat would be adjusted, to use his term. And so the story goes on.

I listened to the honourable member for Brisbane Central talk about openness. Where was his openness when he had a discussion behind a cowshed at Kingaroy? I notice that he has now left the Chamber. What was discussed with a former Premier in surroundings not quite in keeping with what the honourable member normally considered his own environment? Was that openness? Is that what we can hope for from the honourable member for Brisbane Central?

He said that the result in the recent Federal election was fair. How can it be fair when Mr Hawke retained the Prime Ministership with 39 per cent of the first-preference vote? Out of the mouth of the same person came criticism of the National Party when it won an election in this State with 39, 40 or 41 per cent of the vote. He said that was not fair, but it was fair for Mr Hawke to remain Prime Minister with 39 per cent.

A Government member: The filing cabinet is in Gympie. You have got it, haven't you?

Mr STEPHAN: The honourable member is trying to distract me. He does not like me talking about Mr Hawke particularly when, on a two-party preferred basis, he is Prime Minister with only 48 per cent of the vote when the conservative parties had over 50 per cent. Is that what is considered to be a fair distribution and what the Government is looking forward to from the Electoral and Administrative Review Commission?

Mr Borbidge: It's the same system in South Australia. The Liberal Party got 52 per cent of the primary vote and lost the election.

Mr STEPHAN: It is the same situation. How many State Governments have been elected with a majority of the vote? Our amendment sets out to ensure that the party with the majority of the vote is the party that wins Government. We are looking forward to democracy and to democracy working.

The honourable member for Barron River, who has left the Chamber, seemed confused about why she is here. I gained the distinct impression that she was not too sure what she was trying to do and what her role was. She spoke about Wujal Wujal.

The zonal system was introduced in 1949 by the Labor Party for reasons best known to it. EARC is considering electoral weightage, electoral zoning, malapportionment and the gerrymander as it has been called. Gympie was originally in the Nash electorate. The Labor Government was not game to call the electorate Gympie because it took in only half of Gympie, which had a population of about 10 000 people, wandered up the coastal area on the eastern side of the railway line, which contained a few wallabies and kangaroos, and took in the industrial area of Maryborough. That is the only way Labor could hold Nash. Yet Government members have the audacity to criticise the boundaries set under the National Party. Labor introduced the zonal system and the gerrymander and nothing the National Party has ever done comes anywhere near what Labor did. If Government members want to learn what a gerrymander is about, they should look at Labor's record rather than something that happened two or three years ago. The honourable member for Brisbane Central should be wary about Labor's record.

I will now deal with the weightage system. What the National Party has tried to do for a long time is ensure that people living beyond the last street light in the metropolitan area have fair representation, which includes the ability of a parliamentary member to effectively service the people, industries and institutions in his or her electorate, taking into consideration area, ease of transport and distribution of population; the ease with which people in an electorate can contact their parliamentary representative when necessary; to maintain, as far as is possible, community of interest; and to achieve balanced representation ensuring that all areas have full opportunity to develop their full potential.] Those matters have not been taken fully into consideration by the Labor Party.

Mr Smyth: I have a sensible interjection. You said that there is an ease of communication between one end and another of an electorate. In my electorate, there is no gazetted road that connects one end to the other.

Mr STEPHAN: That is all right. I do not know what representations the honourable member has made since his election. One of the problems in country areas is the inability to be able to communicate. I do not know whether the honourable member has made representations or how many Ministers he has approached with that problem. It takes funding. We have made representations previously and I do not see why more representations should not be made for extra funding from the petrol tax for roads in Queensland and the rest of Australia.

The levy imposed on fuel is not returned as revenue for Queensland roadworks. This is another instance in which members of the Labor Party would do well to make representations to both the Prime Minister and the Federal Minister for Transport in an endeavour to ensure that Queensland obtains an adequate return of revenue that can be spent on roads.

It is worth while taking a closer look at the ALP and its links with trade unions. The results of a recent survey reflect the community's attitude to this association. They reveal that most Australians believe that unions should not be affiliated with the Labor Party and that trade unionism should not be compulsory.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Honourable members, I know that the Deputy Speaker said he would allow a wide-ranging debate. I have been listening to the debate in my chambers and I must say to the member for Gympie that the wide-ranging perspective ought to be narrowed somewhat. Unions have nothing to do with the motion that is before the House. It is permissible to talk about electoral boundaries and electoral systems, but from now on I will rule that speakers must confine their remarks more closely to the terms of the motion or I will ask them to resume their seats.

Mr STEPHAN: I take the point you make, Mr Speaker. However, earlier I asked the Deputy Speaker about the Cooke report as it related to his ruling. I point out that the Cooke report concerns unions. The Deputy Speaker ruled that it was permissible to refer to the Cooke report and trade union activity.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I assure the member for Gympie that I am in the chair now and that Standing Orders do not allow the Cooke report to be debated at this stage. The motion relates to matters before the Electoral and Administrative Review Commission and the loss of documentation. As I am in the chair now, I am taking control of this matter. I will allow a wide-ranging debate, but within the parameters I have outlined.

Mr BOOTH: I rise to a point of order. In the light of your ruling, Mr Speaker, surely the reference in *Hansard* to the Cribb report should be expunged. The Minister who opened the debate referred to it. Although I think that your present ruling is probably correct, I do not think it is right to allow the inclusion in *Hansard* of a complete, roving report on the National Party. The report was compiled by the National Party at no expense to this Parliament. The Government has brought the report into the House and tried to use it to attack people personally. The present ruling indicates that that should not have been done. I agree with your ruling, Mr Speaker, but I think that the reference to the Cribb report should be expunged.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! There is no point of order. I have set the parameters for the remainder of the debate. I think the debate has been wide-ranging enough. From this point on, honourable members will keep to the prescribed limits that I have indicated.

Mr STEPHAN: I take the point you have made, Mr Speaker. I would have also liked to have thought that previous speakers had been confined to that.

Mr SPEAKER: From now on, speakers in this debate will be.

Mr STEPHAN: The subject of the electoral system in Queensland is of great interest to all honourable members. The desired outcome of the review will be a distribution and determination that will enable all people in Queensland to be fully represented. Prior to raising the issue of the union movement, I had been speaking about the ability of people to make representations on the matter of roadworks and the need for the provision of adequate roads in electorates. It is fundamental to a good system of roads that taxpayers' funds be distributed properly instead of having them applied to other purposes. These matters concern me greatly. I believe that now far more time should be spent pursuing those issues than has been spent in the past.

I take note of the comments made by members of the Government indicating that these issues are not given very much consideration at all. Honourable members must bear in mind the problems that are associated with electorates, particularly in country areas, including the ability of representatives to obtain necessary services and uphold the living standards of their constituents. The whole concept of a democracy means that all sectors of the community are entitled to an adequate voice and a vote to protect their interests. Interests such as adequate roads are matters of which honourable members should take a great deal of cognisance.

I support the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition and hope that it will assist in the correct decision being arrived at. It behoves all honourable members to assist in achieving the goals of the Electoral and Administrative Review Commission. For that reason, I support the amendment that calls upon the Government to give an unequivocal undertaking to implement the recommendation of EARC's review into Queensland's electoral system, in line with the commitment given by the previous National Party Government.

Mr BREDHAUER (Cook) (5.21 p.m.): I find it ironic that today members are again debating continued attempts by the Opposition to frustrate the process of reform of Queensland's electoral laws. Obviously, the commitment to the "lock, stock and barrel" reform process did not include—as my colleague the member for Manly said earlier—the filing cabinet. Apparently Queenslanders can have the lock, the stock and the barrel, but not the filing cabinet.

I have been a member of this Parliament for nine months and I have been patiently waiting for debate on Government reform and probing questions on economic and social policies of the Labor Government. However, these have not eventuated. I have looked for signs that the Opposition has learnt from the lessons of the past and that the National Party has heeded the rebuke of the electorate that was so subtly delivered on 2 December last year. I have also looked for signs indicating that members of the National Party have been dragged, kicking and screaming, into the twentieth century just as most of us are preparing to march into the twenty-first century. However, the signs are not there. Day after day, week after week, members of the National Party collectively regurgitate the hoary old chestnut about Caspall and the Minister for Primary Industries. They persist in farcical charades about taxes and charges.

Earlier in this debate, the member for Burdekin spoke about bringing this House into disrepute. I am sure that his reference to the Minister for Tourism, Sport and Racing as the "thug" of the Parliament hurt the Honourable Minister very much.

Mr Hayward: He is mortally hurt by that.

Mr BREDHAUER: I am sure that he was. I could see a pained expression cross his face every time it was mentioned.

Opposition members talk about the right of reply and bringing people into disrepute in this House. When I consider the way in which, in the past in this House, Opposition members have denigrated people, I find the debate from that side of the House farcical. I refer particularly to the Opposition's support for the CJC report into poker machines, which also denied people the right of reply and brought the reputations of a number of people, including the Minister for Tourism, into disrepute. Opposition members have not recognised the effect that that debate had on those people.

However, currently EARC is diligently trying to carry out its duty, yet the Nationals have lost an entire filing cabinet. They did not lose selective bits of it that might have embarrassed them; they lost the whole filing cabinet that contains the information about the 1985 electoral redistribution.

While we sit here, we hear invoked the ghosts of Christmas past. When I heard members lamenting the fact that they could not find Ned Hanlon's filing cabinet to ascertain what occurred in the 1949 redistribution, I could not believe my ears. The fact is that most redistributions have been documented and that archival materials are available on which we can make assessments about their impact on history, but also on which we can make assessments about where we should be heading in the future with electoral reform. The National Party has failed to come to grips with the fact that this is not an issue of the past, it is an issue of the future.

When I first heard of the missing filing cabinet, my mind was cast back to an earlier time when the former member for Mansfield, the predecessor to the current member, was on staff with me at the Ingham State High School. At that time, an industrial dispute was occurring at the school over class sizes. The former member for Mansfield returned to his staff room one day and discovered that his filing cabinet was not there. Fortunately, he was able to find it. During the course of the industrial dispute, he had made a couple of enemies and his filing cabinet finished up out the window.

Mr Hayward: You know he blamed you.

Mr BREDHAUER: Yes, he blamed me. In fact, at the time, the belief was widely held that I was responsible.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The member for Cook should return to the issue that is being debated.

Mr BREDHAUER: Thank you, Mr Speaker. Perhaps we should ask the former member for Mansfield to help us find this filing cabinet?

Earlier in this debate, comments were made by the member for Lockyer about the member for Manly, who had made reference to the role of public servants in this issue and who defended stoutly the public servants who may or may not have been involved in the disappearance of the filing cabinet. I find it ironic that honourable members opposite can stand there and stoutly defend the reputations of public servants when those same people, as Cabinet Ministers and members of the former Government, attacked time after time the integrity of public servants throughout the State of Queensland. They have continued to do so in Opposition.

The 1985 electoral redistribution is widely regarded to have perfected the abuse of the distribution of electoral boundaries which the former Government and its former coalition partner perpetrated over three decades. Let us look at some of the supposed principles embraced by that redistribution and some of its implications for the people of Queensland. The National Party's submission to that 1985 redistribution would have contained the principles on which its submission was based—a submission which even the party administration cannot find. In common with the member for Brisbane Central, I find it astonishing that, within the infrastructure of a modern-day political party, a document from the most recent redistribution, which presumably would have been used as reference for future similar submissions, cannot be found. In the absence of such a document, which cannot be tracked down and which is part of the debate today, I have looked to the National Party's submission to the current EARC review of the Legislative Assembly to see if I can ascertain some of its principles on electoral redistribution.

I quote briefly from page 7 of the National Party's submission to the EARC review of the electoral system, which stated—

"Every Queensland, no matter where he or she lives, is entitled to enjoy the same quality of representation, the same attention from his Parliamentary member and the same degree of access to his Member."

Where it says "his", I include "his or her". The submission continued—

"The ability of one Parliamentary member to effectively service the people, industries and institutions in his or her electorate, taking into consideration area, ease of transport, and distribution of population."

It continued further—

"The ease with which people in an electorate can contact their Parliamentary representative when necessary and with which he/she can contact or visit his/her constituents."

I find those objectives very laudable, but I also find them to have been distinctly lacking in previous redistributions that were undertaken by the National Party. I will examine a couple of specific instances of how the 1985 redistribution affected a couple of electorates, which will put paid to the concept that they were actually done in the best interests of the people of non-metropolitan Queensland. The honourable member for Brisbane Central commented that Bjelke-Petersen had said that the reason for the redistribution was to provide better representation for people in non-metropolitan Queensland. Let us look at a couple of electorates to see if that principle has actually been implemented.

Firstly, and not surprisingly, the 1985 redistribution retained the zonal system and further enhanced National Party interests. The member for Brisbane Central and others enunciated clearly why we had difficulty with the redistribution process in 1985. It was founded on what we believed was an iniquitous system. The system was proposed to provide improved representation for people who lived in the remote parts of Queensland. The two most remote electorates in Queensland are two with which I am familiar, the Mount Isa electorate, now ably represented by its current member, and the electorate of Cook. I would like to look briefly at how both those electorates were affected by the 1985 redistribution.

In 1983, the seat of Mount Isa was won for the Labor Party by Bill Price from the former National Party member, Mr Angelo Bertoni. There had been a protracted and quite heated campaign for the seat of Mount Isa before Bill Price eventually wrested it off Angelo Bertoni. After the redistribution, however, the electorate of Mount Isa lost the Burke Shire, the Mornington Shire and Doomadgee to my electorate of Cook. That effectively removed a substantial Labor voting block from the Mount Isa electorate and placed it in what was, and what still is, a safe Labor seat, that is, the electorate of Cook. What the National Party was attempting to do was to make the seat of Mount Isa more marginal so that it could have a chance of winning it back at the 1986 election. It went back to the conservatives in 1986. That is history. However, the attempts by the National Party at rotting its interests through the redistribution were thwarted by the fact that the Liberal Party got under its guard and won the seat. Of course, it is also history that it has now returned to the fold and is once again a Labor Party seat.

The quota for the western and far-northern zone in 1986 was 9 386 constituents. The two most remote electorates in Queensland—Mount Isa and Cook—were 35 per cent and 12.5 per cent over quota when the boundaries were finally settled in 1985. In fact, both seats were over the quota for the zone which is acknowledged to be less remote, that is, the country zone. At the other end of the spectrum, the electorates of Warrego, Peak Downs, Gregory, Balonne and Roma—honourable members can guess what party holds these seats—ranged below quota by between 7 per cent and 15 per cent. So the two Labor-held seats were 35 per cent and 12.5 per cent over the quota and the National Party seats that I have mentioned were well under the quota.

It must be remembered that this was at a time when an electoral redistribution had just been carried out. The process had just been finished and the boundaries had just been set. Two seats were substantially over the quota for their zone and five or six seats were substantially below the quota for their zone. That is when the boundaries had just been corrected or, it might be more pertinent to say, when the boundaries had just been fixed.

After the 1989 election, the electorate of Cook had over 50 per cent more electors than either the Roma or Gregory electorates and substantially more than others such as Warrego and Balonne. That persists to this day. The electorate of Cook is the most remote seat and one of the largest in the State. It has a land area of approximately 351 000 square kilometres. In addition, there are the difficulties that one has in traversing the electorate, plus all of the island communities in the Torres Strait and the Gulf of Carpentaria. The Cook electorate has 50 per cent more electors than the electorate of Roma, which is the seat of the Opposition Leader. His electorate is only a few hours' drive from Brisbane. The member for Brisbane Central has already said that the effect of the 1985 redistribution was not to enhance the vote of people in the country but people who lived about three hours' drive from Brisbane. The interest of the National Party was not in the people in remote parts of Queensland; its interest was in the National Party.

I was going to mention the case of Wujal Wujal. That is a very interesting one. The member for Barron River has already alluded to it. Talking about hoary old chestnuts, I will not hammer Wujal Wujal too much. I believe that it has been given a good going over. Suffice to say that it is, and will remain, the best example historically of an electoral gerrymander that I believe Queensland and probably the rest of the world has ever seen. I hope that we never see the likes of it again. I am confident that in considering its recommendations, the EARC will be aware of situations such as that.

I want to make a couple of other comments about some of the issues that were raised by members of the Opposition. I refer in particular to the reference to corruption and the little anecdotal story told by the member for Burdekin about a motorist from New South Wales driving up to the wonderful township of Home Hill. I have no doubt that as that motorist was travelling through the northern areas of New South Wales, corruption would have been uppermost in his mind because the National Party in that region has also had some problems with corruption over the last few years. However, the interesting point is that the member referred briefly—I almost missed it—to corruption being limited to certain areas. That reminds me of a pre-election statement that was made by Huan Fraser. I forget the name of the seat that he was running for in the Federal election. However, he said that corruption—

Mr Palaszczuk: Rankin.

Mr BREDHAUER: Yes, he was the National Party candidate for Rankin. I thank the member for Archerfield for his assistance.

Huan Fraser said something along the lines that corruption did not occur in Government circles, or that corruption did not really affect most Queenslanders, that it was not something that most of us should be worried about because it did not happen on a large scale. Let me assure honourable members opposite that any corruption in any form in any area of the public service, the police service or any level of Government will affect all Queenslanders because all Queenslanders pay the penalty.

I want to comment also on the repeated attacks on the fairness of electoral systems in other States by the Opposition Leader, the member for Gympie and various other members of the Opposition. They cited situations interstate and federally in which elections have been won by Governments that have won less than 50 per cent of the vote. I would like to point out the fallacies in their arguments. There are a number of them, the first of which is that in some way Bob Hawke and the Federal Labor Government engineered the boundaries prior to the last Federal election so that they could win with less than 50 per cent of the vote.

What members of the Opposition just do not understand is that there is an independent Federal body that reviews electoral boundaries, that that independent body receives cross-party support federally and that, in fact, the redistribution at the last Federal election was tipped to have cost the Labor Party seats and not to have helped it to secure seats.

Mr Stephan: Are you saying that is fair?

Mr BREDHAUER: I will take the interjection by the member for Gympie. It is fair. I was looking for something in the honourable member's speech that I could attack but, as usual, it contained nothing of substance. He never puts forward any arguments. It is a fair system because it operates on a system of one vote, one value for all Australians, and the boundaries are set by an independent review commission.

Mr Hayward: He is probably more concerned about the Northern Territory, where 51 per cent of the voters elect 100 per cent of the members.

Mr BREDHAUER: That would be right—51 per cent of the voters elect 100 per cent of the members.

The member for Burdekin also referred to Western Australia. He complained about an imbalance. I thought it was ironic that that is the other State that has an electoral zonal apportionment. He did not appear to be aware of that.

There are two basic reasons why State Labor Governments have won recent elections and why the Federal Labor Government won its third election. Firstly, people appreciated what the Labor Party had done during the past eight years. Secondly, people could not trust the Liberal and National Parties to do a good job, so they left them on the outer. Page 2 of the National Party's submission to EARC states—

"The principles underlying the National Party's submissions are contained in its Platform which states:

'The focal points of Australia's democratic tradition are its seven Parliaments. Modelled upon the Mother of Parliaments, the House of Commons at Westminster, our Parliaments should ensure that Governments are responsible to the elected representatives of the people, and thus to the people themselves. The preservation and enhancement of the operation of the nation's Parliaments is essential to the continued health of our democracy.' "

I firmly believe that the track record of the National Party during the past 30 years and the loss of that filing cabinet prove once and for all that the National Party knows nothing about the Westminster system. It never has; it pays it only lip-service.

Mr BOOTH (Warwick) (5.39 p.m.): I join in this debate on the case of the missing filing cabinet. Honourable members should consider why a whole day has been wasted in this House discussing this issue.

Mr Schwarten: Do you think it is a waste of time that all those documents are missing?

Mr BOOTH: Yes, I do. Nobody knows who shifted the documents. They could have been shifted since the election.

Mr Borbidge: They might still be there.

Mr BOOTH: They might still be there. They might turn up during the next fortnight, or they might have been shifted by somebody other than a member of the National Party.

I believe that this debate was brought on for a very different reason. Perhaps members of the Government are getting the message that the new Labor Government is on the nose in the community and are trying to dig up a bit of dirt on the National Party. I wonder if somebody has conducted a public opinion poll and knows what is going on in the community. As well, the Federal Budget, which will be brought down tonight, no doubt will contain some horrible news for the taxpayers of Australia. Perhaps members of the Labor Party are hoping that this debate will receive some coverage on the front page of tomorrow's newspapers. I do not think it will.

I am surprised that the mover and seconder of the motion, namely, the Minister for Tourism and the Attorney-General, have not been in the Chamber for most of today. They must not have their heart in this ridiculous debate.

The honourable member for Yeronga claimed that the missing files contain vital evidence. They contain vital evidence about nothing. The Parliamentary Committee for Electoral and Administrative Review will take no notice of what occurred in the 1985 redistribution or any other redistributions. Although the report of the Electoral and Administrative Review Commission has some merit, I do not believe that the committee will take notice of it when it makes its decisions.

Several arguments have been presented in support of an increase in the size of country electorates. It has been suggested that members in country areas should receive additional assistance by way of 008 numbers, additional staff and charter flights. However, I do not believe that paid public servants—electorate secretaries—in country areas will be able to do the same job as those in metropolitan districts. They cannot provide the same services to people who have complaints.

In 1949, when Labor Premier Hanlon introduced the Electoral Districts Bill, he gave a very valid reason for its introduction, a reason which I believe is still valid.

Mr Schwarten: You are tinkering with the boundaries started with the Moore Government.

Mr BOOTH: The zonal system started with the Hanlon Government. The EARC report states—

"The argument for zones based on the wealth and export production of the rural areas was developed later by the Country Party. However, in 1949 Hanlon pointed out that the 'very life and security of capital cities' depended on the 'successful development and expansion of country areas'."

I turn now to examine what has happened to our balance of payments. No encouragement has been offered to primary industry and very little has been offered to secondary industry. As a result, Australia has very little to export. We must look after the producers. This Government is trying to disadvantage the very people whom it should be helping.

I was surprised by the great respect that was shown to Mr Lane by Government members, who seem to think that anything that he says must be true.

Mr Schwarten: You used to think so.

Mr BOOTH: No, I did not. I was very fair. I do not think that Mr Lane behaved badly in this House. I am not attacking him personally.

However, the mover of the motion saw fit to make a personal attack on the Leader of the Opposition, Mr Cooper. The Goss Government should be ashamed for bringing on a debate which may be of no significance. I was surprised by the comments of the Leader of the Liberal Party, Mr Beanland, some of which were directed at my electorate. I will make every effort to ensure that my constituents are made aware of what he said. Tomorrow morning I will be anxious to read what he said in this debate. He visits my electorate and he tells the people that he is very worried about it and that he wants to represent it. But in this place he says that he wants to wipe it out. He cannot have it both ways. It has to be one way or the other. He said some things today that will not do us any good.

In fact, I do not think that this debate will benefit the Goss Government. I cannot see that, by the Government's taking this action, the reputation of the EARC will be enhanced. I cannot see the EARC benefiting from a debate such as this. However, I will not elaborate on that.

The member for Brisbane Central, Mr Beattie, said he thinks that the redistribution that was carried out in 1985 by the commissioners resembled the National Party submission. He said also that he believes in one vote, one value and in a tolerance of 10 per cent. If the EARC delivers the same finding as that, will he suggest there was some collusion?

Mr Beattie: No, because I have absolute faith in EARC. I had no faith in the National Party.

Mr BOOTH: The honourable member is making an arbitrary decision about the members of EARC.

Mr Stephan: He is claiming that it is different for them than it is for the National Party.

Mr BOOTH: Sure. The honourable member was very quick to claim that there was collusion between the commissioners and the National Party in the 1985 redistribution.

Mr Beattie: One of them was a fund-raiser. One of them raised funds for the National Party.

Mr BOOTH: What about the members of the EARC? Have they never had any political affiliation—absolutely none?

Mr Beattie: They are honest people with good integrity.

Mr BOOTH: I am not doubting their honesty. I never doubted their honesty.

Mr Harper: Who on that committee was a member of the National Party? Ask him to name one.

Mr BOOTH: The honourable member said that one of them was a fund-raiser. I do not know whether he knows or not. He made statements this afternoon that I think will come home to roost.

Mr Harper: He has been told to toe the line.

Mr BOOTH: All of them might have been told to do that.

During this debate, much has been said about the Cook electorate. It may be that that electorate is too large and maybe some mistakes were made in relation to it. Merely because a mistake was made in the Cook electorate, surely that is not sufficient reason why every electorate in Queensland should be penalised.

The member for Cook spoke about the Federal system of redistribution, which he said is carried out by an independent authority. I think that every commission that has ever set electoral boundaries under the Westminster system has always been independent, but in this State some people have rubbished such a commission.

Mr Stephan: In relation to the Federal redistribution, they were given guidelines of a 10 per cent tolerance.

Mr BOOTH: Yes, they were given that guideline.

I want to make some comments about the Federal seat of Rankin. That electorate has no community of interest whatever. I do not say that in a derogatory fashion.

Mr Ardill: Well represented.

Mr BOOTH: Yes, it might be. I did not say that it was not. I do not know that the member is that outstanding.

That electorate has no community of interest. If members opposite can tell me what community of interest the people of Inala have with those in the farming districts of my electorate——

Mr Beattie: They are all intelligent. What more community of interest do you want?

Mr BOOTH: They are intelligent. I did not intend to be insulting and say that people were not intelligent. I am saying that, over the years, there has been an endeavour to create electorates with a community of interest. I do not believe there is any community of interest in Rankin.

Mr Schwarten: That's why you have got mining communities with coastal communities.

Mr BOOTH: Yes, that is a bit of a problem. But mining communities do not make up big groups.

Mr Schwarten: Broadsound, for example. You have the Capricorn Coast and you have Dysart. What is the community of interest there?

Mr BOOTH: There are probably some difficulties there.

Nevertheless, the boundaries for the electorate of Rankin should be altered. If common sense prevailed, such changes might be made.

I think this debate has been a complete fizzer. I think it was a great mistake by the Labor Party to initiate a debate about the case of the missing filing cabinet. No-one knows where that cabinet is. I am sure that if the former Premier knew where it was, he would have handed it over immediately. But nine months have passed since he has had control of it and many things could have happened to it in that time. I think it was quite crazy to debate this matter.

I was very disappointed with the remarks made by the mover of the Government's motion. He spent a lot of his time discussing the Cribb report, which was a National Party report. I will not rehash it, because Mr Speaker—

Mr Harper: An independent one, too.

Mr BOOTH: Yes, an independent one.

The honourable member spent a lot of his time referring to that report, and quite wrongly so, I think. Nevertheless, he was allowed to do so. However, that is water under the bridge.

I think a Government must be falling to pieces and must be in tatters when it spends a day discussing a matter such as this.

Mr SULLIVAN (Glass House) (5.51 p.m.): I am pleased to rise to add my voice to this call for the Opposition Leader to do the right thing and to deposit the aforementioned files in the approved receptacle, that is, the hands of the EARC commissioners.

I have a great deal of sympathy for persons who find the cupboard bare when they take over office. Having taken over the office of the former National Party member in my electorate of Glass House, I was left with two pieces of paper constituting one file, and I had to find the manila folder in which to put those two pieces of paper.

Mr Stephan: You didn't know what to do with them; is that what you are saying?

Mr SULLIVAN: I knew exactly what to do with them. I put them in a little file.

I believe that the people who cleaned out the ministerial offices were rank amateurs compared with those who did a vacuum cleaner job on my office. I am actually in a position to give the member for Lockyer, who wishes to go searching for these missing files, an unequivocal assurance that, as a result of that vacuum cleaner effort, he will not find them in my office.

However, I did find one other very interesting piece of paper when I moved the furniture in my office. It is a multicoloured piece of paper—a photograph of the former member with a very broad smile and very ruddy cheeks wearing a pink frilly lei. Perhaps he departed this place in good time to prevent him from having to cast an embarrassing conscience vote. The simple facts are that I do not believe that either a former Premier of this State or a senior ranking National Party person, be he in Parliament or in the party organisation, cannot provide EARC with the documentation that it seeks.

I feel well qualified to speak in this place about the electoral matters that pertained in 1985. The previous speaker, the member for Warwick, admitted that there may have been some mistakes made with the redistribution in Cook and that there could be some

difficulties with Broadsound and, if the interjections from the honourable member for Rockhampton North had continued, perhaps there could have been an admission of some difficulties with many more of the 89 seats that make up this Parliament.

One of the many abuses of the 1985 redistributive effort is the seat of Glass House. On 27 March this year, in my maiden speech, I pointed out that both I and my constituents have an interest in the processes of the 1985 redistribution. The suspicions that we have can only be allayed or confirmed by the return of those missing documents that are so necessary for EARC to properly complete its examination of the zonal system. In that speech in March, I suggested that the electorate of Glass House was manufactured through the process of redistribution in order to return a National Party member to this place.

A Liberal Party member interjected.

Mr SULLIVAN: The boundaries of the electorate of Glass House display the creativity that was lacking in that interjection. They display a creativity that was the hallmark of the former Government's management of electoral redistributions in this State over a number of years. I used the term "management" advisedly, because that is exactly what the 32 years of National Party Government and National/Liberal coalitions gave this State—managed electoral boundaries to distort election results in their favour.

However, on 2 December, the National Party was found out in a big way and the electorate of Glass House was won by me for the Australian Labor Party. Of course, it won many other seats. Locally, the shock is still evident in the actions and on the faces of many of the individual National Party troglodytes who make up some of the population of my seat. Those people are still unable to acknowledge the fact that their beloved party transgressed at all during 32 years of rorted election results.

My recollections of the events of 1985 suggest to me that it took two attempts for the commission to actually get the boundaries of Glass House right. Earlier this afternoon, the member for Brisbane Central displayed a front page of the *Sun* newspaper. I took down the date as 6 November 1985. That article contained in it a map that showed the new electorate of Glass House that was designed to be won by the National Party.

Mr Harper: How did you win it then?

Mr SULLIVAN: I was very, very clever.

The boundaries as at 6 November 1985 were not the final boundaries. The boundaries are an insult to the electors of Glass House. It makes up one of five electorates in the Sunshine Coast region and each of them was designed to be won by the National Party.

To make absolutely sure that the National Party was going to win Glass House, it needed to change a little the boundaries that the commissioners had originally suggested. As a result, the electorate of Glass House included large areas of the Mary Valley, the Conondale Ranges and a suburb of Caloundra. Can honourable members believe it, a suburb of Caloundra in the seat of Glass House! These areas were included in the electorate because historically it voted very solidly for the National Party.

Mr SCHWARTEN: Hysterically.

Mr SULLIVAN: Historically and hysterically.

The electors of Glass House historically voted for the National Party and yet, if somebody were to look at the voting figures from the township of Imbil, they would discover that in 1989 those electors moved in rather large numbers to the Labor Party.

Mr Santoro interjected.

Mr SULLIVAN: Over Mr Santoro's bleatings, I welcome to this Parliament Mrs Sheldon, who is one of the members representing the Sunshine Coast region from which I also come. Five former seats held by the National Party—four down, one to go. Perhaps

the member for Gympie is feeling a little lonely and a little vulnerable. Perhaps that is why he has to mumble on about everything that comes before the House.

One further thing that occurred in my area that needs to be mentioned is the absolute misnaming of the seat of Caboolture. It was previously represented in this place by a member of the National Party who in fact became the member for Glass House because he saw that he could win there whereas in Caboolture he may not have such a good chance. He actually never lived in the seat of Glass House, but maintained a residence in the seat of Caboolture.

The seat of Caboolture does not contain any part of the township of Caboolture. Why the name was retained one can only assume, but my assumption is that it was retained because, with a sufficiently large amount of money pumped into the election campaign, with a high-profile candidate, and the fact that the seat was a National Party seat, then it might just possibly be retained for the National Party. History proved that hope to be false and today in this Parliament the Labor Party has a very able member for Caboolture in Mr Hayward.

Mr Coomber interjected.

Mr SULLIVAN: I take that interjection because it proves that the member has not been listening from the outset of my speech. Because he is behind me, I assume he has only recently walked. What this has to do with the files goes back to the beginning of my speech when I said that I and my constituents have a very great interest in ensuring that these files are found so that the fears that we have about the processes that led to the establishment of the seat of Glass House can be answered.

I believe that the Leader of the Opposition is in a position to ensure absolutely that his party releases or surrenders those documents to EARC and I believe that he should do so immediately. Sitting suspended from 6 to 7.30 p.m.

Mr SANTORO (Merthyr) (7.30 p.m.): It is with some reservation that I join in this debate. I do not mind admitting that I was not going to speak at all, but I was prompted by one of the remarks made by the Minister for sports and tourism.

A Government member: The Minister for Tourism, Sport and Racing.

Mr SANTORO: I thank the honourable member for the correction.

When the Minister described the member for Somerset as a member of the Opposition who was rotting away and wasting his time and, who, without the backup of bureaucracy, went about his business in an unprepared way, I was reminded of something that I have been saying ever since I made my maiden speech, and that is to decry the very personal and vilifying nature of some of the comments that honourable members make about each other. I felt aggrieved on behalf of the honourable member to whom the Minister referred. I remind the Minister and all honourable members of the great contribution to Queensland that that individual has made and continues to make.

Mr Gibbs: You're not great enough to be humble.

Mr SANTORO: If the Minister listens, he will be well reminded that it was the gentleman to whom he referred as somebody rotting away and leading a useless existence in this House who had the courage to initiate the Fitzgerald inquiry. He also contributes magnificently to the workings of the Parliamentary Committee for Criminal Justice. I am sure that the fair-minded members of the Labor Party who serve on that committee will vouch—

Mr Harper: This Minister wouldn't like that very much.

Mr SANTORO: No, he certainly would not. The fair-minded members of the Labor Party who serve on the Parliamentary Committee for Criminal Justice will vouch for

the incisiveness of the comments and the contributions that are made by the member for Somerset and for the knowledge and experience that he brings to bear upon the deliberations of that committee.

In the cut and thrust of debate honourable members should not lose sight of basic civilities. Witty, light-hearted interjections should be tendered and should be received with civility. However, honourable members should not—for the want of a better expression—prey on the sensitivities of other honourable members.

I refer to the characteristics of openness, accountability and fairness as they apply to people and the processes that shape Queensland's electoral systems and boundaries. Before making points which will clearly illustrate the position of both myself and my party compared with the position of the ALP, I restate the Liberal Party's position and commitment to the electoral reform process that is currently under way. The Liberal Party's position on this issue has always been consistent. We favour an electoral system that is composed of only one zone and that has boundaries which incorporate electorates comprising an equal number of people, with a tolerance of 10 per cent.

At a Federal level, that system is favoured by the Labor Party, the National Party, the Democrats and the Liberal Party. For many years, the Liberal Party has been in favour of that system, which is enshrined within our submission to EARC. There is no inconsistency in what the Liberal Party advocates. If members of both the Labor Party and the National Party who have sought to distort our views on this point make proper reference to the records, they will stand corrected.

The comment made on the Liberal Party's submission to EARC by the National Party bears particular mention. The Leader of the Liberal Party was singled out by the member for Burdekin, who said that the people in the electorates that are represented by members of the National Party would object strenuously to the position taken by both the Leader of the Liberal Party and the Liberal Party as a whole in relation to electoral reform.

The Leader of the Liberal Party reports fully to meetings of the parliamentary Liberal Party, and he has told us of the visits that he has made to the Whitsunday area, Warwick, Toowoomba, Townsville and Mackay. When he has travelled to those centres, many of which are in electorates that are represented by National Party members, members of the general public have voiced no major objections to the Liberal Party's view on this issue. National Party people, Labor Party people and Liberal Party people have not come out of the woodwork, as the member for Burdekin suggested, and said that the Liberal Party's position is wrong and not in the best interests of those people.

I remind the member for Burdekin that the same people to whom he referred usually, live in Federal electorates that are infinitely larger than the State electorates that comprise those Federal electorates. Although I have searched the newspaper clippings and the parliamentary records, I have not found any evidence in the House of Representatives' record of complaints from National Party members or anybody else about the lack of proper representation for those people who live within very large Federal electorates. Whether they live in Western Australia, half of which comprises one Federal electorate, or whether they live in some of the smaller but nevertheless still very large electorates which make up the Queensland Federal electorates, to the best of my knowledge there is no known record—and I can be corrected by any honourable member who brings forward such evidence—of people objecting to the size of the electorates in which they live and the quality of the representation that they enjoy by any member, irrespective of whether that member is Liberal Party, Labor Party or National Party.

I say in the most constructive fashion to the National Party that it should tell the people whom it represents that, in this day and age, we can avail ourselves of an enormous number of electronic and communications tools that will enable us to represent our constituents as effectively as if they lived in electorates smaller than the size advocated by the Liberal Party. We should tell the National Party that the quality of representation should not be determined solely by the size of electorates but by other considerations,

including the use of technology and the diligence of members who seek the endorsement of parties and of electors to represent them.

I say to National Party members who might claim that smallness leads to better representation that they are in fact doing their electorates and the people who live in them a disservice. The Liberal Party stands for a position that has been consistent over many years, one which, if a historical perspective is taken, will stand scrutiny. That is what I say to the Labor Party and the National Party when they criticise our perspective on electoral reform.

The Attorney-General and the other Labor Party members who have participated in this debate have taken mainly a historical perspective when analysing the Labor Party's record in this place and particularly the National Party's record. I want to recap on the Labor Party's record of the past, and I will go back to 1917 and 1922, although I will not dwell too long on that period because other members have done so. Also I want to look at the Labor Party's current attitude to electoral reform.

Mr Heath interjected.

Mr SANTORO: I suggest to the honourable member for Nundah that he take notes of what I am saying so that he can come to a full realisation of what his party is really about.

I refer firstly to what happened with the Upper House in Queensland. Labor members, who profess to be the guardians of democracy and the people who stand for democratic principles, accountability and openness, should remember that, in 1917, Queensland had two Houses. The lower House was controlled by the Labor Party and the Upper House was controlled by people with persuasions different from those of the Labor Party. The Labor Party went to the electorate and said, "What we want you, the electors, to do is to give us permission to abolish the Upper House." The electorate voted 179 000 against and 116 000 for— a substantial majority, honourable members opposite would say. Labor's proposition was rejected. Labor said, "The people have spoken but we do not like what the people said. What we are going to do is avail ourselves of the power to stack the Upper House." Labor ignored the wishes of the people and started stacking the Upper House. Eventually, it had enough members in the Upper House to do the kamikaze trick and abolish it.

I am on record in this place as saying—and I maintain this attitude—that one of the major reasons Fitzgerald was able to uncover the malpractices in the Government and the administration was that the Labor Party had abolished one of the most essential check and balance mechanisms within the Westminster system.

Mr Ardill: What party did Don Lane belong to?

Mr SANTORO: The honourable member should listen. If the Labor Party had not abolished the House of review, that House would have picked up many of the malpractices that Fitzgerald eventually uncovered and which, in fact, ended up allowing Labor to become the Government. That is part of Labor's legacy in Queensland. It is the only State in the Commonwealth that does not have a House of review, and Labor was responsible. Government members should not forget that it was the Labor Party that abolished the House of review in Queensland.

Let me now turn to the other major legacy that the Labor Party left Queensland—the gerrymander. The Labor Party accuses the National Party of perfecting the gerrymander. Be that as it may, it was the Labor Party that gerrymandered Queensland. That is another part of its less than distinguished legacy.

Mr Livingstone: Do you want to bring it back?

Mr SANTORO: I will get to that point. The honourable member should have patience.

The Liberal Party will never let the Labor Party forget that it introduced the gerrymander and abolished the House of review so that Queensland is the only State without an Upper House.

Government members: Hear, hear!

Mr SANTORO: I hear honourable members say "Hear, hear!" to my statement that the Labor Party abolished the Upper House.

Why is it that the Labor Parties in other States—Victoria, New South Wales, South Australia and Western Australia—and in Canberra have not abolished their Upper Houses, which honourable members opposite are so proud that their party did in 1922? It is because they realise the essential function performed by Upper Houses or Houses of review. The counterparts of Government members do not seek to abolish their Upper Houses even when they are in power; yet Government members are running against the tide and saying, "We are proud of what happened." They are not standing up for the principles expounded by their Labor counterparts at Federal and other State levels.

They can boast all they want to that they performed that piece of political bastardry on the political system in Queensland. They can go ahead and feign all sorts of misgivings and false emotions. Members of the Labor Party know that they are out of step with their Federal counterparts, and the Liberal Party will remind them of it time after time. The Minister can shake his head, but it cannot be denied. It is a matter of public record that the Labor Party is out of step.

Mr Ardill: Tell us about Don Lane.

Mr SANTORO: I am getting to Don Lane and I will come to that shortly. The question should legitimately be asked: is this all relevant? After all, it is all in the past and no doubt members of the ALP would say, "We are the ALP of today. All this happened 30 or 40 years ago."

Government members interjected.

Mr SANTORO: Labor members should not get excited. I am paraphrasing what they would say. They would say, "We are the ALP of today. Forget about the past."

I remember the Leader of the Opposition asking the Premier whether he would stand by the recommendations of EARC. To suggest that the Premier's answer was fudging and that he did not commit himself is an understatement. Let us hear about the guarantees that members of the Labor Party and members of the National Party are asking from the Liberal Party in relation to EARC recommendations. Let us hear it from the Premier and from Government members—especially those ALP members who are yet to speak in this debate. Let us hear them say that they will support EARC's recommendations.

Mrs Edmond interjected.

Mr SANTORO: The member for Mount Coot-tha should get up and make the commitment that the Labor Government will implement EARC reforms as recommended by that commission.

Mr Livingstone: "Lock, stock and barrel"?

Mr SANTORO: Yes, that is right. I suggest to members of the Labor Party that they are not prepared to do that and that they have not been prepared to do it. I believe that they will stand condemned by that singular lack of commitment to the very principles they espouse.

Government members interjected.

Mr SANTORO: My advice to ALP members is to stand up and say what they think.

To find out whether the ALP has benefited from gerrymanders, let me examine what has happened in other States and at other elections when a Labor Government has been returned. Let me examine what happened on 24 March 1990 when the coalition gained almost 400 000 first preference votes but still missed out. It is facile to make a comparison between the share of the primary vote gained and the number of seats won, yet that simplistic calculation was always used to assess the fairness of electoral systems. Now that the system seems to favour the ALP, there is a singular silence to be found among ALP members.

When Federal election results showed an analysis of votes gained and seats gained and an overall result favouring the ALP, no outcry was heard from members of the ALP. Irrespective of who draws up the boundaries—they are independent commissioners—ALP members should have the guts to get up and say to the commissioners, "Make sure that we get boundaries that reflect the will of the people." For years, Federal Labor politicians used to complain that they were robbed when, despite the polling of the coalition, the distribution of minor preferences kept the ALP out of power. Yet in the 1990 election, when there was a striking and definitive case of unfairness and when the coalition gained 400 000 primary votes and an undisputed majority of two-party preferred votes, the coalition still missed out, which means that to win enough seats at the next election the Liberal Party and the National Party still need a swing of 1.8 per cent in their favour.

Let me examine what has happened in other States. Indeed, it is becoming an all-too-familiar experience for the Liberal Party to be deprived of Government despite winning a popular majority. Apart from the most recent Federal elections, Labor administrations in Victoria, South Australia and Western Australia have retained office with only 49.5 per cent of the vote, 48.1 per cent of the vote, and 47.5 per cent of the vote respectively in a two-party preferred system. Do members of the Labor Party call that a fair system?

Mr Ardill: Yes.

Mr SANTORO: The member for Salisbury calls that a fair system? I remind him that 47.5 per cent of the people elected a majority Labor Government, and if he reckons that is fair, his definition of "fair" must be warped.

In New South Wales, the "Wranmander" meant that Nick Greiner required a majority of 52.5 per cent of the vote to win office in 1988, yet what has the Labor Party done in relation to those figures? Members of the Labor Party have remained ominously silent.

Let me now turn to the position in Queensland. Despite Labor's propaganda blitz, the ALP was never prevented from winning power because of the gerrymander. The ALP in Queensland was kept out of power because of its failure to win the popular vote, and that is what the record shows. Following the disastrous 1974 election, Labor's share of the vote slipped to 38.5 per cent. Prior to 1989, the ALP consistently gained only 45 or 46 per cent of the two-party preferred vote in this State. At the last State election, when Labor finally achieved a popular majority, the ALP won Government—and fair enough—with a popular majority that it had never previously been able to achieve. Labor members should never forget that.

Government members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Johnson): Order! I think we have had enough of that noise.

Mr SANTORO: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. I was beginning to wonder.

Members of the Liberal Party do not run around blaming defeat on the system or complaining about a "Hawkemander", which Labor was fond of doing. Let me refer to another case of the Labor Party's selective amnesia. I will cite the ALP submission to the EARC inquiry in relation to the Hare-Clarke system. I ask honourable members to

listen because I suspect that most Labour members would not have heard of this system. I say that because the reference is tucked away very conveniently in the submission. Admittedly, the submission is trying to make a philosophical point, but I ask honourable members to listen to what ALP strategists say about the Labor representatives who won elections under the Hare-Clarke system.

At page 31, the ALP submission to EARC stated—

"In the 1989 Tasmanian Election both these problems arose. A minority Labor Government was created despite the fact that the Liberals had a clear majority of the putative two-party-preferred vote. With just 15% of the Green preferences and half the Others' preferences, the Liberals would have won. Those shares of preferences were well within the range of the Liberals as a study of preference flows in the recent Federal election will show.

Proportional representation robbed the Liberals of a victory that they would have had if the majority had been heard. It was indeed fortuitous for the Labor Party and the people of Tasmania, but a sad blow for democracy."

The Labor Party submission talks about the Liberal Party's being robbed of a victory, but where have we heard Government members say that publicly or in the Parliament? They conveniently hide it away in a submission. In common with the Labor Party, the Liberal Party does not want a Hare-Clark system. I guarantee that, if EARC recommends a Hare-Clark system, Government members will be the last people to implement it. That is why the Premier, in common with the Liberal Party, will not say that he will support any recommendation that EARC might bring down. The Hare-Clark system will give Queensland the piece of political bastardry that the Labor Party condemned in its report. That is the reason why the Premier and Government members will not give the guarantee that they are demanding and that the National Party is demanding of the Liberal Party in relation to EARC. Government members have been caught out by the conscience of their own submission. They will not implement a Hare-Clark system if it is recommended.

I will now come to one of the points that Mr Ardill raised about Don Lane.

Mr Ardill: Under a Hare-Clark system, you won't even be here.

Mr SANTORO: The honourable member interjected earlier and I told him that I would seek to answer one of his questions. If he pays me the courtesy of listening, he may learn something.

Mr Beattie suggested that Mr Lane, as a Liberal—

Mr Harper interjected.

Mr SANTORO: That may be the case. I cannot prove it, but I accept the interjection of the honourable member for Auburn.

Mr Beattie suggested that, in the distribution process on behalf of the National Party, Don Lane was employed by the National Party to exert the skills that he picked up when he was a Liberal. I simply say that the Liberal Party refutes the suggestion by Mr Beattie or anybody else in the Labor Party that it commissioned Mr Lane to exert any influence whatsoever over the independent commissioners who drew up the boundaries. I say to Government members, and also to members on this side of the House, that it is a point of common agreement in this place that the Liberal Party suffered the most under successive redistributions. The Labor Party story that Don Lane exercised influence on behalf of the Liberal Party to bias the results of any redistribution hearings in favour of the Liberal Party just does not stack up.

I will make another point which is very pertinent to this debate. The 1977 Liberal Party submission to the distribution commissioners, in which Mr Lane figured prominently, was made public. Did Government members hear that? It was made public. The accusation that Mr Lane, as a Liberal, manipulated the commissioners and benefited the Liberal Party just does not stack up. When Government members seek to perpetrate

that fraudulent view, they keep proving themselves to be nothing but frauds. The Liberal Party's submission was made public. The historical record will show that Don Lane did not intervene to the benefit of the Liberal Party. For Government members to suggest anything to the contrary is a travesty of the truth.

Mr Ardill interjected.

Mr SANTORO: I will not accept the honourable member's interjections, because I believe that I have answered them.

I conclude with the valid point that the Liberal Party is the only party that has made a submission to EARC that, if implemented, will mean that Queenslanders will have 17 fewer politicians than the number recommended by the Labor Party. Our recommendation of 82 electorates compared with the Labor Party's 99 electorates would mean 17 fewer politicians. The Liberal Party will keep pushing that policy to the electorate. It is not recommending ten fewer politicians than the number recommended by the Labor Party; it is recommending 17 fewer than the number recommended by the Labor Party.

The Liberal Party understands why the Labor Party is pushing for ten additional politicians. It is in all sorts of diabolical straits. When the Labor Party tries to accommodate that increased number of members after a redistribution, it will have all sorts of problems. How does the Labor Party overcome its problems? It wishes to inflict ten additional politicians on the public of Queensland. The public of Queensland will never forgive the Labor Party. The Liberal Party will keep reminding the people of Queensland that the Labor Party and the National Party have been making submissions to all sorts of people, including EARC, to gain additional politicians.

Government members may feel incredibly uncomfortable. The Liberal Party's submission to EARC is for 17 fewer politicians, and it will stick by that.

Time expired.

Mr HEATH (Nundah) (8 p.m.): Mr Deputy Speaker, I hope to give you an easier time than you had during the speech of the member for Merthyr. My contribution will be much more rational. I will actually refer to the motion and to the missing files and the filing cabinet, which the member for Merthyr seems to have forgotten about.

One of the notable points about the last decade of Queensland's political history is the consistency with which the National Party adheres to its principles. Some of these principles, I admit, may be admirable. However, some of them include contempt for the public disclosure of documents and secrecy regarding the tabling of commissioned reports. Recently, honourable members saw the Attorney-General table a pile of such reports which the Nationals had kept hidden—

Mr Veivers: What about the Cooke report?

Mr HEATH: The first two sections of that report have been tabled in this House.

The Nationals also showed contempt for a fair electoral process or system for Queensland. We saw single-party Governments elected on 39 per cent of the vote and majority parties in coalition Governments elected on 19 per cent of the vote. These totally undemocratic results were permitted to occur by an unfair, unjust electoral zoning and weightage system which saw Queenslanders in some electorates, such as Manly and Logan, regarded as being worth three and a half times less than other Queenslanders in, say, the Roma electorate. And members of the Opposition talk about fairness! This system was fine tuned and perfected by the National Party. Now, after the years of turmoil in Queensland associated with the Fitzgerald inquiry, which eroded or seriously damaged public confidence in the police, the Parliament and the public service, Queensland has the chance—the blueprint, I suppose—for a return to honest administration at all levels, firstly, through an open and honest Government and, secondly, through the impartial commissions, that is, the CJC and the EARC.

The National Party in this Parliament now professes strong support for a return to the real Westminster system, tells us that it supports the inquiries and activities of the CJC and the EARC, and demands accountability. It is worth remembering that in 1988, after years of recalcitrance, the Nationals finally set up a Public Accounts Committee, when other such committees had been in operation in Australia since the turn of the century. Now we find that all of this rhetoric about a new, clean National Party, an open and honest National Party is hollow, empty, barren, sterile.

Mr Elder interjected.

Mr HEATH: Exactly, but it shows historical consistency.

The National Party's submission in relation to the 1985 redistribution is missing. The Leader of the Opposition does not know where the documents are; former Premiers do not know where they are; party officials do not know where they are; and, most certainly, the EARC does not know where they are, but it really would like to have a good look at them. Apart from this contempt of the EARC, this is a blatant insult to the people of Queensland. Some people want to know why the Nationals insulted them by saying that they were of three and a half times less importance to the State than some other Queenslanders. In and around my electorate there are many, many people who remember very well the two turncoats, Don Lane and Brian Austin, not just in terms of designing submissions to the electoral commission but also in terms of personal disfranchisement. There remains a lot of anger about that in my area. There are also many people who still wonder why Austin's Wavell electorate disappeared before the next election, and whether the rumours that Mr Lane redrew the boundaries of his own Merthyr electorate personally, line by line, street by street, are true. Perhaps the EARC is wondering the same thing.

While I am on the subject of the electorate of Merthyr—the historical view expounded by the current member for Merthyr can be easily debunked here in the Forty-sixth Parliament of Queensland. Put simply, if the present 54 Labor members had been in the Government in 1949, there would have been no zonal system, because not one of them supports a zonal system.

Mr Borbidge: What rubbish! You brought it in. You introduced it.

Mr HEATH: The honourable member did not listen to what I said. I said that not one of the present 54 Labor members would have introduced a zonal system.

Speaking historically, if the Liberal Party supported a fair electoral system, why did not the Liberals cross the floor and vote with the Labor Party prior to 1983 to end the gerrymander then and there? They had many chances and every time they were shown not to have the spine to do that. That was the contribution by the member for Merthyr to selective amnesia.

I will return to the matter of the missing filing cabinet. There is enormous public interest in locating these files, quite apart from the aspect of the EARC needing the documents in order to complete its work. For the first time in decades, Queensland is looking forward to a genuinely independent, honest and fair electoral system, and is relying on the recommendations of the EARC to provide this. However, it appears that the National Party, by professing that it cannot find the submission—or the filing cabinet—is bolstering the public perception that it has not changed its attitudes, that it cannot change its attitudes and that its supposed new look is no more than a coat of paint.

I strongly support this motion. I call on the Leader of the Opposition to show that he is a real leader—and therefore, I suppose, show that the rumours to the contrary are untrue, if he can—and to turn his party upside down, if necessary, and demand that the files be located and forwarded to the EARC. The contention that the National Party organisation has no copy of the submission is ludicrous, unless it was deliberately shredded. The people of Queensland are as interested in this matter as is the EARC, and they deserve more respect from the National Party.

Hon. N. J. HARPER (Auburn) (8.07 p.m.): Obviously tonight is a very important night for a number of reasons. Not only has the Government brought on this debate but also, at this time in the Federal sphere, the Federal Treasurer is telling Australians about the success of National Party Governments over a number of years and acknowledging the state of Queensland's finances when the Labor Government took office in December last year.

I wish to dispel the nonsense that was peddled earlier this year both publicly and in this House by the Treasurer. Let me quote from the Budget Speech that was delivered in Canberra tonight by the "World's Greatest Treasurer". He said—

"The level of public indebtedness is assuming greater significance in both domestic and international financial markets and other analyses of the States' overall economic positions and assessments of creditworthiness. The main points to note from Chart 10"—

which relates to net debt and net interest outlays as a percentage of GSP—

"are that at 30th June 1987"—

which, as honourable members know, was when the National Party formed a Government of this State—

Mr Gibbs: What has this got to do with the debate?

Mr HARPER: I am referring to what the Federal Treasurer said—the "Greatest Treasurer in the World". He said that State sector net indebtedness—

Mr ELDER: I rise to a point of order. Mr Speaker, I draw your attention to the speech that is being made by the member for Auburn. I ask that you adhere to your ruling prior to the dinner recess and bring the honourable member back to the issues rather than allowing him to digress on economic forecasts.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I will take further note of the speech that is being made by the member for Auburn.

Mr HARPER: I appreciate the wisdom of your ruling, Mr Speaker. The scope of the debate was widened by the Government. I am now addressing this matter to show the reliability of the National Party when it was in Government. I believe that is pertinent to this debate, because the Government is trying to claim that the National Party was irresponsible in and out of Government.

The Federal Treasurer has acknowledged the responsible attitude of the National Party in Government. He said that the proportion of the total debt held by the general Government sector, which, unlike the private sector—

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I will not permit the honourable member to continue on this subject for much longer. I have noted the tone of his speech. He will talk about the EARC, electoral redistributions and lost filing cabinets, otherwise I will insist that he resume his seat.

Mr HARPER: Naturally, Mr Speaker, I acknowledge your ruling. However, I am sure that you would appreciate the fact that members of the Opposition are very pleased that the Federal Treasurer has complimented the former National Party Government for its responsibility.

Firstly, I turn to the role of the Attorney-General in this Parliament and other Australian Parliaments. As you would be aware, Mr Speaker, when you were absent from the Chamber the Attorney-General addressed the House on this motion. The role of the Attorney-General in Australian Parliaments is very pertinent to this debate.

The *House of Representatives Practice* mentions the role of the Attorney-General. On page 101 it states—

"The Attorney-General is the chief legal adviser to the Commonwealth Government and has overall responsibility for the conduct of actions brought by the Commonwealth Government in the legal system."

It goes on to say—

"When making decisions about whether the laws of the Federal Parliament are being properly observed and whether people should be prosecuted for not observing the law, the Attorney-General acts as the First Law Officer of the Crown."

Mr SPEAKER: Order! What is the relevance of this to the debate? I am being tolerant with the honourable member.

Mr HARPER: When the Deputy Speaker was occupying the chair, I took several points of order when the Attorney-General was addressing the House on this matter. I want to demonstrate the points that I was making at that time in the general debate. Mr Wells was afforded the opportunity as the Attorney-General to take part in the debate.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I suggest that Mr Harper speak to the motion and my broad interpretation of it, otherwise he will resume his seat. I will not allow him during this debate to discuss the responsibilities of the Attorney-General.

Mr HARPER: Again, Mr Speaker, I bow to your ruling. However, it is a sad day when the role of the Attorney-General, who chose to lead the debate as the seconder of the motion, cannot be discussed during the course of this debate.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The Attorney-General can take part in the debate at any time as a member of the Government. Simply because the Attorney-General has taken part in the debate, that does not entitle a member to debate the role of the Attorney-General. I will not allow the honourable member to continue debating the role of the Attorney-General.

Mr HARPER: Mr Speaker, naturally I have no alternative other than to accept your ruling. However, it is unfortunate that the role of the Attorney-General has been prostituted in this House.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I have just warned the honourable member that I will not allow him to debate the role of the Attorney-General. The honourable member will resume his seat. I call the Minister.

Hon. R. J. GIBBS (Wolston—Minister for Tourism, Sport and Racing) (8.15 p.m.), in reply: I will not say that this debate has raged. Although the intelligent comment has come from the Government side of the House, this debate has been a bitter disappointment in terms of the quality of the speeches that were made by members of both conservative parties on the other side of the House.

The standard of the debate was established this morning when the first outrageous mistruth was told when the poor member for Sherwood walked into this Parliament. I think it is an observation that everybody makes. It simply is not a truism that the member for Sherwood is uglier than the member for Southport. I certainly think that he wins the honours.

Mr Hamill: Beauty is in the eye of the beholder.

Mr GIBBS: As the member for Ipswich rightly points out, beauty is in the eye of the beholder.

The sad thing that has emerged from this debate for this Parliament and, more importantly, for the people of Queensland—

Mr BORBIDGE: I rise to a point of order. Mr Speaker, with respect, I refer to your ruling earlier in which you denied the member for Auburn an opportunity to speak in respect of the role of the Attorney-General. I draw your attention to the fact that earlier in the day the Minister for Tourism spoke at length on the Cribb report. At that time I took a point of order and I asked Mr Deputy Speaker if it was his intention that this would be wide-ranging debate and he said that it would be.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! There is no point of order. The member for Surfers Paradise will resume his seat. I am aware of what happened earlier in the debate. At that time I was not in the chair. As I explained earlier, when I am in the chair I will make the rulings as Speaker. I will not waste the time of the House debating what happened earlier in the day. The honourable member will resume his seat.

Mr BORBIDGE: My point of order is that there have been two conflicting rulings given. Out of respect for the Chair the Opposition accepted the ruling by Mr Deputy Speaker, which is now at variance with the ruling given by yourself.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will resume his seat. There is no point of order. I warn the member for Surfers Paradise that if he continues to take a point of order on a matter that I have explained, I will have to deal with him. I call the Honourable the Minister.

Mr GIBBS: The incredible sensitivity of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition continues. The simple fact is that from the moment this motion was moved this morning there has been an absolute failure on behalf of the National Party in particular and also the Liberal Party, from which we do not expect anything better, anyway, to address the matter at hand, namely, the question before this House relating to the disappearance of the files and the disappearance of the filing cabinet.

We have not heard one explanation given as to why this important submission, which was prepared by the National Party in 1985 to go before the electoral redistribution commissioners in this State, has suddenly disappeared. Nor have we heard why, in the report that has been constantly referred to here today from the Electoral and Administrative Review Commission, the commissioner himself has said that he finds it extremely difficult to come to a conclusion in relation to the commission's role because of the lack of that particular document? I do not believe that anybody in this House is satisfied——

Mr Booth interjected.

Mr GIBBS: I do not believe that even people in the honourable member's party can be satisfied or convinced that a Government that was in power in this State for 32 years could put away in a metal filing cabinet a document which, on the night of 2 December 1989, suddenly and mysteriously disappeared. Not only did the document itself disappear, but also the metal filing cabinet. Where did they go? Not one member opposite has been able to answer that question, which was the substance of the motion moved by the Government.

I continue to say, as I said this morning when I moved the motion——

Mr BOOTH: I rise to a point of order. The honourable member has just made a statement that these documents disappeared on the night of 2 December.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I have heard enough. There is no point of order. That is not a point of order.

Mr BOOTH: But surely, Mr Speaker, you are not going to allow a statement such as that——

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

Mr Booth interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Borbidge: It's disgraceful.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The member for Warwick will resume his seat. The member for Surfers Paradise will not interject other than from his right place, or I will warn him under Standing Order 123A.

Mr GIBBS: The dishonesty, the lack of accountability and the paucity of performance by the Leader of the Opposition have again been demonstrated in this House today. On

innumerable occasions, Opposition members have attempted to place smokescreens over the real issue—that of the disappearance of their 1985 submission to the distribution commissioners.

We even saw the charade of the member for Lockyer, who this morning waved a document and pretended that he had it in his possession by saying, "I have got it here." Of course, he never had it. We knew that he did not have it.

I reiterate what I said earlier: once again Opposition members have been exposed for the dishonest, disorganised political rabble that they are. There is no doubt in my mind that, when the motion is put to the House, not only will my colleagues on this side of the House be supporting it but also, I would hope, the Liberal Party will at least have the intestinal fortitude to cross the floor and support the Government on the issue as well.

Question—That the words proposed to be omitted stand part of the question—put; and the House divided—

AYES, 55

NOES, 22

DIVISION

Question—That the motion be agreed to—put; and the House divided—

AYES, 55

NOES, 22

DIVISION

Resolved in the affirmative.

MOTOR VEHICLES SAFETY ACT AMENDMENT BILL
Second Reading

Debate resumed (see p. 1504).

Hon. V. P. LESTER (Peak Downs) (8.33 p.m.): The Bill proposes a small amendment that will give more credence to the workshops at which motor vehicles are examined.

Another matter of concern is that for a person to be licensed as an approved examiner, he must be employed by the proprietor of the premises at which he is to undertake his motor vehicle inspection activities. At present, people who work under contract are not eligible to be licensed as approved examiners.

Any matter that relates to roadworthy certificates is important. Although defective vehicles are not the main cause of road accidents, they do cause many accidents. The percentage of accidents caused by defective vehicles is quite low compared with the percentage of accidents caused by drink-driving, speeding and lack of care whilst driving. However, defective vehicles do cause some accidents. Vehicles that are riddled with rust do not withstand accidents as well as vehicles in good condition.

Honourable members must move with the times. Although the present Act is effective, in some respects it is out of date. It is necessary to approve reasonable premises for the inspection of motor vehicles. The Bill will rectify the current problems. The Act should allow capable people who operate on a contract basis to become examiners. At present, they are not able to do so, because an examiner must work for the proprietor of the premises at which motor vehicle inspections are carried out. The Act is not in line with current practices. The Bill seeks to rectify that anomaly. The Act must be amended to allow contractors to become examiners.

In the past, some contractors have examined vehicles and, technically, those examinations are not valid. That is the reason for the retrospectivity provision. The Bill does not propose a major amendment, but the amendment is important in order to keep up with changing times. The Opposition supports the Bill.

Mr ARDILL (Salisbury) (8.38 p.m.): This is one of a number of validating Bills on the business paper correcting honest mistakes made by the previous Government. It is very necessary to validate certificates which were hopefully—I repeat "hopefully"—honestly issued. Personally, I do not believe that certificates should be issued by motor vehicle repairers at all and I look forward to the day when these two activities are separated.

I once worked for a motor dealer and repairer who actually paid his wages staff a small fee to find faults in his clients' vehicles—not to improve the safety of the vehicles but to increase his sales and to compensate the employees for not being paid time and a half for overtime.

It is vitally important that the standard of repairs, repairers and vehicle safety, particularly relating to large vehicles, should be beyond question. It is also important that certificates should be beyond question. Having worked in the distribution aspect of the industry, I have had personal knowledge of the poor standard of repair on many heavy transport vehicles. Drivers often complained to me of being forced onto the road in vehicles with serious faults by fleet-owners whose only interest was in maximising the loads carried.

Any Bill which has, as its object, the tightening up of vehicle standards should have the support of the House.

Mr J. N. GOSS (Aspley) (8.40 p.m.): A number of motor mechanics and owners of inspection stations will breathe easier when this Bill becomes law. Probably many proprietors and mechanics still do not realise that, because they did not directly employ the mechanic, the road certificates and licences that they issued were not

valid. This could not only cause a problem for the inspection station owner and the mechanic but also have an effect on the vehicle-owner who believed that he had a valid certificate. This would be the case when someone was selling a vehicle.

The Liberal Party is not a supporter of retrospectivity. However, we feel that, in this case, it is acceptable as the original intent of the law was not broken with malice or for personal gain; rather the law did not keep abreast of changes in employment practices within the industry. The Bill will amend a very unfair requirement which was never intended by the passing of the original legislation.

The Liberal Party is pleased that the Government is recognising the need for contract or higher employment in the motor repair industry and supports the Bill.

Mr PREST (Port Curtis) (8.41 p.m.): I am pleased to take part in the debate on the Bill to amend the Motor Vehicles Safety Act. I have been concerned for some time about the inspection of motor vehicles and the issuing of roadworthiness certificates. Some 80 points have to be checked before the roadworthiness certificate is issued. This is done in a matter of minutes at a cost of \$25.

The inspection includes removing the wheels and checking the brakes, the pedals, the hydraulic systems—right through the braking system—the drive train, the universal joints/couplings, the tail shaft, the bearings, the automatic transmission control, the exhaust, fittings and protrusions, door catches and so on. A proper inspection of all those points would take about two hours and, as the hourly rate in a garage is something like \$40 an hour, the present certificate is dirt cheap. It is a case of getting what we are paying for—something that is hardly worth the paper it is written on.

This is the cause of many accidents. People are being hoodwinked. People buying vehicles believe that the roadworthiness certificate is worth something but, within a matter of moments, they are faced with hundreds of dollars worth of repairs, especially if they are caught by the police. If the police go over the vehicle with a fine-tooth comb, as they should, it could be put off the road immediately.

I am concerned that the inspection stations, at times, not only inspect the vehicles but also sell the vehicles. The person who checks the vehicle presumes that it is in a roadworthy condition and off the owner goes. Once again, it is the poor, old, unsuspecting buyer who cops the very raw deal.

According to the August edition of the *Road Ahead*, the RACQ made submissions to the Travelsafe Committee and it is to be hoped that, when the committee brings down its findings and recommendations, there will be a tightening up of road safety certificates and, in particular, the roadworthiness of vehicles. Again according to the *Road Ahead*, the RACQ says—

"There are unsafe 'bombs' on Queensland roads and they should be removed."

That was the crux of the RACQ's submission to the Travelsafe Committee.

PREST (LOQ)

The RACQ also believes that compulsory periodic inspections for roadworthiness are not the answer. The club believes that, rather, police and Transport Department officers should exercise more fully their current powers to inspect vehicles at random for safety defects. Stiffer penalties should be handed out to those irresponsible motorists who currently believe that they can drive their bombs with relative impunity. As I said earlier, the people who buy these cars are unsuspecting buyers. After all, it was only a matter of hours, days or a week before when the vehicle had been cleared by an inspector or at an inspection station and a roadworthiness certificate issued.

Motor vehicles change hands in this State very rapidly. Provided that a vehicle is not new and is either purchased or reregistered, a new roadworthiness certificate can be issued. It must be remembered that 20 per cent of car-owners drive new cars and keep those cars for an average of five years. Used car dealers sell those cars on an average of every two to three years, which means that 80 per cent of cars registered in Queensland are inspected every two to three years. I point out that cars deteriorate very rapidly in a period of as little as one year, let alone a period of two to three years. I believe that

there is an insufficient number of inspections being carried out and that the present inspections are inadequate.

I hope that before long, the Travelsafe Committee will make recommendations to this Parliament to ensure that second-hand vehicles are issued with a certificate that packs a punch. I also hope that the certificate will not be the result of a 10-minute examination for a small fee, but rather one that is worth more than the paper it is written on and much more than the nominal fee. I would also hope that the owner who drives the vehicle away is able to be sure that his own life and the lives of other people, such as pedestrians, are perfectly safe.

Hon. D. J. HAMILL (Ipswich—Minister for Transport and Minister Assisting the Premier on Economic and Trade Development) (8.48 p.m.), in reply: I thank honourable members for their support. Very little can be said other than to recognise that common sense has prevailed in relation to this matter. Although the Government does not embark upon retrospective legislation lightly—as the member for Aspley correctly stated—this is an occasion when retrospectivity is warranted. Honourable members would realise that the measures that this amendment seeks to rectify were not intended. It is certainly the case that changes in employment practices in the industry have called for this action to take place.

I suggest that this legislation is a good example of community consultation coming to the fore. It was only earlier this year when representations were made to me by the industry that I was alerted to the particular problem. People involved in the industry were most concerned that they would find themselves in some way compromised or liable because of certificates issued in good faith that were outside the letter of the law.

I am delighted that honourable members on both sides of the House have seen the wisdom of this legislation. I thank them for their support.

Committee

Clauses 1 to 4, as read, agreed to.

Bill reported, without amendment.

Third Reading

Bill, on motion of Mr Hamill, by leave, read a third time.

CLEAN AIR ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from 7 June (see p. 2358).

Mr ELLIOTT (Cunningham) (8.51 p.m.): On behalf of the Opposition, I support the basic thrust of trying to control the use of CFCs, as any intelligent person would. Anyone who has looked around at the problems caused by chemicals and has become aware of related matters would be a fool not to support the thrust of attempts to control their use. However, I believe that because the Government has not really done anything positive about addressing these problems, the attitude of the Opposition is probably limited to support in principle. The Minister has merely included heads of power and added new sections to the original Act which will allow Government officers to adopt Gestapo tactics. At the Committee stage, I will refer to those clauses in more detail.

The public of Queensland expects that the Minister for Environment and the Government would be more forward-thinking and would propose some basic alternatives, which is what I propose to do tonight. It is not my style to throw brickbats or to attempt to lampoon the Minister personally. I am greatly concerned that the Minister is not dealing with the real issue and looking far enough into the future.

At present, with a possible war facing us in the Middle East, we must look at the alternative sources of fuel which already exist in this country. Companies such as Transfield have put forward proposals that involve the use of ethanol. What is the Government doing about alternatives that involve the use of ethanol? It has an opportunity to take that initiative. It is not a matter of Australia's being short of energy and having a requirement to spin out its petroleum reserves. It might give us an inner glow to suggest that we are 70 per cent to 80 per cent self-sufficient in oil supplies, but that is not good enough. We do not know when our exploration programs will come to a shuddering halt. We should be looking not only towards the environmental side of the spectrum but also towards the energy and efficiency side of it. The introduction of ethanol as a fuel additive would extend our reserves of petroleum products and would make a real impact on the protection of the ozone layer and on the reduction of pollution.

I will deal, firstly, with carbon dioxide. On a per capita basis, carbon emissions in Australia are among the highest in the world. They are twice as high as those in the United States of America. According to the *Time* magazine of 2 January 1989, America produces 4.29 million tonnes of carbon emissions and Oceania, which includes the south Pacific countries, produces 10.5 million tonnes of carbon emissions annually. A 10 per cent ethanol blend in fuel in Queensland would reduce the greenhouse carbon dioxide emissions by 800 000 tonnes a year. We should not be looking merely at the potential of energy resources and the ability to stretch our reserves of oil; we should consider the greenhouse effect.

In his second-reading speech, the Minister was critical of past coalition Governments and the former National Party Government. He maintained that those Governments were not interested in the environment. I was a member of those Governments and I am fully aware of what went on. At that time, the ministerial council and the working party of departmental officers at both Federal and State levels were considering a problem that was confined to Sydney and Melbourne. With the introduction of unleaded fuel in 1986, Queensland did not have a problem in that area. If the Minister reduces the lead level in fuel without doing something positive such as adding ethanol to increase the octane rating, he will infringe upon the rights of people who purchased vehicles in good faith, expecting them to perform. If that program, which was accepted by the community, is cut short, the Government will be cutting across the democratic rights of those people.

At 0.84 grams per litre, Queensland has the highest allowable level of lead in fuel of any State in Australia. The addition of 10 per cent ethanol blend to super petrol would allow an immediate reduction in the emission of lead in Queensland to at least the Victorian standard. Queensland grows sugar cane and has the ability to grow forage sorghums, which are just as good a source of ethanol as sugar.

Mr Booth: Some of them are better.

Mr ELLIOTT: As the shadow Minister for Primary Industries, the honourable member for Warwick, rightly points out, in many instances forage sorghums are better. The potential to grow them in large areas of Queensland is great. The Government will be derelict in its duty if it does not do something constructive about the introduction of ethanol into fuel in Queensland.

It is all very well to run around the place, as the Minister does, and get a warm inner glow from posing and postulating on all of these problems. Something positive must be done. I know that the Government has the will to do something. The Opposition wants to see some action. It wants to see some decisions made by Cabinet that will launch us into the next century. Members of the Government should ask themselves where they are going to be if the Gulf war blows up. If something is not done to overcome emission problems, we must ask ourselves whether we will not start to experience acid rain. We live in the lucky country, but we should not be complacent about it. If something is not done, we will experience problems.

With your permission, Mr Deputy Speaker, I will table this document, which indicates what ethanol can do. I do not want to go on ad infinitum.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Campbell): Order! There is no need for the honourable member to seek permission to table the document. He is able to do so.

Mr ELLIOTT: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. I may wish to refer to the document later, so I will table it at the end of my speech.

It is easy to get a big stick and start belting people over the head and telling them what they cannot do. The Government has not got over its Opposition mentality. It still thinks like an Opposition. It has a siege mentality.

Mr Palaszczuk: We are here. You are there.

Mr ELLIOTT: But the Government is not taking action. The Opposition accepts its role. Members of the Opposition are trying to carry out their role to the best of their ability.

What the Opposition is saying is that it is time the Government did something positive. It is not good enough to have 84 different committees, commissions and inquiries. The Opposition wants to see the Government make some decisions. It wants to see the Government do something.

Mr Perrett: So does all of Queensland.

Mr ELLIOTT: That is right. As the honourable member for Barambah so rightly says, the people of Queensland want to see some action.

Mr Stephan: Do you think they are frightened to make decisions?

Mr ELLIOTT: The new Labor Government could be viewed by the large majority of Queenslanders as being reluctant to make decisions.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Will the honourable member please come back to the Bill.

Mr ELLIOTT: This is very much related to the Bill, Mr Deputy Speaker.

What I am saying is that the Government is running around, setting up all sorts of committees and commissions, but it is not making decisions. As I have said, I think it is very important that honourable members examine in detail some of the provisions of this Bill. Quite frankly, I think that some of them are unreasonable. The Government is tending to take the same approach that it took in relation to the Heritage Buildings Protection Bill. I do not believe that that is in the best interests of the people of Queensland. Once again the Government is tending to attack the basic premise that a person's home is his castle. It is continuing along that line.

If the former National Party Government even looked remotely like introducing legislation that allowed people to enter upon premises without a warrant or without some sort of prior permission, the then Labor Opposition used to go right off the deep end. Clause 7, which amends the old section 40, allows inspectors to enter any premises.

Mr Comben: Would you agree if we were to amend clause 7 (1) (a) to provide for entry onto premises in the case of an emergency without a warrant?

Mr ELLIOTT: Is the Minister suggesting an amendment?

Mr Comben: If you were agreeable, in view of the force of your arguments.

Mr ELLIOTT: I am glad to see that the Minister is amenable to that sort of argument. That certainly pleases the Opposition. One would not like to think that the Minister was intractable.

Mr Comben: I am not intractable.

Mr ELLIOTT: That is very good.

I have outlined the basis of our opposition to the Bill. The Opposition feels that the Government is not looking forward, that it is not prepared to examine these new

technologies. If the price of crude oil increases, projects such as the Rundle oil shale project will come back into their own. There is a fairly large possibility that some of these projects will once again be viable. It used to be said that Rundle was viable at 60c. I am not a technocrat. I cannot tell honourable members whether that is correct or not. There may well be people around who can. However, I think that the Government should be heading in that direction.

Quite frankly, we have a gun at our heads. Primary producers in electorates such as mine and the electorates of the member for Barambah and the member for Warwick—in fact, all primary-producing regions—and, of course, those who own small businesses are going to be tremendously adversely affected by the higher cost of oil. It will come right off the top. Honourable members should ask themselves what impact an increase in the price of oil would have on the income of farmers. As I have said, it will come right off the top. There is no way of passing on that cost.

The Iraqis will more than likely renege on the wheat contract. Eighty-five per cent is covered by insurance. The balance, which probably amounts to \$120m, will have to be picked up by the wheat-growers. Honourable members should ask themselves what sort of situation that will bring about.

I ask the Minister to examine these matters and give consideration to the future direction of this Government. The people of Queensland expect him to do that.

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

Mr FOLEY (Yeronga) (9.07 p.m.): This Bill brings Queensland law into a movement in international law directed at an international problem. One great fault of being an island nation is that we are, by nature, insular. If one wanted to exacerbate insularity in a people, one would divide a nation into six States and promote among them disputes passing under the happy guise of federalism.

For too long this nation has failed to address the international problems in its domestic legislation. The Minister is to be commended for bringing before the House this legislation which attacks the problem of ozone depletion. In recent years the international community has directed its attention to this problem.

Queensland can stand proud as part of the international community by adopting a responsible approach to the environment that is in cooperation with the progressive nations of the world. It marks a radical departure from the sad legacy of environmental neglect which this Government inherited from the National Party. That Government was characterised by a contempt for those who were—as the former Premier said—friends of the soil or friends of the dirt.

Clause 6 of this legislation introduces proposed new section 32A of the principal Act, which provides for certain regulations to be made concerning ozone-depleting substances. That enables the machinery of law in our State to attack the problems that confront our planet. We must not allow the insularity of our State and nation to become a fetter to the tremendous need to ensure that cooperation is the order of the day in international affairs.

During this century we have brought upon the world environmental problems the like of which it has not seen in its entire history. Equally, at the international level attempts have been made to address environmental concerns. That burst into the consciousness of Australian jurisprudence through the Franklin Dam issue when, for the first time, many Australians came to realise that the emergence of an international law that was concerned with world heritage might impact upon our corner of the planet in a way that is perhaps not fully understood.

Queensland has a history of being resistant to developments in international law and, indeed, in the case of the previous Government, frankly suspicious about developments in international human rights law. It is easier to understand international environmental law and the need for it, because it means survival. Unless we take these measures and

unless each nation of the world sets out to attack the problem of ozone depletion, we shall most certainly be facing a very dismal future indeed.

Mr Booth: Can you give us something definite to do? Tell us what to do?

Mr FOLEY: I am indebted to the characteristically incisive interjection from the honourable member.

Certain substances must be prescribed to be ozone-depleting substances, as provided in proposed section 32A (a). Their manufacture, sale, storage, use and possession must be regulated. As well, we must regulate the design of things intended to contain or use ozone-depleting substances and the design of things in the manufacture of which ozone-depleting substances will be used.

That is the answer to the honourable member's question. I hesitate to point out that the answer is plain for all the world to see on the face of the Bill. This legislation sets up a machinery of law to enable an attack to be made on this very fundamental problem. It is equally important that an attack be made on the problem of lead content in petrol.

Mr Elliott: Do you not agree that ethanol would help in that regard?

Mr FOLEY: That is as may be. However, in this day and age it is extraordinary that it is necessary to include clause 10, which amends section 50 of the principal Act, to get the legal machinery necessary to reduce lead levels in petrol.

This issue affects many people in my electorate who live near Ipswich and Beaudesert Roads, which carry large volumes of traffic. The emissions from that traffic include lead levels. This Government is determined to put in place environmental laws that protect such people.

Mr Elliott: Are you suggesting that the only way to do this, though, is to take the lead out and thereby say that all those people with those cars—

Mr FOLEY: No. The honourable member is confusing a necessary and sufficient condition.

This legislation represents an important measure. Although it is not the only measure, it is necessary and should have been taken a long time ago. Legislative steps need to be taken to reduce the lead content in petrol. People in the community suffer from lead poisoning. As a child, my wife suffered from lead poisoning. This legislation will help to remedy that problem.

On a day when the Parliament has received a report which, on one view, might tend to limit the rights of parliamentarians' spouses, it is good to see action being taken to remedy the sorts of problems that they might have faced as children.

Mr Booth: Those people with super motor cars won't think too highly of you.

Mr FOLEY: The point of the exercise is to face up to our environmental responsibilities to ensure that we do not remain in the Dark Ages by failing to tackle the issue of lead levels in petrol.

The international oil industry exercises profound power over the military and legal structures of the whole world. It is perhaps not surprising that the legal remedies which needed to be put in place in Queensland have been slow in coming.

I am pleased to support this Bill, introduced as it has been by the Minister, because it enables an attack to be made on the most elementary right of a citizen, namely, the right to breathe clean air. I knew instinctively that upon the election of the Goss Labor Government the air would become cleaner and the sky would become bluer. That has certainly been the case in the transformation of the psyche of the Queensland people. This Act takes it a step further so that even the biologists and the chemists may measure that profound change in our healthy approach to the environment that was ushered in by the introduction of the Goss Labor Government to Queensland.

I support the Bill.

Mr COOMBER (Currumbin) (9.16 p.m.): Initiatives to remove or reduce the use of ozone-depleting substances by 95 per cent by 1995 are commendable. Queensland—and particularly the Queensland Government—is coming into line with the Montreal protocol, which was signed in September 1987 by more than 20 nations. This protocol limits the production of ozone-depleting substances and will cut CFC production by 50 per cent by the year 2000.

In the main, Governments are formed by representatives who lack scientific knowledge or background. A cursory glance around this Chamber indicates that this is such a Government. Moneys have to be budgeted for the advancement of scientific research and technological advances. The greenhouse effect is one such phenomenon which should be investigated. Scientists, oceanographers and climatologists all over the world are united in their concern about the greenhouse effect. However, Governments prefer to ignore the problem. In my opinion, the lack of scientific knowledge in our elected representatives is partly to blame.

This amendment is a positive step to reduce CFC concentrations in the atmosphere. Government strategy to reduce carbon dioxide, methane and other greenhouse gases must surely follow. Chlorofluorocarbons—or CFCs—are a group of man-made compounds comprising chlorine, fluorine, carbon and sometimes hydrogen. They are safe, stable alternatives to refrigerants such as ammonia and sulphur dioxide and are non-flammable, non-irritating, non-explosive, non-corrosive and very low in toxicity.

As CFCs do not react with other atmospheric chemicals, they last for many years in the atmosphere and ultimately rise to the UV-shielding ozone layer. There the CFCs attack and break down the unstable ozone molecule more quickly than natural processes can replace them. Consequently, in the last 10 years, ozone concentrations in the stratosphere have decreased by more than 3 per cent.

CFCs are usually found in aerosols, refrigerators, air-conditioners, dry-cleaning solvents, some plastic foam manufacturing and a few other areas. Along with CFCs, other greenhouse gases include carbon dioxide, nitrous oxides, methane, ozone and other halons. All of those gases, except CFCs, occur naturally, but in very small concentrations.

Ozone is a gas formed by the action of sunlight on oxygen, mainly occurring in the stratosphere which is some 20 to 50 kilometres above the earth. Ozone protects living organisms from ultraviolet radiation. The depletion of ozone concentration in the stratosphere is a major concern not only to Australia and Queensland but also to all other countries in the world.

I would like to take this opportunity to talk a little about the greenhouse effect itself. There has been little, if any, increase in the amount of scientific knowledge of the greenhouse effect, other than that exhibited at a conference called Greenhouse 1987. If climate changes occur, they will vary from region to region and, consequently, there will be winners, but mainly there will be losers. So the prospect for all is not gloomy. For a variety of reasons, Governments are finding it attractive to run with the greenhouse scenarios which were originally put in place by scientists as a type of shock therapy to draw attention to the rise in greenhouse gas volumes.

The more commercial of the scientific community at that time were perhaps motivated by the opportunity for research funding than by concern for the planet's future. Fortunately, there appears to be a recognition by the scientific community that Governments are now running ahead of the scientific data and there is a need to turn the volume down.

In fact, the Queensland Government has recently prepared a Green Paper, suggesting that an allowance of 0.8 metres be included to offset future sea level rises. That is a prime example of this illogical reasoning, as the current data which is now available would suggest that this figure is more likely to be 0.2 metres. To take the extreme point of view—it has been suggested that the greenhouse effect is a weapon being used by the opponents of capitalism to frustrate industrial growth.

What has become clear is that the developing and undeveloped nations see the greenhouse effect as a threat to their ability to develop and lift their living standards. In the extreme view, they see it as a plot by Western nations to keep them in their place. The danger for Australia as a major supplier of coal, natural gas and metal ores—all substances rich in greenhouse potential—is that our Government may see it as politically advantageous to support the Toronto and similar altruistic declarations without fully analysing the broader outcomes flowing from such decisions.

The greenhouse effect is no longer merely a debate among scientists about possible climate change; it is rapidly turning into a major political debate which may have enormous effects on world commerce and trade and, given the very rubbery data upon which it is all based, the outcomes could be disastrous.

What is needed is a much broader community debate based upon properly coordinated scientific data and in the context of a realisation that all the political decisions made on the greenhouse effect can have enormous impacts on all nations. There is an urgent need for a small specialised scientific group to be designated within Australia to act as a collection centre and clearing house for greenhouse data. In this way, organisations which have a direct interest in applying the data would be able to base their conclusions on a common scientific basis and Governments would have an advisory panel ready to assess greenhouse initiatives before Government commitments are made.

It would be tragic if the greenhouse issue was allowed to push the rest of the major pollution issues off the world's political agenda. Issues such as the acid rain problem in Europe and the pollution of receiving rivers are of equal if not more concern. A statement made by Dr Brian Tucker, chief of the CSIRO's division of atmospheric research, simply summarises the situation. He said that present scientific evidence points to the greenhouse problem being genuine, global and progressive. However, he cautioned that precipitative action taken on the basis of extreme predictions or to placate public alarm generated by media hyperbole could lead to large amounts of resources being applied in the wrong areas to no good effect and cause economic, commercial and social disruption to no good purpose.

One only has to look at the reactions of politicians during the last Federal campaign. The Australian Democrats favoured the phasing out of Australia's coal exports, which are worth \$4.7 billion. Add to that the cost of a 10 per cent to 20 per cent reduction in carbon dioxide emissions and Australia, already on the verge of a recession, would be basically wrecked.

Australia is the world's largest coal-exporter and the Federal Government has just cancelled yet another uranium mine. What would the world do for the rest of this century if Australia agreed with international calls to cut carbon dioxide emissions by 20 per cent and there was no coal or uranium? Suppose everybody followed the lead of those Australian politicians. We are all very happy not to follow our international trade competitors in productivity, labour market deregulation and anti-inflation measures, but suddenly, with the environment question, from a position of economic weakness, Australia has a burning zeal to be the world's leader. Australia would be far more impressive if it led the way in reducing greenhouse panic by giving science a huge priority and advancing on the greenhouse problem from a position of facts and knowledge delivered impartially to a world that cannot afford to overreact to a potentially serious problem that has not been thoroughly researched.

To put Australia's position in the world into perspective, its current share of world energy use is 1 per cent and its direct greenhouse emission contribution is quite small. However, it is a very large exporter of coal, much of which has the least greenhouse emission potential of the coals available throughout the world.

At the recent Toronto conference on greenhouse, it was estimated that, if no significant action was taken to reduce greenhouse emissions during this decade, the current annual global discharge of 285 million tonnes of carbon dioxide would rise to 362 million tonnes in the year 2000. Currently, Australia produces 3.9 tonnes of carbon dioxide per person per annum. The sources of those emissions are electricity generation,

road transport, industry and mainly through the household. Fossil fuels are the major culprits in terms of carbon dioxide emissions, but natural gas rates much less carbon dioxide than do fossil fuels. One of the promoted strategies for reducing emissions is to replace coal and petroleum with natural gas.

In terms of known global reserves for current usage rates, the relevant figures are that there is enough coal for 280 years, sufficient natural gas for 60 years and adequate crude oil reserves for 44 years. Australia's natural gas reserves in eastern Australia will last only 15 years, and a transcontinental pipeline will be required if the Western Australia reserves are to be utilised. Whatever action is taken, it appears that the last remaining fossil fuel will be coal. Therefore, it is important that the substitution route not be taken for convenience without, at the same time, the proper effort being put into research to establish a more efficient means of using coal.

It is clear that, despite its statistically favourable safety record, the nuclear fission industry has lost a public relations war. However, the development of nuclear fission reactors would appear to be greenhouse's best chance. The trend is emerging for new nuclear stations to be cancelled and for existing stations to be phased out. Sweden has commenced phasing out as a firm programmed commitment. In the United States of America, the cost of nuclear power station construction has reached a level that has compelled power utilities to reconsider their programs. However, much of the cost overrun in the United States can be attributed to the excessive delays caused by law suits filed mainly by opponents of nuclear energy.

It would seem that, with so much capital tied up in nuclear power plants in many countries, inevitably pressure will be exerted on Australia to free its uranium production and exports. Reserves of uranium worldwide can supply current demand for only 41 years. Australia's uranium resources are, to some extent, locked in the ground, and South Africa, which is subject to trade sanctions, holds 44 per cent of the reasonably assured reserves. Canada, the major current supplier, can sustain that rate of production for only 13 years. Based on current usage, without Australian and South African reserves, the world supplies shrink to 23 years.

However, in Australia, road transport, either by car or by bus, is a major greenhouse generator. The figure in Australia is some 22 per cent of total greenhouse emissions. In terms of greenhouse efficiency and operational efficiencies, rail transportation is four times as efficient as road transport. In the total scenario of gas emissions, in producing steel and other metals for road and rail transport, the rail alternative would further improve on that greenhouse efficiency advantage.

In respect of passenger vehicles, the universal use of small cars would reduce gas emissions significantly, as would a change in public attitude which resulted in broad compliance with established speed limits. Even by changing to small cars, by the year 2000 there would be a 15 per cent increase in greenhouse emissions. If the speed limit was reduced to 80 kilometres per hour, in the year 2000 there would be a reduction of 12 per cent.

The estimated cost to industry or the consumer of attaining the Toronto goals by the year 2005 has been estimated at between \$20 billion to \$30 billion per annum, yet this will have only a minuscule effect on the greenhouse problem. Based on those figures, it is difficult not to argue that the cost of eliminating the greenhouse effect would greatly exceed the cost of adapting to it. There are many other parameters and factors that affect greenhouse gases that have to be considered. This amendment is a positive step to reduce CFCs in the atmosphere. A Government strategy to reduce carbon dioxide, methane and other greenhouse gases must follow.

Mr SULLIVAN (Glass House) (9.31 p.m): No more basic or fundamental right accrues to human beings than the right to breathe clean air. Although that sounds simple, unfortunately that goal has proven to be elusive. Only political will seems likely to ensure that we have clean air to breathe.

The Bill provides the power to make regulations for the control of the concentration of lead and other additives and impurities in petrol. Lead emissions from petrol are a known cause of health problems in children, yet Queensland residents have been expected to tolerate lead levels in petrol that are twice the levels permitted in other States. Some forms of airborne hydrocarbons are carcinogenic, and ozone formed at low levels can exacerbate breathing problems. Motor vehicle emissions are therefore a problem of great consequence.

As a means of transport, private motor vehicles hold an unbeatable allure by offering their owners mobility, convenience and, in today's society, a certain status. Private car ownership has proved to be irresistible. Nowhere has this been more evident than in the sprawling urban area of Brisbane. Initially, Brisbane evolved from a small outpost to a large country town, limited by the spread of rail services. After World War II, the availability of motor vehicles facilitated the greater sprawl of Brisbane. The eventual conurbation of the area from the Sunshine Coast to the New South Wales border is daily becoming a reality. The motor vehicle is, in part, encouraging this to occur.

The physical nature of that urban area makes it virtually impossible for a person to live, be employed and seek entertainment in a single neighbourhood. The motor vehicle, which makes that urban sprawl possible, is a significant contributor to urban air pollution. Stricter fuel economy and pollution standards are the most obvious and immediate measures that can be adopted to counter the effects of air pollution.

Amongst the air pollutants generated by motor vehicles, lead has been the most successfully fought. As an additive in fuel, lead prevents explosions in the engine cylinders from being too violent and forms a protective oxide layer on the exhaust valve, which makes exhaust emissions an even greater cause of pollution.

It is not impossible to prevent what has been described as a harmful cocktail of emissions. Oil companies can remove the impurities that cause great harm, and engineers can design cars that run on unleaded fuel using advancing ignition timing. Because lead was added deliberately to fuel as an octane enhancer, it could just as easily be eliminated from it. Yet Queensland residents have tolerated levels of lead in fuel that are twice the levels of other States.

Since 1986, all new vehicles manufactured in Australia have been equipped with catalytic converters and engines designed to run on unleaded fuel. The orderly reduction of lead levels in fuel used by pre-1986 vehicles—which is made possible under the proposed amendment—is a welcome and vital contribution to the task of reducing air pollution occasioned by our reliance on motor vehicles. The nature of our society means that people must do far too much travelling. It is time to take seriously the concepts of collective car ownership, car pooling and trip rationalisation. It is time to defend and extend the present public transport systems. Our society accepts that the provision of public transport is a cost to society. This acceptance will allow the Government to provide advances in that area.

Alternatives to the motor-vehicle-centred society seem unthinkable, yet we must embrace those alternatives. We must build a bridge from our current motor vehicle culture across to an alternative transportation future with a greater diversity of modes of transportation, one in which all forms of transport—buses, trains, cars, bicycles and walking—complement each other. Overseas bike-and-ride stations and facilities to carry bicycles on trains are enormously popular. However, despite recent advances in Queensland, those innovations remain little used outside Denmark, Japan, the Netherlands and West Germany.

Mass transport systems offer a number of advantages over motor vehicles. When fully used, mass transport systems are more energy efficient and create less pollution. Those systems have an additional advantage. Because a motor vehicle takes up approximately eight times more road space per passenger than a bus, mass transport systems relieve enormously the congestion occasioned by the proliferation of motor vehicles.

Perhaps the love affair with motor vehicles would be cooled if the many subsidies received by motor vehicles and the environmental and health costs associated with them were fully accounted for. I am not aware of any place where motor vehicle owners bear the full costs of road building and maintenance, traffic regulation, police and fire services, and accident and related health care.

Mr Elliott: Are you advocating a much higher portion of cost to be paid by motorists?

Mr SULLIVAN: I am not advocating anything.

Mr Elliott: Are you postulating that?

Mr SULLIVAN: Absolutely. An environment tax would help to internalise the less quantifiable environmental costs. Obviously, political opposition to such measures would be enormous. However, honourable members must realise that, as we approach the next century, we cannot continue to ignore the true costs to society of motor vehicles.

In the years ahead, the challenge is twofold: to develop innovative transport policies and to improve air quality. The most serious long-term consequence of motor vehicle emissions is the atmospheric degradation occasioned by the build-up of atmospheric degradants—the greenhouse gases of carbon dioxide, nitrous oxide, methane and low-level ozone. Along with the health problems, those consequences must be fought vigorously by all Governments. It is no longer good enough for honourable members to pretend that we have concerns for the future of our planet. The amendments proposed by the Bill provide for a real start to that process. I congratulate the Minister for Environment and Heritage on introducing the Bill. I support the Bill.

Mr SPRINGBORG (Carnarvon) (9.37 p.m.): At the outset, it must be realised that mankind has a very short tenure on this earth in the context that the earth has been in existence for 4.5 billion years and mankind, in its present, intelligent, civilised form has possibly been around for only 20 000 years. On a chronological scale, that is about 11.59 and 59 seconds to midnight. If we adopt a sensible, balanced approach as a united force, as a Government and an Opposition working together, we can alleviate the problem and make our tenure on this earth a longer and happier one. I am a fatalist and I do not believe that human beings will be on this earth for a long period to come—perhaps only a few thousand years—and we will then be superseded by some other form of life.

Mr Sullivan: Monkeys?

Mr SPRINGBORG: Perhaps it might be evolution in reverse.

The whole of Australia and most of the Western World are not necessarily creating the problem with chlorofluorocarbons. Even though the United States produces a large quantity of CFCs, most of them are not consumed in the Western World. The developing countries are the real problem. They are the ones that have a crying need for CFCs in refrigerators and air-conditioners. They will not be able to use the alternatives—hydrofluorocarbons, because of their high cost, or the traditional ammonia cooling system, which is somewhat dangerous. Because of the latter system's impact on life and limb, it is possible that people would prefer not to take the risk.

Many parts of the Minister's second-reading speech were commendable. However, I felt that he dwelt a little too long on CFCs. I seek his advice. Halons are also a contributing factor in the break-down of the ozone layer. I think that fire extinguishers are the culprits. Is that right?

Mr Comben: Yes.

Mr SPRINGBORG: I am not asking the Minister to refer constantly to his advisers, because I am not trying to put him on a spot at this stage; that might happen later in Committee.

As well as halons, there is the prospect that supersonic aircraft may be used for transport. In this regard, I refer to *New Scientist*, a magazine which no doubt the Minister, being an environmentally and scientifically conscious person, knows about.

Mr Comben: I have been reading it for longer than you have been alive.

Mr SPRINGBORG: I thank the Minister, and he can be assured that I have been reading it for a considerable time and probably will be reading it after he is no longer around.

As we are well aware, the ozone layer extends from approximately 15 kilometres to 50 kilometres above the earth's surface. This fleet of 200 supersonic aircraft is being planned in Europe. I suggest to the Minister that this will have a very serious consequence when we are dealing with the environmental impact of CFCs on the ozone layer, because we are also talking about regulation. If we are to regulate the production of halons and phase out or even ban the production of CFCs, we must also recognise that there are other contributing factors in the break-down of the ozone layer—in particular, this proposed supersonic transport aircraft that will fly within what we take for granted is the ozone layer. *New Scientist* reports—

"The exhausts from these aircraft will produce water vapour and the hydroxyl radical (OH) . . . "

I say that for the benefit of the scientists. I am not a scientist; I am a humble farm labourer and a blue-collar worker—and there are none of them on the other side of the House.

Mr Beattie: Blue-collar farm workers vote for us, though.

Mr SPRINGBORG: That was in the days when they were not very wise. The article continues—

". . . both of which contribute to the greenhouse effect—as well as the oxides of nitrogen that destroy ozone."

If the Minister is giving consideration to regulating for tighter controls on CFCs, he must also start pushing worldwide, perhaps through the expansion of the Montreal protocol even though it is dealing specifically with CFCs, to regulate these aircraft because they will counterbalance our positive work in eliminating CFCs.

From tripping around my electorate and talking to many people, I have found a great deal of scepticism about whether there is or is not a greenhouse effect, and I imagine that many honourable members have found the same thing. The reason so many people are sceptical is that when they pick up a newspaper or switch on the television—I am sure that the Minister and his advisers will agree with this—they see blizzards across the United States of America, which is experiencing the coldest temperatures in 100 years.

People say, "The greenhouse effect is supposed to make us warm up. How come we have record low temperatures around the world?" It must be taken into consideration that no-one is sure of the real impact of the greenhouse effect or the break-down of the ozone layer.

At the commencement of my speech, I pointed out that people have been on this earth for a relatively short time. For some of us, it has been a shorter time than for others, of course. Because of that and because of the fact that Europeans have lived in Australia for only 200 years—even though our Aboriginal brethren may have lived here for a maximum period of 100 000 years, according to the latest calculations—records have been kept in this country for only a hundred years. The information derived from those records reveals that occasional seasonal fluctuations occur. Perhaps the current so-called warming effect is the result of a cyclical phenomenon that occurs every 10 000 years. I assure the honourable member for Brisbane Central that it is true that people are uncertain as to whether or not the greenhouse effect is cyclical. Reams of evidence have been produced which suggest that although the greenhouse effect is occurring, there

is scepticism felt by members of the scientific community about its causes. They are saying, "Hold on. This might not have anything to do with the greenhouse effect. We are not quite sure what the real impact will be in the future."

On a more cryptic note, I mention that an edition of *New Scientist* reported on the likely impact of the cane toad on New South Wales if the greenhouse effect continues in the long term.

Mr Welford: It is the Liberal Government down there; that is the thing.

Mr SPRINGBORG: Did the honourable member chase out the cane toads? I do not know whether they perceived him as some type of vermin that would attack them, but obviously they could go south in the event of any increase in temperature. The Government should be considering budgetary allocations for the biological control of these pests because one problem will lead to another, and goodness knows where it will all end up further down the track.

It is also stated in one of my much-quoted scientific journals that the planting of more and more trees may not be the answer to combating the build-up of greenhouse gases. Apparently, the world's population is consuming greater and greater quantities of fossil fuels, such as coal and oil, and that contributes many millions of tonnes of carbon dioxide to the atmosphere each year. Trees are great when they are young because that is when they suck the carbon dioxide out of the atmosphere. However, as they get older and slow down—in common with many of the members in this House—

Mr Beattie: Even you.

Mr SPRINGBORG: Come on, that is not true. I will give the honourable member for Brisbane Central a footrace in 30 years' time and see how he goes.

I ask honourable members to take these matters seriously because they must be considered. If a build-up of CO₂ occurs in the atmosphere and more trees are planted, the trees will provide a short-term answer. However, when those trees decompose—

Mr Coomber: Their respiration rates decrease.

Mr SPRINGBORG: Yes, their respiration rates change as they get older. Moreover, when they begin to decompose, they also break down and contribute CO₂ to the atmosphere, which is a problem that must be faced.

I suggest that the Government should provide tax incentives for alternatives. I have an article that was referred to by the Opposition's very learned spokesman on Environment, the honourable member for Cunningham. It cites Esso, which states that in 1985 this country had the potential for 100 per cent self-sufficiency in oil. However, by the year 2000, it will be 50 per cent at the most and perhaps as low as 25 per cent. That indicates a level of consumption that will certainly contribute to the build-up of greenhouse gases, so incentives should be provided for the use of alternative fuels. I suggest that consideration be given to the use of ethanol. The honourable member for Warwick mentioned earlier that in some parts of South America up to 40 per cent of leaded fuel is ethanol, which indicates that it is a possible alternative. Apparently, the best that could be hoped for is that all vehicles would use 40 per cent ethanol, which would subsequently cut by 40 per cent the emissions of lead into the atmosphere.

The honourable member for Glass House suggested that the Government should move to eliminate lead in petrol. I hope that that will occur at some time in the future, but this country cannot continue to rely solely on its resources of fossil fuel. Alternative fuel sources must be developed. Recently I heard a story about the possibility of an electric car becoming viable in the near future. The particular electric car to which I refer is being developed in the United States and uses a battery that is not conventionally charged. For example, the car could travel for approximately 300 kilometres at quite a high speed.

Mr Prest: It wasn't a hydrogen car, was it?

Mr SPRINGBORG: No, it was not. I think that the hydrogen car goes back quite a few years—possibly to the honourable member's heyday.

This battery-powered car is unusual in that it is recharged by removing the drain plug and dropping all the sludge out of it. The car is refilled with electrolyte and a compound is added which causes a reaction. In no time at all, the car can be away.

Mr Beattie: What do you do with the sludge?

Mr SPRINGBORG: It is recycled, which is the beauty of this car. It can be recharged in a matter of moments. The Government should be putting money into that sort of research and development.

Scientific research was mentioned by the honourable member for South Coast, who said something that I have personally believed to be true for a long time. This country possesses great intelligence and has people who have a scientific capacity rivalling any other scientific community in any other part of the world, yet their career structure is abysmal. That is the fault of Governments of all political colours which have not treated them well. In particular, the latest treatment of the CSIRO has been very poor. Its grants and financial entitlements have been chipped away over the past few years.

Scientists must be encouraged, because I believe that science will play an important part in this country's future. If scientists can be encouraged and made content, the Government will find that alternative fuel sources will become viable and be made available much sooner than was previously expected. Ten years ago, one would have thought that such a suggestion was airy-fairy in much the same way that the thought of a man landing on the moon was considered improbable in the 1920s. However, it is possible to develop these alternatives, and all members of Parliament and all Governments must work on this problem jointly. The big stick approach, which has been advocated by some people, must not be adopted in order to beat individuals into submission if they do not want to conform to CFC regulations. We should be offering them incentives, or perhaps imposing a penalty for the wrongful use of CFCs. We could offer incentives to companies which develop particular areas.

I will finish on a different note.

Mr Beattie: We didn't mind that note. It was all right.

Mr SPRINGBORG: The matter came up when I was reading one of my learned magazines.

Mr Beattie: It's been a learned address.

Mr SPRINGBORG: I thank the honourable member for Brisbane Central. I am glad that I have his bipartisan support.

In the past, scientists have suggested that, although we could be developing new alternatives, there is also a chlorofluorocarbon 123, which does not have the impact on the ozone layer or the greenhouse effect that the current chlorofluorocarbon 11 does. Perhaps it could be used as an interim measure. Whereas CFC 11 is particularly damaging to the ozone layer, CFC 123 has only 7 per cent of the impact of CFC 11 on the ozone layer and contributes only 2 per cent of the impact that CFC 11 does to the warming of the earth. We could be investigating all those areas.

The House has heard enough of my pontificating. However, I ask the Minister to consider some of the points that I have raised. I support him in preserving the environment. I intend to be around for a considerable period, and I want a good environment for my children and my grandchildren. I hope that we can work together to achieve that.

Mr PITT (Mulgrave) (9.55 p.m.): To understand the significance of this Bill, it is important to place it within the Federal and international context. In March 1989, the Federal Government passed the Ozone Protection Act, which gave effect to Australia's obligations under the Montreal protocol which was agreed to in 1987. The protocol set

out strategies to be adopted which were designed to limit the consumption of CFCs and related chemicals such as halons that deplete the ozone layer.

Although the phenomenon commonly referred to as the greenhouse effect has been the centre of close examination for over a decade, the occurrence and significance of ozone depletion has been more recently acknowledged. The scientific community was alerted to the problem by the British Antarctic survey in 1982, but it was not until 1987, when the United States National Aeronautics and Space Administration made its shock announcement, that the world community sat up and took notice. NASA linked the depletion of the ozone layer and the phenomenon of a hole above the Antarctic with chlorofluorocarbons and bromofluorocarbons. That startling revelation was quickly confirmed by other groups and the scientific community sounded the alarm bells.

When it became clear that regulatory controls were needed, the protocol established in Montreal was then agreed to. It came into force on 1 January 1989, providing for the gradual reduction in levels of production and consumption of CFCs and halons to be reduced to 1986 levels by 1990, to 80 per cent of those levels by 1994, and to 50 per cent of those levels by 1999. Later evidence, however, indicated that such measures do not go far enough. To limit action to that stipulated by the Montreal protocol will not suffice.

The Federal legislation—the Ozone Protection Act—in some ways goes further than the Montreal protocol. It addresses the problem of manufacture or import of ozone gases in certain polystyrene products made with CFCs used in packaging or insulation, in car air-conditioning maintenance kits that are non-refillable and weigh 5 kilograms or less, in aerosol products containing CFCs, in dry-cleaning machinery capable of being operated by such gases, and in disposable containers of refrigerants designed for use in the maintenance of refrigerative units which weigh 5 kilograms or less.

The Commonwealth has adopted those measures in compliance with the strategy agreed to by the Australia and New Zealand Environment Council. The success of that thrust, however, depends to a large extent on all Australian States putting in place legislation which supports the ANZEC strategy. A system of uniform control measures is therefore vital and it is anticipated that its adoption will result in the virtual cessation of depletion of ozone by 1995. It has been claimed that the phase-out rate is twice that of the Montreal protocol, thus putting our country at the forefront of the battle.

As the Minister has pointed out, this Bill can fulfil its charter only if it has the support of both industry and the community. The process of consultation, which has become the hallmark of this Government, has been detailed and productive.

The previous legislation did not address the problem. It had been left to the Health Act to make that less than encouraging attempt. The section on hazardous substances inserted in 1988 dealt only with aerosol pressure packs. Legislation designed to come to grips with the complex issues involved has been more properly placed under the auspices of the Clean Air Act.

The second area covered in the Bill provides for the Queensland Government to be given powers to place controls on the quantity of additives, including lead and other impurities, which are found in petrol. Our State's record in that regard has not been good. It has been claimed that petrol produced in Queensland contains more than double the quantity of lead that has been deemed permissible in other States.

The continued use of high levels of lead in petrol also poses a serious health problem. Medical research has accurately identified lead emissions from petrols as contributing factors in certain conditions experienced chiefly by children. If we are to judge by the American and European experience, our choked cities could also give rise to future generations suffering learning difficulties and displaying symptoms of hyperactivity. In the past, as control mechanisms were not laid down, Queensland has been particularly vulnerable in that respect. The petroleum industry itself was relied upon to do the right thing.

The health of our young people must not, however, be left to chance. The provisions of this Bill will ensure that the air we breathe is not unduly contaminated. With the passage of this Bill, Queensland can proudly proclaim it is doing its part in protecting our environment.

I have great pleasure in supporting the Bill.

Mr J. N. GOSS (Aspley) (10 p.m.): This is an extremely important Bill. Let me make it quite clear that strong action is needed. However, it must be accompanied by a good, clear advertising campaign. I can remember when the depletion of the ozone layer was first mentioned on television programs. Everybody was concerned; everybody was into recycling. It seems as though the memories of many people are very short. Many people who only 12 months ago showed great enthusiasm about doing something to reduce the depletion of the ozone layer have now forgotten about the promises that they made themselves and their good intentions at that time.

It is a matter for concern that some people who have refrigerators, freezers, air-conditioners and fire-extinguishers really do not know what gas those items of equipment or those appliances contain. A good campaign is needed to make people aware that when they replace their halon fire-extinguishers, they should choose the dry-powder type of extinguisher, if that type of extinguisher is suitable.

Not just this State but the whole of Australia has an important role to play as a major per capita user of CFCs and other ozone-depleting gases. I have a booklet put out by the AEC containing 106 recommendations. Those recommendations are a good, positive step towards solving the problem. However, there are positive steps that have to be considered at a local level.

One of the ways in which everybody can participate in halting the depletion of the ozone layer is through the reduced use of the motor vehicle and the increased use of public transport. This State Government has a golden opportunity to expand the State's rail networks and to promote and assist in the development of more bus services. Honourable members have heard tonight about the volume of traffic using the roads between Noosa and the border. We must have a good, efficient transport system to encourage people to get out of their cars and use public transport.

The use of car pools should be encouraged. People who live in inner-city areas should take a bus or walk. People should be encouraged to use less electricity by using bulbs that are more energy efficient. Some people leave lights on all the time. I am perhaps one who is guilty of not turning lights off when I leave a room. My wife tells me about it time and time again. People should be encouraged to use electrical appliances less frequently and to choose energy-efficient items. People can wash their clothes in cold water and—I can get back at my wife with this one—they can take a shorter shower, especially in winter.

There are many simple ways in which people can use less energy. The simple things that the homeowner can do can have an enormous impact. People can choose aerosol cans that do not contain CFCs and, even better still, they can choose a pump-action container. Items that are packed with foam and foam products can be rejected. People should check their home air-conditioners and car air-conditioners for leaks. With the good designing of today, there is very little need for air-conditioned homes. We will need to have a serious talk with our cows about the methane problem—

Mr Springborg interjected.

Mr J. N. GOSS: I thank the honourable member very much.

When I was the Brisbane City Council, I was pleased that, as a leading local authority, it conducted a couple of seminars and made a commitment to review its own energy needs. The Brisbane City Council has phased out the use of CFCs, and it has examined other ways of slowing down the release of greenhouse gases in its own area of operation, such as using the gas at the Luggage Point sewage treatment works to operate the diesel generators, the appointment of a recycling officer and the operation

of the Free Tree campaign. The Brisbane City Council has done all of these things in an effort to reduce ozone gas levels.

I am pleased to say that the former Metropolitan Fire Brigade Board phased out its dangerous extinguishers. Although the quantities of halons and bromofluorocarbons used in fire-fighting agents in Australia are relatively small, they have a high percentage of ozone-depleting potential. I believe that halons 121 and 1301 are about four times worse than straight CFCs. Automobile air-conditioners have a leakage rate of 34 per cent. That is really unacceptable. I think that the motor vehicle manufacturer has to consider ways of improving the joints and seals in motor vehicle air-conditioning units.

All levels of Government and the public must cooperate to ensure that this most serious problem is addressed. The policy of "think globally but act locally" should be promoted.

Mr ARDILL (Salisbury) (10.08 p.m.): I congratulate the Minister and his department on this legislation. What a change it represents from the attitude and direction of the previous National Party Minister. This Bill will put Queensland in the forefront of the battle to prevent the depletion of the ozone layer by CFCs. That is as it should be in a State that is renowned for its outdoor life-style and weather.

Because of the surfing culture of recent years, the young people of today, including my own sons, are more at risk from ultraviolet rays than any other generation has been. With the depletion of the earth's ozone layer, one can expect considerable skin problems to develop in the future. I can personally attest to that. Even though I have not sunbaked for years, I am now starting to see the results on my own skin of too much exposure to the sun.

When I was selling CFCs 11 and 12 during the early 1970s, I had no idea that I was taking part in the depletion of the ozone layer. We should not lose sight of the fact that the ozone depletion would not have come to notice if it had not been for the campaign of the much-maligned greenies. Vested interests continued to ridicule those people until it became ludicrous to do so.

This Bill will put Queensland in a position in which it can claim to be observing and supporting the Montreal protocol. The other aspect of this Bill which gives me great pleasure is its power to reduce the lead content of petrol. It is only fair that due credit should be given to the Ampol refinery for its cooperation in gearing up to meet the new standards.

Many areas of Brisbane have a totally unhealthy level of lead emissions, including Fortitude Valley, Woolloongabba, much of Ipswich Road—which was mentioned by the honourable member for Yeronga—and most areas near major roads where stop/start conditions prevail.

Mr FitzGerald: But won't the lead disappear with the change of fuel?

Mr ARDILL: That will be a very long time.

Mr FitzGerald: It won't be too many years, I don't think. There is a very high percentage of new cars, and the old ones will rust out.

Mr ARDILL: That is correct. All new cars run on lead-free petrol. However, cars such as my Kingswood, which uses super petrol, will be on the road for many years.

This Bill will materially improve the life-style and working conditions of thousands of people in this city who suffer daily from those stop/start traffic conditions. A large portion of the pollution that often creates a photochemical smog in the Brisbane area is created by motor vehicles. That condition has been getting worse for many years. The more that our roads become congested and the more that stop/start traffic becomes the rule of the road, the problem will worsen.

In areas in which the smog cannot escape, nitrogen oxides that are created by fuel emissions cause eye irritations and breathing difficulties. Those nitrogen oxides, CO₂,

carbon monoxide, methane and water vapour affect the ozone layer and contribute to the greenhouse effect.

Much of the noxious emissions from vehicles that idle in traffic and travel at less than the optimum speed could be eliminated by efficient traffic engineering and coordination of traffic lights. I disagree with the member for Aspley, who said that the Brisbane City Council is doing everything possible. The council has totally neglected this issue. In fact, it has destroyed some of the efficient systems that were already in place simply to save the maintenance costs of those systems.

When the traffic lights system in Fortitude Valley was coordinated, one traffic expert calculated that that one act reduced the consumption of petrol and diesel in the city by many thousands of litres per annum. By clever traffic engineering within known and available technology in Queensland, much can be done to reduce air pollution and petrol consumption.

The reduction in lead content will come at a cost in vehicle maintenance, but that cost must be borne. By introducing this legislation the Minister and this House will have done Queensland's share of reducing the lead content in those emissions. I commend the Minister for introducing the Bill and support it.

Mr PEARCE (Broadsound) (10.14 p.m.): Public awareness of the possible change to future climate induced by human activities has grown rapidly during the past few years. Internationally, the greenhouse effect is now considered to be one of the major environmental problems facing the world today. Dramatic media coverage and documentaries frequently warn of the dire consequences for mankind from the greenhouse effect if urgent action is not taken to counteract it. Worldwide, countries are devoting considerable resources to research, particularly to the characterising and predicting of expected climatic changes.

Although the magnitude of the climatic problem which may result is uncertain, the possible seriousness of the consequences of inaction is not. Without the greenhouse effect, the average temperature on earth would be around minus 18 degrees centigrade instead of around 15 degrees as it is as present. Without this effect, earth would probably be a frozen wilderness inhospitable to man.

In recent times, the term "greenhouse effect" has been adopted to describe the projected outcome of increased levels of heat-absorbing gases known as greenhouse gases. Human production of these greenhouse gases is rising rapidly. The resulting increase in atmospheric concentrations already may have warmed the planet over the past 100 years. The principal greenhouse gases are carbon dioxide (CO₂), methane (CH₄), chlorofluorocarbons and halons (CFCs and BFCs), nitrous oxides and ozone.

Scientists claim that atmospheric carbon dioxide has increased by 25 per cent since pre-industrial times and is continually increasing at a rate of 0.4 per cent each year. At the current CO₂ emission rate, it is expected to double pre-industrial levels by the year 2030. Scientists predict that the increase of greenhouse gases has to date already committed the planet to an increase in surface temperature of between 0.6 and 2.4 degrees celsius.

Let me turn now to the ozone layer and what is happening to it. Some 25 to 35 kilometres above the earth's surface a thin layer of ozone acts as a protective veil absorbing lethal levels of ultraviolet radiation from the sun. Over the past decade, there has been increasing concern about the release of certain chemicals, mainly chlorofluorocarbons and bromofluorocarbons, depleting the stratosphere ozone and in turn posing major environmental and health problems to Australia as well as to the rest of the world.

Although the chemistry and physics of what occurs in the atmosphere is not fully understood, there is now conclusive evidence that the ozone layer is seasonally decreasing as a result of the emission of chemicals that form active radicals containing hydrogen, nitrogen, chlorine, fluorine and bromine. Ozone loss appears to be most pronounced over Antarctica, and up to 50 per cent has been recorded lost in spring each year. These

areas of depleted ozone are commonly known as ozone holes. In some ozone holes, up to 95 per cent of ozone has been depleted.

The decreasing trend in ozone depletion above Antarctica over the past decade has recently been directly attributed to chlorine radicals from CFCs, together with the presence of ice nuclei which enhance chlorine-catalysed ozone destruction. It is also of concern that seasonal decreases in ozone levels over southern Australia in the same period have also occurred. These decreases have been greater than the global average. To date, the changes to the ozone layer caused by CFCs and halons have been small. Scientists now report that about 2 per cent of the ozone has been lost worldwide. It is estimated that, on average, a 1 per cent decrease in ozone will lead to a 2 per cent increase in ultraviolet radiation.

New observations of ozone behaviour are broadly consistent with model predictions about what should be happening to the ozone layer. According to the models, if CFC production and use continue at the present rate, during the first half of the next century total ozone levels will fall by a few per cent and upper atmospheric ozone levels by much more.

People should be warned and made aware that even at the low levels of UV radiation that currently reach the earth, radiation is still sufficient to cause eye damage and skin cancer in humans. It is said that about 10 000 people die from skin cancer every year. If ozone levels drop to that predicted level, the corresponding rise in UV radiation levels is likely to increase eye disease and skin cancer as well as having adverse effects on the immune system of both humans and livestock at all latitudes.

Although increased rates of skin cancer cannot be calculated with certainty, United States scientists have estimated that some 1.65 million cases of non-melanoma skin cancer could have been prevented if CFC emissions were banned. Further to this, it is claimed that ultraviolet radiation can also damage plant species. Of some 200 species tested for UV-B sensitivity, about two-thirds produced adverse reactions, including pollen failure and hormone and chlorophyll damage.

Ultraviolet radiation is already responsible for the degradation of many common synthetic materials. In particular, it causes plastics and paints to fade. Higher ultraviolet-B levels could exacerbate these problems, resulting in considerable maintenance and adaptive costs. Changes in the ozone layer in conjunction with changing concentrations of other chemicals are also likely to lead to a warming of the earth's surface. In addition, increases of UV radiation may indirectly affect climate change through the depletion of marine algae, which is now believed to be the primary "sink" for carbon dioxide, a major greenhouse gas.

CFCs and halons have been estimated to contribute approximately 17 per cent to the greenhouse effect due to the size of the molecules and their ability to remain in the atmosphere for up to 100 years or more. Records show that CFCs and halons were first created 60 years ago. Since then they have been used for many products which take advantage of their chemical traits. CFCs are stable, odourless, non-toxic, colourless, will not conduct electricity, are non-flammable and produce a fine, even spray. Generally, they have been used as aerosol products, refrigerants, solvents and for foam production and fire-fighting.

Based on 1986 consumption data, CFC use per person is recorded to be greater in Australia than in the rest of the world. Australia uses approximately 38 per cent of CFCs on aerosols, 33 per cent on refrigerants, and the remainder on plastic foam.

Concentrations of chlorofluorocarbons and halocarbons are rising faster than those of most greenhouse gases because their annual rate of release has been increasing in recent years. Concentrations of CFCs, which were used as an aerosol propellant and are still used as a blowing agent for foam insulation, and CFC 12, a refrigerant, are growing by about 5 per cent annually. The concentration of CFC 13, a solvent used for cleaning electronic microcircuits, is soaring at the annual rate of about 11 per cent.

These figures point to an urgent need to control and, in the short term, ban the use of CFCs throughout the world. I congratulate the Minister for Environment and Heritage on the introduction of the Clean Air Act Amendment Bill. New section 32A creates regulation-making powers to control the manufacture, sale, storage, use, possession, recycling, and disposal of ozone-depleting substances and the design, manufacture, sale, installation, use, maintenance, and decommissioning of things that contain or are manufactured using ozone-depleting substances.

While CFCs, known as ozone-depleting substances, are now recognised as major contributors to the depletion of the ozone layer, some countries still continue to ignore the warnings and are pressing on with the use and production of CFCs. For example, China has plans to increase tenfold the production of CFCs in its bid to have a refrigerator in every household by the year 2000.

It is worth noting that the cheapest fridge coolants and insulators are CFCs, and this alone highlights the urgent need for scientists to come up with viable alternatives. However, it is refreshing that the world's largest producer of CFCs, the chemical company Du Pont, is so optimistic about the development of alternatives that it has pledged to end production of CFCs by the year 2000. In fact, companies that produce 60 per cent of the world's CFCs have pledged their support for a complete phasing out of those ozone-depleting compounds.

The facts cannot be ignored as Australia faces real problems as a result of the vanishing ozone layer. More ultraviolet light will affect Australia's animals, crops, ecosystems and, of course, human health. People living in this great State of Queensland, and the thousands of tourists who visit each year, will be faced with the increasing threat of skin cancers and eye cataracts.

Despite being the world's highest user of CFCs per head of population, Australia is now one of the world leaders in the campaign to reduce CFC use. By 1995, it aims to achieve a 95 per cent phase out of ozone-depleting substances. As a result of the passing of this Bill, the State of Queensland will be playing an important role.

Australia should be concerned that available evidence makes it quite clear that no country will be immune from the consequences of the greenhouse effect or the depletion of the ozone layer. Scientists claim that there could be dramatic changes to sea levels that may cause flooding of coastal cities and low-lying inland areas. In addition, the greenhouse effect may contribute to possible changes in the distribution and availability of freshwater resources. As I have said, there is concern that the greenhouse effect will mean changes to the productivity and distribution of farmland, the disturbance and destruction of natural ecosystems and, of course, the health risk to humans from the greenhouse effect are also of major concern.

There are real dangers to the balance of nature through an erratic greenhouse effect brought about by a depleted ozone layer and there is enough confidence in research to confirm that controls on the use of CFCs must be put in place. Once released into the atmosphere, CFCs will react against the ozone layer for between 70 and 110 years.

Australia cannot ignore the warnings. It cannot allow the destruction of the ozone layer to continue. He must act now and bring about the control of CFCs. I support the Bill.

Dr CLARK (Barron River) (10.26 p.m.): This evening, I welcome the opportunity to be part of the debate on this important piece of legislation.

"At the moment we are afraid; do not leave our generation without hope; have the courage to save the ozone layer." Those were the words of 17-year-old Susannah Begg of Melbourne, a member of the ACF youth delegation to London in June of this year to participate in the renegotiation of the Montreal Protocol, a UN treaty to protect the ozone layer. Why then are the youth of our country so concerned?

Tonight, this House has heard from many speakers. However, I would like to reinforce the words that members have already heard. It is a message that we really cannot hear too often.

Ozone depletion lets into the atmosphere dangerously high levels of ultraviolet UV-B band, lethal to many forms of life. UV-B is responsible for snow blindness, eye damage, the premature ageing and wrinkling of skin, eye diseases such as cataracts, and certain types of skin cancers could become more and more common. Worldwide, about 10 000 people die from skin cancer every year. Significantly, Australia already has the highest rate of skin cancer.

If current trends continue, future generations face a significant impact on the world's ecosystems, lower agricultural crops, reduced forest growth and depleting populations of phytoplankton at the top of the aquatic food chain, leading to an imbalance in marine ecosystems and diminishing populations of fish. That is why the youth of Australia are worried, and rightly so.

Tonight, members have heard of the chemicals that deplete the ozone layer, including chlorofluorocarbons—CFCs—halons, methyl chloroform, carbon tetrachloride and hydrochlorofluorocarbons. All those chemicals are injecting harmful chlorine and bromine into the atmosphere at a million tonnes a year.

Primarily, it is the industrialised countries that have been using those chemicals commercially in aerosols, cleaning solvents, foam blowing agents, air-conditioning and refrigeration. Between 1930 and 1990, 18 million tonnes of CFCs and halons were produced; 16 million tonnes are still in the atmosphere.

In Australia, what are the culprits? In 1986, it was indicated that domestic refrigeration, air-conditioning, automotive air-conditioning, aerosols and portable fire-extinguishers accounted for 65 per cent of all ozone-depleting substances. So Australia knows the culprits and it can begin to take some action.

The youth delegation went to London because the thinning of the ozone layer is a global problem and it was being addressed there by the nations of the world. While our young people were not completely satisfied, it has to be said, with the progress made during negotiations of the Montreal Protocol, which is ratified by 51 countries, it is certainly very encouraging that international cooperation is occurring on this problem. The only solution is to recognise it as a world-wide global problem that all nations must solve together. Australia is a signatory to the protocol and is playing its part.

After extensive consultation with industry, unions and public interest groups, the Australian Environment Council has developed a strategy for ozone protection which the Federal Government, State Governments and territories have all agreed to adopt and are working on together.

The strategy sets out the action necessary to allow a total phase-out of all ozone depleting substances in Australia by 1988, with a 95 per cent reduction in the annual consumption of ozone-depleting substances by 1995. The strategy is very detailed, containing 106 recommendations that cover a wide range of end-use controls. Whilst firm targets have been allocated to most actions, the ability to implement a number of recommendations is dependent upon the future availability of substitutes, new technology and processes, alternative products and the provision of disposal facilities. We must recognise that there are limits to the speed at which we can move.

Approaches taken to phasing out ozone-depleting substances that are recommended in the strategy and that will be adopted in Queensland include: bans on products and manufacturing processes involving ozone-depleting substances; restrictions on the installation and use of products that contain ozone-depleting substances; labelling in order to allow the public to make informed decisions as to which products are ozone-friendly; accreditation of service personnel to ensure that unnecessary losses of ozone-depleting substances do not occur and that recovery procedures for CFCs and halons are implemented by competent staff; recovery and, wherever possible, reprocessing, recycling or disposal of ozone-depleting substances; improved design and operating procedures to reduce CFC and halon emissions; improved industry awareness of how servicing and maintenance procedures can be improved, along with knowledge of alternatives available; and improved public awareness of what individuals can do to reduce the use of CFCs and halons.

That detailed strategy is the framework within which all States have the ability to work together. I am very pleased to support the amendments to the Clean Air Act. Through those amendments, Queensland can play its part in working towards the achievement of that strategy. Queensland will now have regulations which give the Government the ability to control emissions. Section 32A contains very specific regulations that will allow the control of manufacture, sale, storage, use, possession, recycling and disposal of ozone-depleting substances. Furthermore, the Bill proposes the regulation of the design, manufacture, sale, installation, use and maintenance of products that contain, or are manufactured using, ozone-depleting substances.

The member for Cunningham suggested that the Government has no positive proposals and no actions. However, if honourable members examine the strategy of the Australian Environment Council, the action that the Government can take will be very clear. The strategy contains approximately 106 recommendations. In order to give the flavour of the sorts of things that will be possible once this legislation is in place, I will read a couple of those recommendations. With regard to plastic foams, recommendation 11 provides that no new CFC-based phenolic foam manufacturing plants should be established in Australia. Recommendation 13 provides for a ban, effective from 31 December 1991, on the manufacture of moulded polyurethane foams that use CFC. Those recommendations actually give dates by which the Government should try to achieve those objectives. Recommendation 28 makes it mandatory, from 30 June 1990, for operators to recover CFC 113 from cleaning operations. Because the strategy was based on the strategies of other States that were slightly ahead of Queensland, that date has passed. However, Queensland will get there. Recommendation 28 further provides for material so recovered to be reused, recycled, reprocessed or held for destruction. Recommendation 43 provides that personnel who install, service and test fixed halon systems be accredited through achieving a standard in the appropriate course, effective from 31 December 1990. Recommendation 50 provides that the sale of all aerosol and non-rechargeable halon extinguishers should be banned, effective immediately. Recommendation 63 provides that the sale of aerosols containing CFCs be banned through State legislation from 31 June 1990. Again, that date has passed, but Queensland can ban it. The alternative technology is available.

As I say, there are 106 recommendations for the Government to begin with, many of which can be implemented immediately. The Bill also provides for wide powers to enter premises, examine equipment and take samples to enforce the regulations that will be formulated. This is not the Gestapo that was referred to. If the Government makes laws, it must be able to enforce them. I am very happy to support an amendment to protect private citizens in their own homes. Clearly, it is not the Government's intention to trespass on that privacy.

Although the powers under the legislation are very wide, if the Minister believes that to enforce compliance with the regulations would deprive the community of substantial economic or social benefit or that no viable alternative is readily available to using the substance, he may grant exceptions to the regulations under section 32A in respect of the use of ozone-depleting substances. It is certainly not the Government's intention to place undue financial burden upon either the business sector or manufacturers. The Government will insist upon replacements only when they are available and only when industry has already adopted them, as is the case with aerosol sprays.

Fortunately, those alternatives do exist; aerosol sprays are one example. Refrigeration and air-conditioning are, unfortunately, more difficult in terms of a new technology. However, even in those areas, alternatives are being developed to CFC refrigerants for air-conditioners in cars that will be available for new air-conditioners. In Victoria, a federally funded trial is currently under way to test an alternative refrigerant which can be directly introduced into existing air-conditioning systems.

The legislation sets the scene for Queensland to accept its responsibility both to the youth of Australia and the youth of the world to protect the ozone layer. I support the Bill.

Mrs BIRD (Whitsunday) (10.37 p.m.): I rise very briefly to support the Bill. Most speakers in the debate have spoken at length about CFCs and their effect. I will add some of my own comments. Communities throughout the world expect and demand legislation such as this, especially from progressive legislators. Issues such as global warming and ozone depletion are uppermost in everybody's mind and dominate all sections of the media. The overwhelming enormity of all aspects of global warming and ozone depletion may appear to trivialise attempts by Governments to introduce clean air legislation at a local level—seemingly, too little, too late. The simple truth of the matter is that, although concern has been expressed about air pollution, it is only just now beginning to be recognised by the public as being worthy of serious attention.

Since the Industrial Revolution, we have known about the serious health side effects of air pollution. Indeed, in London in 1952, black industrial fog claimed 4 000 lives and left tens of thousands ill. As a consequence of this incident, many Governments introduced legislation to combat the primary pollutant of the day—sulphur dioxide—in emissions from power plants, industries and home furnaces.

Severe health problems introduced by air pollutants, however, continue around the world today. In the United States alone, more than 100 million people breathe air that is considered unhealthy by the Environmental Protection Agency. People are daily breathing unsafe air in countries such as Hungary, India, and especially Mexico, where diplomats have been advised not to plan having children while posted there.

The environmental impacts of air pollution are extremely grave. Acid rain and air pollution are devastating forests, crops, lakes and buildings over a wide area of Europe and North America. To overcome these problems, industry built taller smokestacks to spew pollutants a long way from their point of dispersal, only to find that sulphur and nitrogen oxides could be transformed in the atmosphere into dangerous pollutants to fall to earth far from their source or enter the upper atmosphere. Governments that permitted the tall stacks to pollute simply moved the problems elsewhere. A local pollution problem became a national or, by accumulating, an international problem.

Air pollution is well and truly on the political agenda. The challenge is enormous but at least the issues are now being addressed. Through experience, Governments have learnt that corporations and industry respond only to legislative muscle, and that their obligations to environmental protection are overruled by their interests in economic protection. Yet in the end result it is industry that has the opportunity and the responsibility of salvaging the environment.

Though this legislation is a giant improvement on the status quo we, as a Government, must, in the very near future, take the opportunity to address this same problem through further energy efficiency, transportation reforms and waste reduction, and I look forward to legislation in that respect.

The comprehensive approach of this Bill is necessary because it focuses on the prevention of ozone-depleting pollution as well as the control of ozone-depleting pollution.

Contrary to comments from honourable members opposite, I believe that the future of Australia and, indeed, the world is a matter of choice—our choice. Things can change. We have the wealth and we have the opportunity; what we need is the political will. This Government is providing that will. I congratulate the Minister and support the Bill.

Hon. P. COMBEN (Windsor—Minister for Environment and Heritage) (10.41 p.m.), in reply: I thank all honourable members for their conditional support. Certainly we on this side of the House appreciate the attitude adopted that this is part of an international movement.

At the end of last week, I attended a workshop for the International Law Association at which a number of distinguished legal people from across the world expressed the feeling that, increasingly, we have to be part of a world movement. The isolate, which Australia is, has for too long allowed us to say that we do not have this problem of acid rain, etc. When we suddenly saw the hole in the ozone layer, we realised that this

was a world problem that affects us. We suddenly realised that we are part of a world community and part of a world movement and that the sooner we adopt things such as the Montreal protocol, the international covenants concerning world heritage listing and the RAMSAR treaty to protect migratory birds—when we move in those international areas to fully be part of that international community—we will benefit. Nothing will benefit us more than to adopt the Montreal protocol and to be part of that movement.

I do not intend to thank individual members and comment at great length on their contributions. The hour is late. I sincerely thank the honourable member for Cunningham, my shadow in this place. We listened with some interest to his support for ethanol. Since he spoke, I have had discussions with my colleague the Minister for Primary Industries, the Honourable Ed Casey. He agrees with much of what the honourable member said. There is much to be done. The Sugar Research Institute in Mackay is doing some work on ethanol. We understand that the Department of Resource Industries is also doing research. Certainly, we in the Department of Environment as well are looking at the potential contributions. We are aware of the contributions not only to the environment in terms of the use of ethanol but also the potential benefit to the economy from the use of ethanol coming from sugarcane in Queensland. So it could be a double benefit to Queensland. The potential is there. We do not dissent from anything the honourable member said. I do note that he wants me to do it tomorrow. His Government was in power for 32 years and did not do very much. I think he could give us a little longer to have a close look at it. We are not having a review or a commission on this one. We are getting on with the job. If the economics are okay, we will be progressing in that direction.

Like a number of honourable members, the honourable member for Cunningham referred to clause 7, which amends section 40 of the Act. This clause gives inspectors the right to enter any premises at any time. This matter was also raised by my colleague, Mr Foley. I certainly accept the comments that have been made. As a result, at the Committee stage, I will present an amendment to effectively provide that inspectors can enter any premises other than a private dwellinghouse. The honourable member will note that under new subsection (4), which amends subsection (2) of section 40 of the Clean Air Act, there is a very large provision relating to the obtaining of warrants applying to certain situations and the ability of inspectors to obtain a warrant to enter a private dwellinghouse. I hope that my intimation will allay the fears expressed by the Opposition spokesman and those of other Opposition members.

I wish to raise a couple of matters that were not dealt with in great detail in previous speeches. I reiterate my thanks to all members who spoke during the debate. I will not thank them individually, because there were 12 speakers and to do so would delay the House. I mention the matter of lead in petrol, which is of great concern to this Government. Extensive discussions between the Government and Ampol and BP have taken place. I place on the public record my appreciation of the efforts of Mr Barry Woods, who is the general manager of Ampol in Queensland. He showed a willingness to take on board the Government's concerns and has indicated a move towards upgrading the refinery at Lytton to facilitate the reduction of lead in petrol within a number of years. The Government has also invited both Ampol and BP to enter into negotiations to ensure that petrol sold in Brisbane will very quickly come down to the level of 0.4, which is now the Australian average. This may mean that a higher level will apply in country areas where it can be absorbed better and where there is less likelihood of damage. I publicly express my thanks to the managers of Ampol and BP for their willingness to enter into negotiations and to discuss a range of environmental issues.

I make the general comment that this is short-term amending legislation. Presently, there is a proposal before my department to amalgamate the Clean Air Act, the Clean Waters Act and the Noise Abatement Act to consolidate the legislation. As I have said to the media in Queensland on a number of occasions recently, the Government is looking into the appropriateness of an environmental protection authority in Queensland and is very impressed with the Western Australian model, which could be used as a means of properly protecting the environment and of undertaking environmental

assessments. I am sure that the amalgamation of legislation relating to pollution will be part of the assessment that is going on at present.

I reiterate my thanks to honourable members for their support. I commend the Bill to the House.

Motion agreed to.

Committee

Hon. P. Comben (Windsor—Minister for Environment and Heritage) in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 5, as read, agreed to.

Clause 6—

Mr ELLIOTT (10.49 p.m.): I refer the Minister to proposed new section 32B and ask him to explain briefly what he has in mind and how he proposes that that section to be administered?

Mr COMBEN: At present, the Government is looking at two options. One is to take the path followed by Victoria which involves an accredited course for mechanics, engineers and people working on machinery such as air-conditioning and refrigerators to ensure that they know how to get out the CFCs. There can be an accredited course, which is certainly the way that a number of trade unions and employer groups would prefer to go.

The alternative is simply to ensure that ad hoc training is provided. There is an equally forceful lobby that wants the Government to take that path, but no determination has been made at this stage. I am about to enter into discussions with the Honourable Neville Warburton to consider the possibility of a TAFE course and accreditation. Although it is my inclination to adopt that course, the Government has not made any decision and is open to suggestions. If the member for Cunningham has views on the subject or has had views expressed to him on this matter that he wants to take up with me, I will take them on board. At the moment, I have no firm opinion on the matter.

Clause 6, as read, agreed to.

Clause 7—

Mr COMBEN (10.52 p.m.): I move the following amendment—

"At page 5, line 17, after 'premises' insert—
'other than a private dwelling-house'."

I believe that this amendment will satisfy the concerns raised by the member for Cunningham. Initially, the amendment to section 40 provided that an inspector of my department could enter any premises, which seems to be a little harsh when it is considered that this amending legislation is dealing with CFCs. I would place this amending legislation in a wider context and point out that this is an amendment to the Clean Air Act. Traditionally, inspectors have had the right to enter premises, because part of their responsibility deals with occupational health and safety. New subsection (4), which amends subsection (2) of section 40, deals with the ability of inspectors to obtain a warrant to enter a private house. That protection will remain in place. However, to ensure that inspectors of the Department of Environment and Heritage are not entering just any premises, I am prepared to agree with the suggestion made by the member for Cunningham and fortified by my friend and colleague the member for Yeronga, Mr Foley. I propose that the words "other than a private dwelling-house" be added.

Mr ELLIOTT: I thank the Minister for accepting that suggestion. I also thank the honourable member for Yeronga.

Mr Mackenroth: We will have to take the words off the word processor which your Government left there, won't we?

Mr ELLIOTT: I am surprised that the honourable member should take that attitude. Regardless of whether the old subsection (2), which becomes the new subsection (4), spells it out, it is important that we do not give the impression to the public that we are travelling in that direction. As I indicated to the honourable member in the debate on the Heritage Buildings Protection Bill, I was concerned about that. People are concerned that we are not seen to move away from the Westminster approach that a man's home is his castle. That has been a tradition for all our lives. I would hate to think that we did anything to jeopardise it.

Mr FOLEY: I commend the Minister for introducing this amendment and I acknowledge the sentiments expressed by the honourable member for Cunningham. It is important to note that, when powers of inspectors are conferred in various pieces of legislation, we not lose sight of the important commitment to civil liberties which this Government has and which, indeed, all reasonable thinking people in the community would have.

It is a pleasure to be able to share with the honourable members of the Opposition a constructive approach to issues of this kind. It is important that, whatever be the policy of a given Bill, the means of enforcement of that Bill not be allowed to be subject merely to the convenience of the bureaucrats of the given department but should be subject to the scrutiny of members of this Chamber, who must always be vigilant to preserve the liberties of the subjects of the Crown. Were it otherwise, we would have a society very different from the one that we now have. The price of liberty is eternal vigilance.

Mr COMBEN: I will be brief in terms of what both honourable members have just said. As we consolidate the three pollution

Acts of this State, on the recommendation of the two members who have spoken it is my intention to put before the Privacy Committee any provisions concerning inspectors and any provisions which may appear to be wide. I will be doing that quite willingly, so the provision can be seen as a short-term provision.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 7, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 8 and 9, as read, agreed to.

Clause 10—

Mr ELLIOTT (10.57 p.m.): I would like the Minister to clarify briefly what he said in respect of super petrol. I understood him to indicate that in the capital city he contemplates a different use of super petrol than that in country areas in which a problem obviously exists. I understood him to suggest that there would be two different levels of lead in super petrol. That would be a practical solution to the problem.

I am interested to hear how quickly the lead content is set at 0.4 grams. At the moment, the lead content is 0.84 grams. My colleague the member for Carnarvon is also most concerned about that matter. We use fuel commercially in the paddock. As well, vehicles that travel long distances in the country do not create a problem with lead emission. It would be trite to abolish that standard of fuel if it could be accommodated. If the octane level of the fuel is decreased, those vehicles will not perform as well. Unless the Minister accepts the suggestion that he agreed with in respect to the addition of ethanol to lift the octane rating, a problem will exist.

Mr COMBEN: The Ampol refinery at the river mouth has recently undergone a fairly major upgrading and renovation. It is able to produce petrol at 0.4 grams lead content per litre.

Mr Elliott: What would the octane rating be—92, 94 or 96?

Mr COMBEN: I will send the honourable member a letter about that.

BP has not carried out such a renovation and is not able to get down to 0.4 grams for some time. Because the legislation will give us the power to reduce the lead

content in petrol to 0.4 grams, we intend to invite the two companies to combine their marketing so that it will decrease fairly rapidly in the city where lead in petrol is a potential health problem. I cannot give a time for that. At the very outside, it would be by the end of the year, but it should be much quicker than that. In the city, we will be looking for the sale of petrol with a lead content of 0.4 grams.

Because BP cannot produce petrol containing 0.4 grams of lead, if the companies take up the suggestion which we have invited them to take up, the BP petrol will effectively be sold by both outlets in the bush. So an octane level of between 92 and 94 will be maintained in the country for some time. In the same way as Ampol has maintained its octane rating by the use of alternative additives, we would expect BP to introduce those alternatives. However, I appreciate the honourable member's concern.

Mr SPRINGBORG: I would like the Minister to clarify something for me. When unleaded fuel was originally mooted in this country, it was suggested by some people that there would be a phase-out period for leaded fuel. Was it in fact suggested that that period might be 10 years, 15 years or some such figure?

Mr COMBEN: Ten years.

Clause 10, as read, agreed to.

Clause 11, as read, agreed to.

Bill reported, with an amendment.

Third Reading

Bill, on motion of Mr Comben, by leave, read a third time.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. T. M. MACKENROTH (Chatsworth—Leader of the House) (11.02 p.m.): I move—

"That the House do now adjourn."

Report by Inter-State Commission on Vehicle Registrations

Mr JOHNSON (Gregory) (11.02 p.m.): I wish to address an issue that is of great concern not only to the State of Queensland but also to Australia as a nation. I refer to the report of the Inter-State Commission, which is currently before the Federal Parliament. I believe that in the current parliamentary session the Federal Government will allow that report to be debated and that it has given the ISC report its blessing.

Many members of this House are not aware of the consequences of the ISC report. For the benefit of those honourable members who are not aware of the position, I point out that the report will mean that in the long term there will be an increase in road transport registration fees. This country will not be able to bear the brunt of this increase. I will briefly outline the situation. Currently a normal semitrailer in the State of Queensland carries a registration fee of some \$2,000. If the recommendations of this report are implemented, that registration fee will increase from \$2,000 to some \$22,000. The registration fee for a Type 1 road train in the State of Queensland is currently \$4,400. That will jump to \$42,000. The registration fee for a Type 2 road train in the State of Queensland is \$6,200. If the recommendations of the ISC report are implemented, that fee will rise to \$62,000.

Mr McGrady: They are just recommendations at this stage.

Mr JOHNSON: And I understand that the Federal Government has given its blessing to them.

Mr McGrady: That is not true.

Mr JOHNSON: It is true.

I want to draw to the attention of the House the ramifications of the implementation of these recommendations. It will mean increased bankruptcy in the State of Queensland. Rail transport will come to a halt. I do not say that in jest. The railways cannot run without road transport whereas road transport can run without the railways.

I will cite some examples to give honourable members an idea of what the ramifications will be. The freight on a load of bullocks from Birdsville to Brisbane would normally be \$65 per bullock. If these recommendations are implemented, the freight increase will be \$40, which will mean a rate of \$105 per bullock to transport those beasts to Brisbane. I know that that sounds like a lot of money, and it is. The cost of transporting a bale of wool from Boulia to Brisbane is currently about \$16. These proposed increases will mean that the cost of transporting a bale of wool will increase to \$50.

As honourable members are well aware, many of these heavy transports run on unsealed roads and station roads and carry a 44 per cent load. The freight trucks carry an 84 per cent load. That gives honourable members an idea. Much of the time they run without a load. I was only speaking with Bruce McIver today. His road train became bogged at Tanbar Station, 80 miles south-west of Windorah on 21 March and they got it out on 11 August. It was bogged there for five months. Honourable members can imagine the profit from that vehicle! That is just one of the many hassles that confront road transport operators in this country. It is no mean feat to run a profitable operation.

The rural sector is currently facing an economic crisis. The price of wool has fallen to an all-time low. Wool-growers are getting 1975 prices for their wool——

Mr Prest: What rot!

Mr JOHNSON: It is not rot. At present, wool prices are at an all-time low.

Currently, wool-growers are getting about \$600 a bale, which is about the 1975 price. However, the costs continue to rise. Wages do not stay down; they keep going up. Wool packs get dearer. Everything gets dearer——

Mr Elliott: You've forgotten about the CPI.

Mr JOHNSON: They do not know what it means.

Before the end of this year, the Western Australian Department of Agriculture will be destroying one million sheep as a result of the Iraq problem and the other problems confronting the rural sector and the wool industry as a whole.

Subdivision of Mount Coot-tha

Mrs EDMOND (Mount Coot-tha) (11.08 p.m.): I draw attention to the plight of an old lady who is settled in the heart of my electorate and who is very dear to all who know her. Increasingly she is under threat from thoughtless planning and the greed of modern society and is unable to defend herself. I speak, of course, of Mount Coot-tha—a grand old lady who is now showing the horrid scars and ravages of development.

On 24 July, I attended the latest in a long line of public meetings that have been called to fight yet another subdivision development in the foothills. The time has come to make some value judgments about Mount Coot-tha and its role in Brisbane. Mount Coot-tha's timbered slopes form a scenic backdrop to the city that is of heritage value. That should be maintained. It also provides a welcome green space and lungs for cleaning the air of the growing city population and helps to control the gases that contribute to the greenhouse effect.

Mount Coot-tha's recognised aesthetic values, which provide a pleasant contrast to the suburbs, are of utmost importance to present and future city dwellers. Recently, the ridiculous situation developed in which the Liberal Lord Mayor announced in all

seriousness the introduction of a new tax allegedly to buy back environmentally sensitive areas.

Mr Beattie: That is a political disgrace.

Mrs EDMOND: I ask the honourable member to listen to this. During the very same week, the Lord Mayor stated that land on top of Mount Coot-tha that is presently zoned rural could end up as 32-perch residential blocks. Madam Deputy Speaker, you and I know—if the Lord Mayor does not—that, with all due respect, such a drastic rezoning could be achieved——

Mr Santoro interjected.

Mrs EDMOND: I ask the honourable member to listen to what I am saying because he will learn something about rezoning.

As I was saying, that rezoning could be achieved only with the willing compliance and acquiescence of the Liberal council. To say otherwise would be downright dishonest or would demonstrate a total lack of understanding of zoning procedures. Following increasing public pressure, I am pleased that the Lord Mayor later saw fit to purchase that land.

I take a longer-term view and intend calling on the Minister for Local Government to ask the Brisbane City Council to introduce a development control plan for the foothills. Such a plan could be used to control development, not to stop it or, as is normally the case, to actually assist further development. In this instance a development control plan could establish the necessary guidelines to protect the foothills from excessive development and, at the same time, minimise the visual blight that is caused by development. Anyone who looks towards the hills will recognise the monstrous damage below Stuartholme and above St Johns Wood as the ugliest examples of development gone wrong.

A development control plan would allow property-owners to develop already urban-zoned blocks of land sensitively while gaining a return on their investment. The development control plan could be used to preserve the natural backdrop and contrast to the city, to preserve and develop native vegetation and fauna habitats close to the city and to provide passive recreation in an area of natural character close to the city. The plan could also provide a buffer area between close residential areas and forest park. It could limit the visual intrusion of development and counter erosion problems caused by the topography.

Building guidelines included in the development control plan could call for compatible building styles such as timber-coloured polehouses that would not cause the drainage disturbances that are presently encountered with slab construction and that are already experienced by people living in the foothills of Mount Coot-tha. I would also hope that the area's delicate geological status would be considered and that tree-preservation ordinances would be included. Similarly, on areas where subdivision is allowed, I would hope that the minimum lot size of 600 square metres would not be the standard but that site and sensitivity of the lot should be taken into account. It is not mandatory for Residential A zones to have 600-square-metre blocks. It is a great shame that much of that land has been zoned for future urban use.

Time expired.

Federated Clerks Union of Australia Affiliation with ALP

Mr SANTORO (Merthyr) (11.13 p.m.): I wish to place on record how the Labor Party is affiliating itself with a large number of people who are members of the Federated Clerks Union of Australia, Central and Southern Queensland Branch.

Honourable members are witnessing an arrogant and confident union that is herding Queenslanders into the ALP corral against their wishes. The union is doing so without the fear of adverse consequences from the Government of the day and with its full and open support. The union State is beginning to take shape. An ugly sight indeed is

beginning to emerge. The Federated Clerks Union affiliation with the ALP clearly illustrates this.

Shortly after the ALP won Government in Queensland, the executive of the union commenced moves to affiliate with the Labor Party. Its intention culminated in a newsletter dated 13 June 1990, which was purportedly sent to all union members by the branch secretary, Bernadette Callaghan, and read in part—

"The Branch Council also discussed the question of affiliation with the ALP, in the wake of the party's attaining government in Queensland.

This question now needs to be addressed as the vast majority of our members are employed under State Awards and affiliation with the ALP would permit our involvement and input in the formulation of policies . . . The Branch Council determined that the views of the membership should be canvassed on this proposal . . . A meeting will be held in Brisbane on July 10 at 5.30 p.m. in the Union Office, 29 Amelia Street, Fortitude Valley. Special guests will include the Premier, Wayne Goss, and ALP President Ian McLean.

. . .

The obvious benefits for the Union are an opportunity to influence government policy and decision making; ensuring that clerks, through their Union, have a say in the various forums; and improved access to Ministers."

What was wrong with that allegedly official notice? Firstly, it did not go to all union members, some suggest it did not go to the majority of members. Secondly, it did not provide for a vote which reflected the wishes of the majority of members to be taken at such meetings. That was despite Ms Callaghan's commitment to members, which was contained in a union newsletter dated 20 September 1985 and stated in part—

"Our position on political party affiliation is the same as that taken on TLC affiliation, i.e. it must be decided by way of a referendum of all financial members. You will decide.

. . .

At our Branch Council meeting of August 24 1985, our position was again clarified. The Council reaffirmed its long standing policy to hold a referendum prior to any affiliation to the Trades and Labor Council or a political party. We are committed to your Union remaining democratic."

So the meeting went ahead on 10 July. Estimates of the attendance vary from 60 to 100 financial members of a union which boasts 16 000 members. It was hardly a representative meeting, I would suggest. At that meeting the Premier did a smoothie, Ms Callaghan did her block, and an unscheduled motion favouring the affiliation of the union with the ALP to be determined by the union branch council was carried. An amendment seeking to give all members the opportunity to participate in a postal vote to decide the issue of affiliation was shouted down and voted out.

On 13 August, a few days ago, another memo hit the desk—the same desk; not a majority of desks, of course—and guess from whom it came? Yes, it was from Ms Callaghan, saying—

"As has been reported in the media, this Branch has taken a decision to affiliate to the ALP . . . The Branch Council debated the question of affiliation at some length, taking into account all objections that had been received, and, in light of the small section of the membership who had expressed opposition, decided to proceed with affiliation but, in recognition of those members strongly opposed, on a figure less than full membership . . . 13,000 rather than 16,000."

Ms Callaghan went on to say—

"Another fact that should be noted is that the Branch Council of the Union is the only body, under Rule"—

unspecified—

"able to decide on matters of this kind."

Since her memo dated 20 September 1985, Ms Callaghan and her cronies have conveniently changed the rules and they obviously have not tried very hard to change them back to a situation which would allow all members to vote on fundamental issues such as the affiliation with a political party.

So what is the result of this sorry saga? Hundreds of members of this union are dissatisfied and demand a say in any union decision to affiliate with a political party. They are objecting strenuously and the petitions will keep on rolling in. The ALP is about to receive, if it has not already done so, about \$26,000 in affiliation fees compulsorily acquired from many union members who do not wish to affiliate and, through affiliation, financially support a political party. A fundamental recommendation of the Hanger inquiry has been disregarded and discarded.

At page 361 of his report, Hanger found that it was—

" . . . wrong to compel Union Members to contribute money to a Trade Union knowing that that money is to be used for the furtherance of the aims of a particular political party . . . That amounts to a significant in-road into personal freedom."

It contravenes Article 18 of the United Nations International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, which states that "no-one should be subject to coercion which would impair his freedom to have or adopt a belief of his choice". It also has the potential for the wrongful use of trade union members' funds, as highlighted by the examples of abuse revealed by the Cooke inquiry.

Repair and Maintenance of Schools in Nundah Electorate

Mr HEATH (Nundah) (11.18 p.m.): I am very tempted to ignore the speech that I have in my hand and answer Mr Santoro's misleading claims. However, I really do want to make the remarks that I planned to.

I wish to draw to members' attention some of the problems faced by schools in the Nundah electorate as they relate to repair and maintenance of buildings and grounds and the appalling delays suffered by those schools in having their requirements attended to. I am unsure of whether the delays were caused by the inactivity of the previous Liberal member for Nundah—

Mr Beattie: Probably.

Mr HEATH: I thank the honourable member.

As I said, I am unsure whether they were caused by his inactivity or whether they were as a result of the electorate not being a National Party seat, which is probably equally likely. But that is not really of major consequence. What is important is that primary and secondary school children and their teachers have had to tolerate disgusting conditions because of uncaring inactivity by the previous Government.

The conditions and the break-downs in toilet blocks at some schools were so bad that had similar conditions occurred in a workplace situation, the employer would be breaching the Workplace Health and Safety Act. Yet hundreds of children as young as five were forced to use those facilities every day.

I wish to read some comments, which came to me from the schools, listing the repairs required . One school required a final solution to the 20-year old problem of constantly leaking roofs in L Block and the assembly hall. The leaks at this school have fused the lights in the ceiling of the hall and the children and staff have had showers of sparks fall on them as well as showers of rain. As they say, the problem is 20 years old.

The same school asked for a repair of all windows and doors in all the old blocks where the wood is rotten, where screws no longer fit holes and effective security is impossible. This year, several video recorders and television sets have been stolen from that school.

Under this Government, following a visit from the Minister, Ron McLean, officers of the Administrative Services Department and me, a repair team was sent to the school.

The team was instructed to stay there until the principal was happy with the repairs and the security. What a difference under a Labor Government.

Some requests from another school included the clearing of underground drains under the main buildings. That clearing was first requested in 1981. Requests were also made for internal painting of the top floor of the main building, such requests being first made in 1982.

There is no possible justification on any grounds for not attending to these requirements for eight or nine years. For nine years the schoolyard has been completely flooded during storms or heavy rain. Because not one of the underground drains was cleared, inches of water lay across the surface underneath the school buildings where the children should be able to congregate for lunch breaks in wet weather.

In eight of the upstairs classrooms, the flakes of paint falling from the ceiling made the place look as though a snowstorm had hit. It should be remembered that the painting was first requested in 1982. Under this Government, the repairs have already been done. This Government has done more in nine months than the previous Governments did in nine years. They would not authorise spending less than \$10,000, which is the amount that was required to eliminate these long-standing problems.

From another school there was a list of 168 items which the principal believed required repair or painting or on which some maintenance work needed to be performed. This school has sets of old wooden stairs which the Honourable Ron McLean found, when he visited the school, were so unsafe that there was some danger of the stairs collapsing under him. Now, I do not suggest that many schoolchildren are of similar physical stature to the Minister, but when a large number of the children are on the stairs at the same time, a similar risk is certainly present.

The point is that not only are there problems causing discomfort and interrupting learning, such as the snowstorm of paint flakes, but also some of the unattended requests for repairs involved a risk of physical injury to schoolchildren. But the previous member for Nundah did not get anything done and the previous Government would not allocate the funds for repairs to the schools in the Nundah electorate.

I have been appalled at what I have found at the schools since 2 December last year. I am still appalled at the thought that any Government—and of course it was a National Party Government—could permit conditions at schools to deteriorate to the dangerous, unhealthy, unpleasant state that existed.

I am very proud to be a part of a Government which is addressing such problems immediately.

Daylight-saving

Mr PERRETT (Barambah) (11.22 p.m.): As I rise to take part in this debate, I would like to talk about the Goss Government decision to introduce daylight-saving to Queensland on a permanent basis. This decision demonstrates clearly the Labor mentality on such issues—mentality that is determined to destroy the quality of life of those people who choose not to live in the metropolis of this State.

In announcing that daylight-saving would be introduced to Queensland on a permanent basis, Mr Goss made an amazing statement when he said that the education system would be allowed flexibility to reduce the impact on children and that a decision as to business hours worked in local areas would be left to local shire councils. Surely this was an admission in itself that he knows that daylight-saving will not be in the best interests of all Queenslanders.

Mr Milliner: Do you want a citizens' referendum on this?

Mr PERRETT: The Minister should just wait.

It is clearly a divisive issue, an issue on which many people have very strong opinions and feelings. Results gleaned from recent trials confirm that.

Mr McGrady: Where does the National Party stand on this?

Mr PERRETT: I wonder where Mr McGrady stands on it. I remember his maiden speech.

The only appropriate way to have dealt with it, therefore, and what Mr Goss and his Government would have done if they had been at all smart, would have been to let the people decide by referendum and then live with their decision.

Daylight-saving, or what could more aptly be described as clock-fiddling, is an idea that was imported to Australia from Europe where a clear majority of people were understandably in favour of maximising their opportunity to enjoy mild and short-lived summers.

Here in Australia, and particularly in Queensland, we have more fierce sunshine than almost any other location on earth.

Mr Veivers: Hear, hear!

Mr PERRETT: It is great to see the member for Southport here because he has been up to my electorate and he knows how my constituents feel and how all country Queenslanders feel about this issue.

To gain more hours of daylight for recreational purposes in Queensland by summer daylight-saving is like sending a shipment of ice to the South Pole. Queensland simply does not need it. My personal view, and the very clear majority view outside the city of Brisbane is that Queensland simply does not need it at all.

This Labor Government decision is just another example of its callous disregard for country people. For many Queenslanders, this decision will detract markedly from their quality of life. In the west and north of the State in particular the result will be great discomfort and great disruption. There will be few advantages, if any, and they will be far outweighed by all the problems that this decision will create.

Mr Goss has no doubt now created a few problems of his own—mostly in the ALP caucus room, I would suggest. I cannot imagine the member for Mount Isa or the member for Barron River taking this decision lying down. What about all the other Labor members who won previously held National Party seats in the 2 December election? How do they feel about this decision? I remind all honourable members that many had very narrow majorities and if they thought they were skating on thin ice before, what do they think after this decision? Oh boy, I like it!

Mr Beattie: Who wrote it?

Mr PERRETT: The member for Brisbane Central is looking right at him.

Goss had acted on daylight-saving because it had become a symbol in southern States of the alleged backwardness of Queensland. By this decision, he is playing to the gallery of his peers and seeking the approval of misguided southern journalists—not the best decision or the most democratic process for Queenslanders.

Queenslanders have not suffered because of the previous National Party Government's rejection of daylight-saving over the years. Any such suggestion is utter fallacy. Queensland, without daylight-saving, had the strongest economy of all the States and continued to develop and expand despite the cries of "banana republic" and "living in the Dark Ages" from Labor clones and their mates south of the border.

There is no doubt that this decision will backfire on the Goss Labor Government. It is now the responsibility of Goss and Co. to show some real leadership and soften the blow by setting some firm guidelines and not trying to duck the issue by throwing the onus of decision-making back on the education system, local authorities and other bodies.

Daylight-saving will create many problems right throughout Queensland. Simply put, there will be no advantages for most Queenslanders. School children will be getting

up in the dark and going home from school in the blazing afternoon sun. Members should spare a thought for the families with young children; country people missing the evening news and weather reports because they are still working; and travellers, who traditionally travel to last light, arriving at the motel to find the restaurant operating on daylight-saving time closed five minutes ago. The problems are many and varied.

Time expired.

Frank Waters AM

Mr BRISKEY (Redlands) (11.27 p.m.): I take this opportunity to speak about Frank Waters AM. I first met Frank in 1972 when my father took over from him as the State secretary of the Amalgamated Postal Workers Union of Australia.

Upon being notified of his passing, I took from my bookshelf Frank's book *Postal Unions and Politics, a history of the Amalgamated Postal Workers Union of Australia*. Upon opening it, I noticed on the fly a note written by Frank to my father which reads—

"For Bob Briskey in gratitude of our friendship over the years and in appreciation of the manner in which you have assumed the responsibilities and leadership of the Queensland branch of the APTU. With warmest regards, Frank Waters. 13th September 1978."

I have fond memories of Frank, as do all who ever had the pleasure of meeting him. He was an outstanding man who was highly respected by his peers and by everyone who met him. His political and industrial career was marked by many great achievements. It is with great respect and a sense of sadness and loss that I speak about Frank today.

Frank was the last surviving member of the first Forgan Smith Government. He was elected to this House as the member for Kelvin Grove in 1932. He was a champion of the working class and when he was made a Member of the Order of Australia for his services to the industrial relations movement, he was extremely proud to receive an honour from his country.

In December 1974, the Amalgamated Postal Workers Union of Australia became the Australian Postal and Telecommunications Union. It was truly Frank's union.

It was formed in November 1925, following the amalgamation of a number of smaller unions. The Queensland branch was formed in 1926. At the age of 19, Frank was elected to the Queensland executive as the vice president and assistant secretary. He was a delegate to and an executive member of the Trades and Labour Council of Queensland. He was the Queensland delegate to the interstate executive of the ACTU until his election to Parliament in 1932. After his defeat in 1938, he returned to the union until 1942 when he served for three and a half years in the army. In September 1946, he was elected as Queensland secretary of the union and stayed there until 1972—a period of 26 years.

He was also Federal president of his union from 1961 to 1973 and a delegate to the ACTU congress from 1953 to 1973. He once again became a delegate to the Trades and Labour Council of Queensland from 1950 to 1976 and he was a member of the executive of that body from 1951 to 1976.

Frank was also a representative of Queensland on the joint council of the Commonwealth Public Service from 1961 to 1973 and, as well as his service to the trade union movement in Australia, he also had a very heavy workload on the international scene, being a delegate to the world conference of the Post, Telegraph and Telephone International in 1963, 1966 and 1975. From 1974 to 1975, he was a member of the world executive of that body. In 1965, 1971 and 1974, he was a delegate to the ASEAN Regional Office of the PTTI. In 1962 and 1970, he was an adviser to the Australian workers delegation to the ILO conferences in Geneva. As can be seen by Frank's involvement in the union movement, he was extremely well known both in Australia and overseas.

Frank was a family man. He always talked about his children and his grandchildren, of whom he was extremely proud. In fact, Frank spoke well of all people; he would speak ill of no one.

Frank had limited education in the traditional sense, but he was an avid reader. My father told me that Frank was the most well-read person whom he had ever met and that Frank could talk on any subject. His loves were art, music and history. I well remember Frank on many occasions visiting my father in his office, bringing books that he had just read to give to my father. Frank Waters was dedicated to his family, the ALP and his union.

This morning, honourable members heard how highly regarded Frank was. I take this opportunity to quote the Prime Minister, Bob Hawke. In March 1978, he said that he and Frank were close friends and the time spent in his company was always time well spent not only because he was an amusing, congenial companion but also because of the quality of his judgments on a range of matters. At that time, the Prime Minister said that Frank was among the best-read people that he had ever met both inside and outside of the union movement, possessing an extremely retentive memory and a shrewd, quizzical view of the world.

The late Denis Murphy said of Frank that, by the time he was 22, he had drive, ambition and a great capacity for organisation. Denis wrote that Frank was at home drinking beer with workers in the public bar and equally at ease with Cabinet Ministers and senior officers of the Commonwealth public service.

Labor leaders such as Bert Evert, Arthur Calwell and Gough Whitlam have sought his advice and been his confidantes. In 1986, Frank said, "Life has been a pretty useful experience. The best thing is if you have been of some small service. I have no regrets."

Frank Waters will be remembered for his great contribution to the union movement, to the Australian Labor Party, and to this House. I offer my sincere condolences to his family.

**INCORPORATION OF SPEECH BY MEMBER FOR REDLANDS IN CONDOLENCE BOOKLET
FORWARDED TO WATERS FAMILY**

Hon. T. M. MACKENROTH (Chatsworth—Leader of the House), by leave, without notice: I move—

"That the speech by the member for Redlands be incorporated in the booklet that will be forwarded to the Waters family."

Motion agreed to.

Motion—That the House do now adjourn—agreed to.

The House adjourned at 11.33 p.m.