

NOTE: There could be differences between this document and the official printed *Hansard*, Vol. 319

THURSDAY, 18 JULY 1991

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

CRIMINAL JUSTICE COMMISSION

Report

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I have to report that on Thursday, 18 July, I received from the Criminal Justice Commission a report on a public inquiry into certain allegations against employees of the Queensland Prison Service and its successor the Queensland Corrective Services Commission.

Ordered to be printed.

CRIMINAL JUSTICE COMMISSION

Report

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I have to report that on Thursday, 18 July, I received from the Criminal Justice Commission a report entitled Complaints Against Local Government Authorities in Queensland--Six Case Studies.

Ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS

The Clerk announced the receipt of the following petitions--

Adoption Law Amendment

From **Mrs Edmond** (23 signatories) praying for significant changes to the Adoption of Children Act Amendment Act 1990.

Abortion Law Repeal

From **Mrs Edmond** (11 signatories) praying for all abortion laws to be repealed so that abortion can be safely and readily available as a confidential matter between a woman and her doctor.

Paper-recycling

From **Mr Springborg** (235 signatories) praying for Government assistance to paper-recycling industries, for the development of recycling processes and to maximise use of recycled material in products.

Radioactive Material Storage

From **Mr Palaszczuk** (41 signatories) praying that no new or temporary radioactive storage facility be established anywhere in south-east Queensland until a more suitable site is found in another area.

Daylight-saving

From **Mr Booth** (115 signatories) praying that daylight-saving be not introduced in future years.

Electricity Transmission Line to Boyne Smelters

From **Mr Palaszczuk** (258 signatories) praying that the proposed second 275kv line to Boyne Smelters be shifted from the residential area to the industrial area, near the original line.

Amendment of Mineral Resources Act

From **Mr Vaughan** (883 signatories) praying for significant changes to the Mineral Resources Act of 1990 so that those pursuing lapidary, fossicking and associated pastimes are not disadvantaged.

Erection of Sound Barrier, Palm Beach

From **Mr Coomber** (337 signatories) praying for the construction of a sound barrier between residences in Japonica Drive, Palm Beach, and the Pacific Highway, before the highway is widened.

Petitions received.

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table--

Orders in Council under--

Health Act 1937-1990

Health Services Act 1991

Mental Health Services Act 1974-1990

Grammar Schools Act 1975-1989 and the Statutory Bodies Financial Arrangements Act 1982-1990

Education (General Provisions) Act 1989

Griffith University Act 1971

Proclamation under the Health Services Act 1991

Regulations under--

Hospitals Act 1936-1988

Hospitals Act 1936

By-laws under the Nursing Act 1976

Statutes under--

University of Central Queensland Act 1989

Queensland University of Technology Act 1988-1990

Griffith University Act 1971

University of Queensland Act 1965-1989

Third report of the Ministerial Consultative Council on Curriculum on the Basics in Schooling

Report appendices of the University of Queensland for the year ended 31 December 1990

Reports of the Board of Trustees for the year ended 31 December 1990--

Rockhampton Grammar School

Rockhampton Girls Grammar School

Brisbane Girls Grammar School

Ipswich Girls Grammar School.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 1)**All Stages**

Hon. T. M. MACKENROTH (Chatsworth--Leader of the House) (10.05 a.m.), by leave, without notice: I move--

"That so much of the Standing Orders be suspended as would otherwise prevent the constitution of Committees of Supply and Ways and Means, the receiving of Resolutions on the same day as they shall have been passed in those Committees, and the passing of an Appropriation Bill through all its stages in one day."

Motion agreed to.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT**Sister-State Agreement with Province of Central Java**

Hon. D. J. HAMILL (Ipswich--Minister for Transport and Minister Assisting the Premier on Economic and Trade Development) (10.06 a.m.), by leave: On 10 July, I was honoured to sign a letter of intent for a sister-State agreement with the province of Central Java in Indonesia. This agreement, which the Queensland Government has actively pursued for a year, is a real achievement as it opens the door for a significant boost in Queensland's cultural and trade activities in South East Asia. I wish to acknowledge the role of the Australian Ambassador to Indonesia, Mr Phillip Flood, in the achievement of this relationship. The ambassador saw the agreement as providing great potential for Australia, and particularly for Queensland, and I thank him and his officers at the embassy for their invaluable encouragement and support.

It is fair to say that the results are already beginning to show, because, last week, three business people who accompanied me in Central Java were offered space for exhibits in a major trade fair in the province later this month. I returned from Indonesia on Saturday, and by first thing on Monday morning the Trade and Investment Development Branch of the Premier's Department had moved into high gear to prepare for Queensland's participation in the trade fair. The trade fair involvement that we organised will enable Mr David Schwede of Specialist Export Services Pty Ltd, Mr John Hocken of Hocken and Associates, and Mr George Faulkner of the Queensland branch of the Australia-Indonesia Business Council, to take part in a six-week exposition that will be attended by more than a quarter of a million Indonesians. That is only the beginning of the potential benefits to evolve from my recent and previous trips to Indonesia to mould the sister-State agreement.

Indonesia is a country of 180 million people, of which 27 million live in the beautiful province of Central Java. After the signing ceremony, our hosts on last week's trip organised an exhaustive tour of some of Central Java's rural and industrial sites. It was an impressive--indeed, breathtaking--experience, which augers well for the prospects of a successful cultural exchange and joint investment program.

Last year, trade between Australia and Indonesia grew by 31 per cent to a value of \$1.8 billion. The balance was heavily in Australia's favour, with an export growth rate of 45 per cent to \$1.3 billion. Last year, Queensland's exports to Indonesia totalled \$86m, with cotton, machinery and non-ferrous metals representing half of that total.

Recently, Indonesia has introduced a liberalised trade package which has lifted restrictions on imports of fresh fruit, beef, chicken and some fish products. Indonesia is also preparing to initiate a multibillion-dollar transport infrastructure program, for which it will require equipment and expertise which Queensland could supply. We are positioned very well indeed for a mutually beneficial exchange. I am confident that, in the future, this sister-State agreement and the personal contacts we have made with some of the most senior Government officials in Indonesia will pay huge dividends for Queensland. I am pleased to advise the House that, in September, the Governor of Central Java, His

Excellency Mr Haji Mohammed Ismail, will be visiting Queensland to finalise the agreement in a signing ceremony with the Honourable the Premier.

I seek leave to table my report detailing the meetings I attended during the trip.

Leave granted.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

Sunshine Coast Hospitals

Hon. K. V. McELLIGOTT (Thuringowa--Minister for Health) (10.09 a.m.), by leave: Three months ago I instructed that a review be conducted of the management and operations of all hospitals which previously came under the Sunshine Coast Hospitals Board. The hospitals were reviewed as part of the program of random audits for public hospitals throughout Queensland initiated last year. The findings and recommendations of the review team have now been forwarded to the Sunshine Coast Regional Health Authority for consideration and implementation. The report concludes that the Nambour, Caloundra and Maleny hospitals all offer a high standard of health care. Although the population on the Sunshine Coast is expanding rapidly, the report states that the resources of the three hospitals are adequate for the services being provided. It is acknowledged that the Nambour hospital, in particular, is very busy, with many departments working at maximum capacity. Next year, when additional beds are provided as part of the State Government's redevelopment program, increasing levels of demand caused by population growth will be met. Five million dollars has been earmarked as part of the accelerated capital works program for this task.

The review team looked also at management issues, strategic planning and support services. It identified some areas in which improvements could be made in the management of resources. However, the report's major priority recommendation is the establishment of day surgery procedures at Caloundra Hospital. After consideration of the report, I have decided to allocate \$240,000 of Medicare incentive funds for capital and recurrent expenditure to establish day surgery procedures at Caloundra. The objective of day surgery is to benefit patients from the surrounding community by providing the convenience of day-only procedures. It will have the additional benefit of reducing the excess demand on facilities at Nambour hospital by undertaking clinically approved procedures which are cost efficient. In a full year of operation, the expected throughput is 900 to 1 000 procedures. There are also other benefits, including the potential for expansion of the number and type of procedures for day surgery and the possibility of private day surgery. As an increasing number of private patients elect to choose the short-term, lower-cost alternative of day surgery, this will further reduce public demand.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

Public Sector Management Commission Review of Department of Environment and Heritage

Hon. P. COMBEN (Windsor--Minister for Environment and Heritage) (10.11 a.m.), by leave: As honourable members are aware, recently the Public Sector Management Commission completed a review of the Department of Environment and Heritage. I now have pleasure in tabling a summary of the review's recommendations and stating that the recommendations build on the considerable successes in the Environment and Heritage portfolio of the past 18 months. These successes include the introduction of Queensland's first effective heritage legislation; a 64 per cent increase in the Budget; maintenance of our target to double the national park estate in our first term; finalising public consultations on protection of the Queensland coast and, in particular, Moreton Bay; and developing new environmental protection legislation. This excellent record of environmental management will not only continue following the PSMC review but also

be enhanced and developed. The review recommends that various environmental functions in government be consolidated into the Department of Environment and Heritage so that the department becomes Queensland's premier environmental manager.

The review concludes that the department should pursue a significantly enhanced role in providing environmental leadership and environmental coordination between departments. The Goss Government's endorsement of the PSMC review of the Department of Environment and Heritage is further proof of our commitment to environmental reform in Queensland. Resources, funding and staff levels in the department will increase, thus improving the quality of environmental management in this State. This consolidated role will require the department to--

- monitor the quality of the natural environment, and conservation status of resources of natural and cultural heritage value;

- manage particular areas of conservation and environmental value, including national parks and other protected areas;

- provide Statewide nature conservation initiatives, pollution control, waste management, coastal protection and cultural heritage protection;

- coordinate and supervise the conservation and environmental management aspects of the activities of all relevant Queensland Government departments at a policy level and conduct appropriate environment audits; and

- report to Government on the state of the natural environment, cultural heritage and the effectiveness of conservation and environmental management.

The department will have improved effectiveness resulting from initiatives such as the following-- assuming a broader range of environmental monitoring responsibilities, including vehicle emissions and conservation of wetlands;

- restructuring of the department with the creation of three divisions;

- improved liaison, communication and cooperation with other Government agencies and local authorities responsible for environment management;

- regionalisation of the department's operations and upgrading regional resources, which will improve the quality of departmental products and services and community access to these products and services; and

- improving significantly the level of community participation in conservation and environment planning and decision-making.

This financial year, new legislation will be introduced to cover environment, conservation, heritage, coastal management, wet tropics, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders and cultural heritage. Liaison with local authorities will be improved to better plan protection of our cultural and historical heritage and additional training and development for officers of local authorities. Waste management responsibilities, other than radioactive waste, will be transferred to the department. An evaluation and audit branch will be established to undertake both compliance and effectiveness audit roles. I have established a task force to assist officers in implementing these significant recommendations.

I take the opportunity to thank the commissioners of the Public Sector Management Commission, officers of the commission and my own officers for their contribution to this very significant report. I am confident that the implementation of the recommendations over the next few months will provide a very effective basis for departmental operations during the 1990s. For the information of honourable members, I table a copy of the recommendations.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT
Appointment of Queen's Counsel

Hon. D. M. WELLS (Murrumba--Attorney-General) (10.16 a.m.), by leave: It is my duty to advise the House that the "regulations" used to appoint Queen's Counsel in this State since 1865 have been, in certain important respects, legally ineffective. They are not regulations at all in the sense in which we are accustomed to using the term. It is usually used by honourable members to describe rules made under the authority of an Act. There is, however, no Act under the authority of which these so-called regulations were made. It was this odd circumstance which initially prompted me to seek a formal legal opinion on the validity of these so-called regulations.

When that opinion came to me, it confirmed that the document which governs the appointment of QCs was in part ineffective in achieving what it set out to achieve. Despite some amendments, this has been the case since 1865. The ineffectiveness relates to clause 2, which reads in part--

"No barrister shall be appointed to be one of Her Majesty's counsel learned in the law except on the recommendation of the Chief Justice to the Governor in Council."

This clause amounts to a restriction on the prerogative power of the Crown. It amounts to an abrogation of the right of the Crown to exercise its discretion, and the passing of that discretion to another. But it is well settled law that only Parliament can fetter the prerogative power of the Crown. The Crown, as represented in this State by the Governor in Council, cannot give its powers away without an Act of Parliament.

The legal doctrine may sound complicated, but it is in fact simple and based on common sense. The president of a local community organisation cannot give away the power to chair meetings, and the treasurer cannot give away the power to keep the books, without putting the proposal through an annual general meeting. In the same way, the Crown cannot give away any of its powers without the proposal going through Parliament. The so-called regulations by which it tried to do this in 1865 are simply ineffective.

However, while the instrument is ineffective to the extent that it tries to divest the Crown of some of its powers by exercise of the royal prerogative, it is not ineffective to the extent that it sets out to do things that can be done by royal prerogative. So clause 3, which prescribes a fee for the Letters Patent issued to barristers on becoming Queen's Counsel, is valid. However, I am advised that it would be preferable to legislate for the collection of fees, as the authorities are divided and the case law on the subject goes back a long way.

It is important to emphasise that the ineffectiveness of the so-called regulations does not in any way affect the validity of any appointment of any person to the office of Queen's Counsel since 1865. Each and every such appointment was an independent exercise of Executive Council's discretion in regard to a matter which is, without doubt, within the scope of the royal prerogative. Those appointments would have been valid had the instrument never existed, and therefore were valid despite the fact that it did.

Apart from the problem of the legal ineffectiveness of the instrument, there is an additional problem of a constitutional kind. Since two former Premiers demonstrated very publicly that they had no understanding of the doctrine of the separation of powers, the phrase has been a household term in many Queensland homes. The doctrine states that the Parliament makes laws, the Executive administers laws and the judiciary interprets laws. Constitutionally the Executive is the Queen. She is represented by the Governor, who is advised by Ministers. It is therefore quite irregular that the Governor in Council should take advice, in matters going as close to the heart of royal prerogative as the appointment of Queen's Counsel, based not on the recommendation of Ministers but on the recommendation of the judiciary. I emphasise that this is not in any way a criticism of the judiciary or the manner in which it, or the Chief Justice in particular,

has expressed the power of recommendation in this matter; I simply make the constitutional point that the title is "Queen's Counsel", and the Queen is represented in this State by the Governor and his Ministers.

The imperfections of the regulations of 1865 and their successor instruments are obviously such that the instrument will have to be repealed and replaced by a valid mechanism. In the meantime, I will be consulting with the legal community and other interested parties to determine their wishes prior to taking a proposal to Cabinet. The necessity of rectifying the situation gives all Queenslanders an opportunity to discuss the role and function of the inner bar, this ancient institution of Queen's Counsel, which has in recent times played such a prominent part in the civic life of our State.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

State Purchasing Council

Hon. R. T. McLEAN (Bulimba--Minister for Administrative Services) (10.21 a.m.), by leave: The new State Purchasing Council, which will oversee the Government's annual spending of about \$1,600m, met for the first time last Friday. One of its tasks will be to support the Government's industry development and regional development objectives. It will ensure suppliers have a good appreciation of the Government's needs for goods, equipment and services. It will act as an umpire on any complaints about the administration of the policy and review the policy's effectiveness. It will also provide a point of reference for suppliers who are suffering slow payment or other difficulties.

We want to see a range of important objectives advanced through purchasing. They are: (a) tangible industry development; (b) regionalisation; (c) making the managers manage; and (d) protection of the environment. We also want to forge a partnership with industry under some banner, such as "Q for Queensland--Q for quality", with which we can all readily identify. If Queensland business and industry can achieve internationally recognised standards of quality assurance, we can all "sell" Queensland to interstate and overseas firms. The council has the powers and it has the personnel, comprising representatives of many organisations, including the Queensland Confederation of Industry, the Queensland Small Business Corporation, the State Chamber of Commerce and Industry and the Trades and Labour Council. There has been a constant whingeing every time this Government has set up a committee or council. In fact, what we are doing is building a brand new Government machine--a machine designed to cope with and react to the demands of this age of high technology and the needs of the public, business and industry. I challenge anyone to knock, with any logic, the creation of this council, its aims or its ideals.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

Lands Department

Hon. A. G. EATON (Mourilyan--Minister for Land Management) (10.23 a.m.), by leave: The Department of Lands is both one of the oldest and one of the youngest departments in the Queensland public sector. In its current form, it is a mere 18 months old, although since the 1860s there has been a Lands Department in one form or another. Since the amalgamation of four departments into one in December 1989, there has been a program of regionalisation. This program is aimed at delivering more efficient and effective services to our clients. Despite claims to the contrary, this has not resulted in reducing staff available in rural and regional areas. Indeed, the reverse is the case. Under the regionalisation program, more staff will be located in these areas to deliver services, the same as those now available to people in metropolitan Brisbane. While this program has been under way, the Public Sector Management Commission has been conducting its review of the Lands Department. I am now in a position to outline the review's major findings.

The report found the responsibilities of the department to be broad and it complimented both staff and management on initiatives designed to deliver more effective services to its clients. It also recognised the department's efforts over the last 18 months to achieve integration and initiate its regionalisation program. But despite determined efforts, a number of problems still must be addressed. The key issues identified by the Public Sector Management Commission which affect the whole department include the need to clarify the department's major role and its business focus; the further development of its regionalisation program; problems of duplication and program overlap, particularly the need for further integration of the valuation and lands service staff and systems; the need to strengthen management training, and the need to complete the department's regional structure as soon as possible.

The review also recommended a legislative overhaul with a review of the penalties for failure to comply with the terms and conditions of leases and permits. Many of these issues have already been addressed. The report also noted the poor condition of much of the Lands Department's accommodation. The review said that the work performed by the Land Administration Commission can be undertaken by senior management of the department and has recommended its abolition. A recommendation has been made to amend the Surveyors Act, the Valuation of Land Act and the Real Property Act so that statutory roles can be assigned to the Director-General of Lands with the power to delegate. This will not affect the delivery of services but will simplify departmental administration.

The report has recommended that the department seek priority funding for the completion of an automated titling system to improve the storage and retrieval of land title information. The review considered the size of the department and recommended reduction by approximately 200 positions by the end of 1992. This is consistent with the internal departmental findings which were made public last month. I am planning to implement the recommendations in conjunction with restructuring and regionalisation programs now under way in the department.

As I said at the beginning, the amalgamation of the four former land-related departments into the Department of Lands has been a difficult task. Much has been achieved, but the issues I have already outlined need to be finalised. I am confident that the result will be a streamlined, efficient department providing a wide range of services in both rural and metropolitan areas.

PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEE OF PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

Annual Report

Mr HAYWARD (Caboolture) (10.26 a.m.): I have pleasure in presenting and tabling the second annual report of the Parliamentary Committee of Public Accounts of the Forty-sixth Parliament. The report covers the period 1 July 1990 to 30 June 1991. The report provides a summary of the committee's inquiries during the period pursuant to its review function under section 13 of the Public Accounts Committee Act. Additionally, the report outlines the committee's activities in response to unsolicited submissions received during the year. Nine such submissions were received, principally focusing on possible misuse of Government motor vehicles.

In line with the committee's commitment to accountability, the report includes a detailed list of committee travel and committee expenditure. The report also provides an invaluable reference list of all reports tabled in this House during the period. I wish to record in this House the hard-working commitment of my committee members; the research director, Dr Kevin Lambkin, and the seconded officer, Mr Jim Beh. I move that the report be printed.

Ordered to be printed.

PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEE OF PUBLIC WORKS
Annual Report

Mr McGRADY (Mount Isa) (10.28 a.m.): It is my pleasure to table before this Forty-sixth Parliament the annual report of the Parliamentary Committee of Public Works for the period 1 July 1990 to 30 June 1991. During the year, my committee presented to this Parliament two very significant reports. The first was the report on the redevelopment of the Bundaberg Hospital, and the second was a major report into Aboriginal housing in Queensland. Members of my committee travelled many thousands of kilometres throughout the State meeting with many hundreds of people to discuss this important issue. The recommendations, if accepted by this Government, I believe will result in a significant improvement in Aboriginal housing in the State of Queensland.

I wish to place on record my thanks and appreciation to all of my committee members. I publicly congratulate Mr Vince Lester on yesterday being appointed deputy chairman of this committee and place on record my sincere thanks to my research director, Ms Carol Keliher, who has done a magnificent job. I move that the report be now printed.

Ordered to be printed.

PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEE FOR ELECTORAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW
Submissions and Reports

Mr FOLEY (Yeronga) (10.33 a.m.): I lay upon the table of the House the six submissions received by the Parliamentary Committee for Electoral and Administrative Review in relation to its report on Judicial Review of Administrative Decisions and Actions, which was deemed presented to the Parliament and ordered to be printed on 14 June 1991; the 20 submissions received by the committee in relation to its report on Public Assembly Law in Queensland, which was deemed presented to the Parliament and ordered to be printed on 21 June 1991; and the 23 submissions received by the committee in relation to its report on the Local Authority Electoral System of Queensland--Remaining Matters, which was deemed presented to the Parliament and ordered to be printed on 25 June 1991. I also lay upon the table of the House the report of the Parliamentary Committee on Electoral and Administrative Review on the Office of the Parliamentary Counsel. This is the tenth report of the committee. I lay upon the table of the House the three submissions on this matter received by the committee.

I thank all members of the committee for their contribution on this matter: the Deputy Chairman, Mr Mark Stoneman; Ms Molly Robson; Dr Lesley Clark; Mr Tony FitzGerald; Mr Robert Quinn, and Mr Rob Welford. The committee records its thanks for the expert assistance rendered by Mrs Jan Warren of the secretarial staff. The committee records its grateful appreciation to its research director, Ms Janet Ransley, for her diligent and scholarly assistance to the committee. I move that the report be printed.

Ordered to be printed.

GENERAL BUSINESS--NOTICE OF MOTION NO. 2

Mr SPEAKER: Is Notice of Motion No. 2 formal or not formal?

Mr Mackenroth: Not formal.

Mr SPEAKER: Not formal.

Mr BEANLAND: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I cannot hear what the Minister called on Notice of Motion No. 2. It is very difficult to hear.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I called what the Minister called. When he calls "Not formal", I call "Not formal", too. Can the honourable member not hear me, either?

Mr BEANLAND: I can hear you, Mr Speaker, but I cannot hear the Minister.

Mr Mackenroth: Not formal.

QUESTIONS UPON NOTICE

1.

Noosa North Shore Development

Mr BEANLAND asked the Deputy Premier, Minister for Housing and Local Government--

"With reference to the serious allegations centring on the conduct or otherwise of the Noosa Shire Council--

Will he ascertain if (a) the chairman of the council attended a late afternoon meeting in October 1990 in Brisbane with a number of other parties including departmental officers to discuss the previous application for Leisureworld's North Shore Noosa Development, (b) who were the parties attending the meeting and (c) what agreement was reached at that meeting?"

Mr BURNS: Staff of my office and of my department have checked their records to determine if a meeting occurred in October 1990, which involved Councillor Playford, the Chairman of the Noosa Shire Council, at which discussions took place on the Noosa north shore development proposal. These records have failed to turn up any evidence that such a meeting did occur. I would also point out that my Director of Local Government is presently absent on leave. It may be that he attended a meeting in October 1990 at which Councillor Playford was present, but my inquiries at this stage reveal that it is unlikely that he did so.

I am sure the honourable member would appreciate, however, the Government's decision on the Leisuremark proposal was not made lightly and a great deal of effort went into making sure that the interests and views of all parties were adequately considered before a decision was made on the application. Naturally, therefore, many meetings on this issue occurred over a long period of time and different people were in attendance at different times.

2.

Gurulmundi Landfill Waste Disposal Site

Mr TURNER asked the Minister for Police and Emergency Services--

"With reference to the report tabled in Parliament on 16 July which indicates that the Miles district is almost certain to be the toxic waste dump site--

(1) Is he aware that (a) both the Health Minister, Mr McElligott and the Lord Mayor of Brisbane, Mr Jim Soorley have indicated the site will store radio active waste, (b) the Lord Mayor has written to concerned Miles residents stating that the Brisbane City Council has nothing to do with the site and (c) the Government Chem Unit has stated that the Brisbane City Council will be managing the site and engaging a supervisor to monitor it as well as having equal representation with the Murilla Shire and the State Government on the landfill management committee?

(2) What is the true situation relative to the Brisbane City Council's involvement and has the Government undertaken any consultations with the Murray Darling River Trust on this issue?

(3) Will he indicate what action he and the Chem Unit have taken to fully investigate the high temperature incinerator method before proceeding with the unpopular and contentious Miles landfill dump?"

Mr MACKENROTH: Firstly, the honourable member prefaced his question yesterday with a statement that the draft impact assessment study report of the proposal

for a secure landfill at Gurulmundi, which I tabled in the House on Tuesday, indicated that "the Miles district is almost certain to be the toxic waste dump site", which is presumptuous. While the report indicates the site is suitable for use as a secure landfill, no decision will be made by the Queensland Government until after the four-week public review period and not before the final report is presented by the consultants in September.

The answers to the honourable member's specific questions are as follows--

(1 to 3) Neither the Honourable the Minister for Health nor the Lord Mayor of Brisbane has stated that the Gurulmundi site would accept radioactive waste. I am advised that the correspondence sent to the offices of both the Honourable Minister and the Lord Mayor by the protest group in Miles was mistaken for letters by the group opposing the siting of a radioactive storage facility at either Esk or Beerburrum currently under consideration by the Department of Health. Let me once again state categorically for the House that the purpose of the secure landfill is for the safe disposal of treated hazardous wastes--paints, pesticides and solvents in solid form. No radioactive material--I repeat "no radioactive material" will be disposed of at this site if the proposal proceeds.

I am advised that the Lord Mayor of Brisbane wrote to the PATCH Group in Miles yesterday to clarify the interest of the Brisbane City Council with the Queensland Government's search for a secure landfill. I understand that the Lord Mayor has informed the group that the council has, for several years, raised with successive Queensland Governments the need for a disposal facility for such waste owing to the exhaustion of suitable space at the council's Willawong treatment and disposal facility. Furthermore, the Lord Mayor has stated that the CHEM Unit in my department has kept the Brisbane City Council closely informed of progress with the search for a secure landfill. The need for a secure landfill is regarded as urgent by the Brisbane City Council. For the honourable member's information--an officer from the Brisbane City Council is currently on secondment to the CHEM Unit and is assisting with the unit's work regarding the landfill issue.

As mentioned in the draft impact assessment study report, if the proposal for a secure landfill at Gurulmundi goes ahead, it is proposed to have a tripartite management committee to oversee the operation and management of the secure landfill. The management committee will comprise representatives from the Queensland Government, the local shire council and the Brisbane City Council. The management committee would meet as required and have access to all data relating to the monitoring and operation of the site. Considering the extensive scientific and technical resources available through the scientific services branch of the Brisbane City Council, the site would be operated on a day-to-day basis by the Brisbane City Council. The Queensland Government has not undertaken consultation with the Murray Darling River Trust on this issue, as it is not considered necessary. Any secure landfill operating at Gurulmundi would have no impact on these river systems.

The CHEM Unit has consulted with Government bodies responsible for investigating the high-temperature incinerator, including the New South Wales Waste Management Authority. The Queensland Government has been in contact with the New South Wales Waste Management Authority regarding the types of wastes suitable for high-temperature incineration. It should be emphasised that the priority wastes for incineration in Australia are some 94 000 tonnes of PCBs, HCBs, CFCs and OCPs. The aqueous solvent, pesticide and paint residue wastes are not priority wastes for incineration. High-temperature incineration is not an applicable technology for the disposal of those types of aqueous wastes. This fact is demonstrated by the efforts of three other Australian States currently identifying suitable secure landfill sites.

It should be noted also that the proposal for a national high-temperature incinerator is accompanied by a proposal for a secure landfill for the disposal of residues. Partial chemical fixation, solidification and micro-encapsulation are accepted treatment processes for these types of aqueous wastes, rendering them safe for burial in a secure landfill.

The Government has gathered research on hazardous waste management from a number of overseas countries, including the United States, where some 130 hazardous waste landfills are presently operating. The US Environmental Protection Agency is planning another 10 to 15 secure landfills to meet the need for safe land disposal for hazardous wastes. Currently, more than 70 million tonnes of hazardous wastes--32 per cent of the hazardous waste stream--are disposed of annually in secure landfills.

3.

Bureau of Emergency Services; Queensland Ambulance Transport Brigade

Mr SANTORO asked the Minister for Police and Emergency Services--

"With reference to the Queensland Government Gazette of 25 May in which there were listed 81 vacancies in the Bureau of Emergency Services.

(1) How many of these advertised positions are newly created?

(2) How many, if any, similar positions are being abolished in the various arms of the Bureau of Emergency Services?

(3) How much is the estimated total cost of setting up these 81 positions?

(4) What is the total budget for the bureau and the Corporate Services Division?

(5) Will this extra expenditure deprive the creation of jobs at a service level within the emergency services?

(6) Can we afford to have a top heavy bureaucracy running the emergency services rather than service people out in the community saving lives?

(7) What affect will the amalgamation of the QATB into the Bureau of Emergency Services have on the levels of remuneration and conditions which have hitherto been enjoyed by ambulance superintendents?

(8) How many members and chairmen of the old ambulance committees have agreed to renominate and serve on the new advisory committees and will he provide these details for each and all of the committees?"

Mr MACKENROTH: (1) All of the advertised positions are newly created. This does not represent an increase in the size of the Bureau of Emergency Services. The creation of these positions is the result of the amalgamation of corporate services positions which were previously located in the various divisions of the bureau--for example, the Queensland Fire Service, the Queensland Ambulance Service and the State Emergency Service.

(2) An equivalent number of positions have been abolished in the various divisions of the bureau.

(3) The cost of setting up the advertised positions is estimated to be \$45,000. This consists of the cost of advertising vacancies and the cost of assessing the classification level of positions. The costs were met from within existing budgets for 1990-91.

(4) The total budget for 1991-92 for the Bureau of Emergency Services and the Corporate Services Division will not be known until advice is received from Treasury. However, the cost of amalgamation of the corporate service function will be, at least, cost neutral.

(5 and 6) The amalgamation of corporate services, although cost neutral initially, will eventually result in savings which could be used to enhance services at the operational level. This will be possible due to the amalgamation of corporate services making it more efficient and cost effective than the previous fragmented approach to the provision of corporate services. An original goal of the amalgamation exercise was to achieve efficiencies which could be used to improve the delivery of emergency services, for example, more operational staff or equipment.

(7) The level of remuneration and conditions applying to ambulance superintendents is currently being assessed by Cullen Egan Dell. The results of this assessment are not yet known. I have given assurances that no existing ambulance personnel will be financially disadvantaged by the organisational changes.

(8) The number of chairmen of former QATB committees who have indicated that they wish to renominate and serve on the new local committees is 61; 21 having indicated that they will resign, with the remaining 14 having still to indicate their intention. The number of members of former QATB committees who have indicated that they wish to renominate and serve on the new local committees is 321; 75 having indicated that they will resign, with the remaining 165 having still to indicate their intention. I am confident that the majority of those who have not yet indicated will choose to join the ambulance committees.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

Senior Executive Service Salary Package

Mr COOPER: In directing a question to the Minister for Administrative Services, I refer him to his remarks on ABC radio yesterday evening wherein he stated that the salary of members of the Senior Executive Service had been reduced to reflect the cost of providing motor vehicles as part of their package, and a report in the *Courier-Mail* today on the same subject, which indicates the free fuel as an additional benefit, and I ask: does the Minister stand by his assertion that senior executive salaries have in fact been reduced to cater for costs of providing departmental vehicles? Is it not the fact that the free petrol is just another perk offered to allow many southern imports to the service to drive interstate on their holidays? In view of the fact that, from next Monday, Government social workers will be prevented from taking their vehicles home, thus impeding out-of-hours work, does this not reflect the misplaced priorities of the Government's so-called car fleet reforms?

Mr McLEAN: I thank the Opposition Leader for his question. Yesterday, when I read the press release, it was strange to note that, in typical National Party fashion, it never came from the leader or from the "Yes, I will. No, I won't. Yes, I will. No, I won't" pretender to the throne. It never came from any one of the other 16 shadow Ministers. The press release came from Mr Crooke. In typical National Party form, it refers to Mexicans across the border and how Queensland is being raided by monsters from overseas. It illustrates that the members of the National Party have not changed one inch. They are still confrontationalist. They are still not Australians. They want to build that wall between Queensland and the rest of Australia, which is typical of the attitude of the members of the National Party.

Mr Katter: Go to a State of Origin match, my friend.

Mr McLEAN: That is where it should stay--on the sporting fields. I will outline the facts relating to cars for public servants. Previously, as part of their package provided by the former National Party Government, public servants were given the use of motor vehicles at no cost.

Mr Harper: No petrol, either.

Mr McLEAN: Right. Now the situation is very clear. The salaries have not changed. The salaries are the same as those paid by the previous National Party Government, but out of that salary comes \$5,200 for the cost of a car. If members opposite multiply that figure by 280, they will find that it totals somewhere in the region of \$1.4m. The \$150 that is added to the salary of each public servant is a lot less than \$1.4m. Therefore, if one wants to go into the facts and figures, one finds that the Queensland taxpayer is benefiting to the tune of \$1.3m.

Mr Cooper: I don't think that has come out of their salary, actually.

Mr McLEAN: It has come out of their salary. It has been arranged. If one looks at the \$5,200 for a standard Falcon----

Mr Katter: You have legalised what you have put our people in gaol for.

Mr McLEAN: What absolute rubbish! The previous arrangements saw public servants paying for fuel usage when they went on annual leave. As honourable members can image, that was terribly hard to administer. How does one work out when a public servant goes on leave? Does he fill his tank on a Friday? When does he do it and where does he go? How many of the 280 public servants who are in that bracket use their car when they go on annual leave? It is probably half. How does one administer it? It was impossible to administer. Under this rule, the Queensland taxpayer is \$1.3m better off than under the rules laid down by the previous National Party Government.

Mr Katter interjected.

Mr McLEAN: The actual facts are that these negotiations took place over a period of time with senior public servants.

Mr Katter interjected.

Mr McLEAN: The deal that has been formulated between them and the Government is most certainly to the advantage of the Government.

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

Provision of Services to Rural Areas

Mr COOPER: In directing a question to the Treasurer, I refer to his announcement that the State Budget has come in with a \$13m surplus, which is well above the amount of \$800,000 previously estimated by him, and I ask: how can he sit there and expect Queenslanders to believe that this Government is increasing services in rural areas when some 26 courthouses have been closed, hundreds of rail freight centres have closed, 6 000 rail jobs have been threatened, DPI services have been curtailed by the loss of 240 jobs and TAFE services around the State have been decimated? How can he sit there and say that this Budget surplus is justified when in actual fact there happens to be a deficit of some \$16m?

Mr De LACY: I am pleased that the Leader of the Opposition has asked this question because I want to address some of these issues. I am very proud of the Budget outcome. The National Party's tory mates in New South Wales would not be able to announce a surplus at the end of their Budget. They will not be able to do it next year or the year after.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The Treasurer will resume his seat. I will stand here until honourable members are quiet. I would like to hear the answer.

Mr De LACY: Opposition members cannot have it both ways. In one breath, they are accusing us of being free spenders. When the Leader of the Opposition addressed that debacle called the National Party Conference in Cairns, I heard him say that the Government was spending too much money on services and that it would call an early election next year because it would be unable to balance its next Budget.

Mr Hobbs interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I warn the member for Warrego under Standing Order 123A.

Mr De LACY: I have news for the Leader of the Opposition; the Government will be able to balance its next Budget. In the next breath, the National Party then produced figures from the ABS showing a so-called blow-out in public service numbers in Queensland. In the next breath, the members of the National Party stand up and say that the Government is cutting public service numbers in Queensland and reducing services. They cannot have it both ways. I will set the record straight. I can give honourable members opposite a commitment--and I am the only Treasurer in Australia who can give such a commitment--that there will be no overall reduction in the number

of public servants in the next financial year. There has been no overall reduction in the number of public servants in the last financial year.

Mr Cooper interjected.

Mr De LACY: The Leader of the Opposition can just listen. He asked the question. I can give members opposite a further commitment that the proportion of public servants outside Brisbane and the south-east corner has increased in the last year and will increase next year.

It means that services to country and regional areas of Queensland are being enhanced and increased. No other State Treasurer can make such a claim. Members of the Opposition should travel to New South Wales and listen to the announcements being made by the New South Wales Government, which is making massive cuts in the numbers of public servants and massive cuts in services right across-the-board. That is not happening in Queensland. The whole story is a beat-up. The Goss Government is all about delivering services; it is not about administration. This Government is increasing service delivery to regional Queensland and to other areas throughout the whole of Queensland.

Mr Stephan: Name them.

Mr De LACY: What does the honourable member ask me to do--name them?

Mr Stephan: Name them.

Mr De LACY: I have a list of all the departments that either have opened offices or have expanded their operations throughout regional Queensland. The list is too long to read out. It covers a whole page.

Mr Stephan interjected.

Mr De LACY: For the benefit of honourable members opposite, I will table that list. However, let me say that if the Government is to enhance the delivery of services during these difficult economic times, it must always concentrate on the efficient delivery of services. Mr Speaker, I cannot give a guarantee that every public servant will be retained in every Queensland town, but I give the commitment that services will be retained. This Government is about servicing the population, not increasing the administrative population. This Government will do everything it can to increase services in Queensland, but it must take into account changing population patterns, improved technology, improved communication and changes in service needs. I do not care what members of the Opposition say. This Government has a commitment to enhancing services and to efficiency. The reason why this Government can balance its Budget and improve service delivery is that it has a commitment to efficiency. Why anybody in his right mind would criticise the Government or oppose that policy, I do not know.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I suggest that the Treasurer is starting to debate the issue. I ask him to sum up very quickly.

Mr W. K. Goss: If they ask 10 questions in one, they get 10 answers.

Mr De LACY: Exactly. Members of the Opposition rise in this Chamber and ask a whole range of questions, and I am answering each question that has been asked. In conclusion, let me say that this issue is a beat-up. The Goss Government is not about reducing services. Services to country areas of Queensland are being increased. This Government will continue to do that, and it is the only State Government in Australia that is doing so.

Tourism

Mr PREST: I ask the Minister for Tourism, Sport and Racing: can he inform the House of the performance of the tourism industry during the past year?

Mr GIBBS: The figures produced for the June quarter in relation to the tourism industry, in particular, show without any doubt the benefits of a Labor Government

being elected in this State. Tourism has far outstripped any performance measures that applied during the term of the previous Government, and the figures are an all-time record for Queensland. I have the latest figures that were released only this morning, and they show that, on a Statewide basis, tourism increased in the June quarter by 24 per cent. The details for tourist destinations throughout Queensland show that Cairns leads the way with an increase of 54 per cent in the number of visitors who passed through the airport, and that Brisbane recorded an increase in the same category of 25 per cent. The Sunlover packages sold by the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation have increased by 20 per cent on the figures recorded for last year, and bookings through State Government offices have increased by 37 per cent.

The interesting point about these figures is that until this Government came to office, very little had been done by the Queensland Government in terms of really getting off its backside and encouraging international airlines to come to this State. In a matter of weeks, Japan Airlines will be scheduling an additional five services per week to Queensland, which will occur as a result of representations made by this Government during its ongoing campaign and the excellent relationship between this Government and Japan Airlines. During the last couple of days, the Government has also engaged in negotiations with Northwest, which I personally hope will become the majority share-holder in Qantas when it goes onto the market in the near future. In addition, as a result of the negotiations and initiative of this Government and the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation, Garuda will be commencing direct services from Indonesia to Brisbane and Cairns in the near future. In a couple of months, the people of Queensland will begin to notice one of the biggest markets that this State has ever tapped into. Shortly, direct air services will operate from Taipei to Brisbane and will be provided by Eva Airlines, Austasia, which is a subsidiary of Qantas, and Mandarin Airlines.

This Government has been to the fore in its display of initiative in tourism. Approximately \$2m was made available by the Government to the tourism industry in the period immediately following the Gulf war, and this money was spent on the development of overseas markets, particularly in Japan, and on the development of the domestic marketplace in New South Wales, Victoria and Western Australia, which is equal in importance to the overseas market. I suggest that Queensland is now reaping the benefits of investment in those three States. I reiterate my belief that the increase in tourism is another hallmark of achievement for the Goss Labor Government and is another reason why the people of this State can rest very comfortably in the hands of a Labor Government that has picked up the reins and managed the affairs of this State, compared to the performance of a tired Opposition.

Economy

Mr PREST: I ask the Treasurer: what evidence is there to support his claim that Queensland is the best financially managed State in Australia?

Mr De LACY: I congratulate the honourable member on a perceptive question. During the last month, there has been mounting evidence that Queensland--

Mr FITZGERALD: I rise to a point of order. I understand the question asked for an opinion of the Treasurer.

Mr W. K. Goss: He said, "What evidence is there?"

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

Mr De LACY: The member will have to listen to the answer. During the last month or so, there has been mounting evidence--not least, yesterday's announcement of a \$12.9m accumulated surplus in the Budget--that Queensland is indeed pre-eminent when it comes to financial management. Some other evidence that has emerged over the last month may not have been brought to the attention of members, and it ought to be because I think that, as proud Queenslanders, they would appreciate it. About a month ago, the international rating agency, Standard and Poor's, did an updated

assessment of the credit-ratings of all the States in Australia. It confirmed Queensland's AAA rating, as it confirmed the AAA rating of New South Wales. All of the other States are rated somewhat lower. If we read the small print, we discover that the agency makes the point that there is a clear hierarchy of financial management performance amongst the States, with Queensland at the top and the other States occupying various positions underneath.

A second point was made by Access Economics, the reputable, Canberra-based economics unit, which did an assessment of the Budget positions of all the States. That was the first time after the New South Wales election that the people of that State found that they had indeed been conned for the last three years by their Liberal Party Premier. The assessment pointed to the structural deficit in New South Wales and the fact that the State would be looking at a Budget blow-out of something like \$900m, and an underlying Budget blow-out of something like \$2 billion. It confirmed that Queensland was the only State in Australia which could expect a balanced Budget this year and could expect to be in a surplus position--I am talking about the underlying or structural Budget position--next year and the year after.

The final confirmation of the emerging evidence that Queensland is the best managed State in Australia comes from the market itself, which is the hardest taskmaster of all. It now is a fact that Queensland can borrow more cheaply than any other State in Australia. The Queensland Treasury Corporation is the central borrowing authority for the Queensland Government. That is the corporation whose operations the Deputy Leader of the Opposition has so much trouble in understanding. Queensland Treasury Corporation stocks have traded through New South Wales T Corp across a whole range of maturities. That means that the financial markets in Australia have recognised in the best possible way that Queensland is the best-managed State.

By way of explanation, for the last 12 months or so, New South Wales T Corp has been considered to be the benchmark stock. Those opposite do not like it. I would think the member, as a proud Queenslander, would be happy with this information. New South Wales T Corp stock has been considered to be the benchmark stock. It was the first and the biggest.

Mr KATTER: I rise to a point of order. Each day a section of the time of the House is reserved for ministerial statements. This is a ministerial statement. It is insulting and offensive to the House for the Minister to take up the time of the House with an answer to a Dorothy Dixier which is in fact a ministerial statement.

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

Mr De LACY: The member for Flinders certainly has a short memory. Those of us who were in the last Parliament will remember him waffling on here for hour after hour. He was not saying anything worth while. I am saying something which is important to the people of Queensland. I conclude by saying that the financial markets, the hardest taskmasters of all, have given a vote of confidence to the financial management of Queensland.

Government Advertising Contract

Mr BEANLAND: I ask the Premier: will he table, before the end of the day, all documentation surrounding the awarding of a \$400,000 Government advertising contract to the ALP's advertising agency, McDonald and Maloney?

Mr W. K. GOSS: Yesterday, I provided all relevant information on this matter. I do not intend to provide any further information. However, if the member for Toowong has a specific question, I would be happy to answer it.

Private Use of Government Vehicles by Senior Public Servants

Mr BEANLAND: My second question to the Premier is again very specific. I refer to the Government's decision to make taxpayers fund the holiday fuel bills of senior public servants. I ask: can he inform this House why the ALP now believes it is all

right to use taxpayers' funds for holidays despite the fact that former Ministers of the Crown have been gaoled for the same practice?

Mr W. K. GOSS: Mr situation----

Opposition members: Ha, ha!

Mr W. K. GOSS: If members opposite laugh at that, it shows how desperate they are for a good laugh. The situation with this newspaper article--or, should I say, National Party press release--has been well answered by the Minister for Administrative Services, but I think it is appropriate to ram home a couple of points that expose the hypocrisy of the National Party and the Liberal Party when it comes to this issue. The previous situation, which was not reported by the journalist, was that, under the National Party and under the National and Liberal Parties when they were in coalition on this side of the House, the cars that were provided to senior public servants were just thrown in on top of a salary package; there was no costing and no accounting to the taxpayer. The difference now in this regard is that this Government is up front. Packages are fully accounted for, fully disclosed and, to demonstrate our commitment to accountability, published.

The second point to be made in relation to the hypocrisy of members opposite which is beyond the issue of accountability is this: they talk about this benefit being provided to public servants. The truth is that under the previous Government the senior public servants had full private use of motor vehicles--not accounted for and not costed. That is the hypocrisy that is not admitted to by the Leader of the Opposition in his question and not admitted to by the Leader of the Liberal Party in his question.

What this Government has done is make public servants accountable and make the system more fair. This Government has counted the cost. It has not just counted the cost of the car; in terms of the salary package, there is a determination of the full cost of the motor vehicle, including fuel, maintenance and repairs, registration and insurance. The public servant is required to pay 50 per cent of all of those costs. That is the true position. It is the leanest and least generous package offered by any Australian State. Why do not members opposite stand up and talk about the comparison between Queensland and New South Wales? The New South Wales Liberal Government provides a much more generous package to its public servants than does this Government. In addition to Queensland public servants having to pay 50 per cent of all those costs, including fuel, they have to pay an estimate of the fringe benefits tax. They have to pay 100 per cent of that.

Mr KATTER: Mr Speaker, the question that has been asked----

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Is the honourable member rising to a point of order?

Mr KATTER: Yes, I am rising to a point of order.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! What is the honourable member's point of order?

Mr KATTER: My point of order is that the question that has been asked is: why are our people being put in gaol for the same things that are now being legalised by this Government?

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

Mr Katter interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I am on my feet. Standing Orders preclude the honourable member's commenting while I am on my feet. I suggest that the member for Flinders has had his go. A question has been asked of the Premier, and he is entitled to answer it.

Mr W. K. GOSS: Under the Liberal Party, public servants had full private use of motor vehicles. There was no accounting, no publication, no information available to

the public. Under this Government, there is a full accounting, and the senior executives are required to pay 50 per cent of all costs, including fuel, and 100 per cent of the fringe benefits tax. I will cite an example. Under the previous Government, when senior public servants had full private use of motor vehicles, there was no accounting, no refund to the public. A senior public servant could drive to the coast or to Rockhampton for the weekend for free. This Government has made public servants accountable. There is now not only accountability to the public but also a better deal for the public.

Criminal Justice Commission Report on Allegations by Member for Nerang Regarding Female Prisoners

Mr PALASZCZUK: I refer the Minister for Justice and Corrective Services to an article which appeared in the *Gold Coast Bulletin* on 30 December last year--I just happen to have a copy of it--which is headed "Prisoners work as prostitutes". In this article Mr Connor claims that women prisoners at Boggo Road were being given leave to work as prostitutes and were using their weekend freedom to smuggle drugs into the prison. Will the Minister inform the House of the results of the findings of the Criminal Justice Commission in respect of these allegations?

Mr MILLINER: I thank the honourable member for Archerfield for the question because today honourable members have seen tabled in the House the most damning report ever produced regarding a member of this Parliament. The member for Nerang had made very serious allegations about people. He has attempted to bring people down. He has smeared the names of good people in this State. The Criminal Justice Commission thoroughly investigated the allegations made by the member for Nerang. He made various claims about prostitution in the prison system. I am very pleased to report that this morning the Criminal Justice Commission has rejected out of hand the claims of the member for Nerang. The member for Nerang stands condemned in this House for the action that he has taken. The way in which he has moved around this State making all sorts of claims and allegations is despicable. The report states quite clearly that there is no evidence to support his claims. The member for Nerang stands condemned.

Criminal Justice Commission Report on Allegations by Member for Nerang Regarding Female Prisoners

Mr PALASZCZUK: I direct a further question to the Minister for Justice and Corrective Services. I remind the House of a videotape tabled last year by the member for Nerang which he claimed showed a drug deal involving inmates of a Brisbane correctional institution. I ask: will the Minister detail the response of the Criminal Justice Commission to Mr Connor's claims?

Mr MILLINER: I thank the honourable member for Archerfield for the question. I would be only too delighted to acquaint the House with the findings of the Criminal Justice Commission regarding those allegations. Last year, the member for Nerang tabled in this House a videotape claiming that drug-running was going on in Brisbane prison. It is very clear from the evidence presented to the Criminal Justice Commission that that claim is totally untrue. The report by the Criminal Justice Commission states--

"Assuming that Connor was acting upon information given to him, and there is no reason to suggest that he was not, he had been fed information which was clearly wrong and inconsistent with the documentary evidence that was available to his sources."

Mr Hamill: He didn't do his homework.

Mr MILLINER: That is right. The member for Nerang did not do his homework. These allegations have been forwarded to me and to the member for Tablelands. The allegations have been checked out and nothing has come up. The member for Nerang chose to seek a very cheap political headline as a result of them. One only needs to read what the report says about the member for Nerang to see the way in which he has

been duped by these people in the Corrective Services Commission who want to bring the system down. He has been fed information by certain prison officers. The report states--

"He, no doubt, saw Ray Connor as a means to obtain publicity and it seems that Connor was used by O'Connor to publish in Parliament and the press the allegations as if they represented the true facts."

The report goes on to say--

"It must be said that Connor showed no circumspection in what material he caused to be published in the press."

That is a most damning indictment of any member of Parliament. The member for Nerang should resign in disgrace. If he will not do that, the member for Toowong should do the honourable thing and sack him.

Treasury Tender C118

Mr BORBIDGE: In directing a question to the Minister for Administrative Services in his capacity as Minister in charge of State Stores and Minister in charge of the Government's purchasing policy, I refer to Treasury tender C118, dial-up monitoring system--Machine Gaming Division, the security system for the operation of poker machines in Queensland, and I ask: why did his Government accept a non-conforming tender? Why was this tender called over the Christmas holidays? Why were tender prices not called when tender documents were opened? Why was the 20 per cent preference not applied to Australian firms in accordance with normal practice?

Mr McLEAN: I realise that the Deputy Leader thinks that I have a quite superior mental capacity, but I am sure that I cannot give those sorts of figures off the top of my head. If Mr Borbidge would like to put a question on notice, I will get back to him. At the moment, I would not have a clue about those figures. As he knows, we have thousands of tenders going through.

Mr BORBIDGE: I place the question on notice.

Dial-up Monitoring System for Poker Machines

Mr BORBIDGE: In directing a question to the Treasurer, I refer to the Government's acceptance of the IGT bid for the dial-up monitoring system for poker machines, and I ask: why did the Treasurer reject continuous or real-time monitoring in favour of an ad hoc monitoring system that does not conform with the Australian Banking Association standards as required in the tender documents approved by the Treasury Department? Has the Government been indemnified in the event of major security problems or new technology that renders the IGT security system obsolete? Is the Treasurer aware of Federal Police investigations into IGT?

Mr De LACY: If the honourable member wants an answer to all of the parts that question, he should put it on notice. The reason we selected a dial-up monitoring machine was cost.

Mr Borbidge: Bob Gibbs said cost would not be an obstacle.

Mr De LACY: The honourable member has asked his question. The point needs to be made that we do have a proper tendering process. The honourable member's problem is that he is trying to judge us by his own standards. If he puts the question on notice, I will give him a comprehensive answer.

Mr SPEAKER: I suggest that the question be placed on notice.

Fraser Island Report

Mr DOLLIN: In directing a question to the Minister for Environment and Heritage, I refer to the Fraser Island report's recommendation that Fraser Island, the Cooloola region and surrounds and the Great Sandy Region park be inscribed on the World Heritage List.

Mr Coomber interjected.

Mr DOLLIN: While recognising that the management plan and strategies for the regional park recommended in the report are yet to be put in place, can the Minister alleviate some local community concerns about the future of the region and advise the House what will be the general nature of the regional park and what types of activities will be permitted in the area?

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable member for Currumbin under Standing Order 123A for interjecting. I will not allow interjections while questions are being asked. The number of interjections during questions today has been ludicrous. Certainly it is part of the parry and thrust of Parliament to interject while an answer is being given, but the Minister should be entitled, as I should be entitled, to hear the question. I have to rule on how it may be answered. From now on, I will be extremely harsh on members interjecting while questions are being asked.

Mr COMBEN: I will answer what I understand the question to be. I thank the honourable member for his question. He has understandably taken a keen interest in this matter since the release of the Fraser Island report. In particular, he has been doing an excellent job of representing the views of the people of Maryborough and keeping the Government informed of residents' concerns and needs. The report recommends that the area be declared as the Great Sandy regional park.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr COMBEN: I have had enough time to make some notes. Further, the report recommends that the administration of the park and the associated legislation be under the control of myself and my department. I know that does not sit comfortably with some in the Maryborough and Hervey Bay community, or with some members opposite, but let me take this opportunity to reassure those who have some concerns. Firstly, while the report does recommend the preservation of the area to the greatest possible extent, it clearly acknowledges that a range of activities will be permitted within the regional park. The report does not recommend that the entire area be locked up and closed off from the community. On the contrary, the regional park will be managed to ensure that its natural values are protected for future generations, and human activities will be not only permitted but also properly implemented and managed.

Put simply, as is the case with the Great Barrier Reef marine park, the Great Sandy regional park will be a multi-use park. Tourism will continue and will be promoted; so, too, will recreational activities. Development in and around the region will continue to be encouraged. Both recreational and commercial fishing will also continue to play a vital role in the area.

Mr Elliott interjected.

Mr COMBEN: The fear and smear campaign, claiming that my department will lock this area away from local residents and human activity, is nothing more than a cruel and deliberate lie from those in the Opposition who interject. Furthermore, I can give this commitment to the people of Maryborough, Hervey Bay and surrounds who may be concerned: this Government will continue to work closely with the local community on these issues. In particular, the Government will closely liaise with the local community in the development of the special legislation, the management plan and the associated management strategies recommended in the report.

Fraser Island Report

Mr DOLLIN: In directing a question to the Minister for Family Services and Aboriginal and Islander Affairs, I refer to the Fraser Island report's recommendations in relation to Aboriginal interests on Fraser Island and in the Great Sandy Region, and I ask: is the Minister aware of some concern in the local Maryborough and Hervey Bay communities about these recommendations? Can she advise the House how these recommendations will operate in practice? In particular, how do these recommendations sit with the recently passed Aboriginal Land Act?

Ms WARNER: I thank the honourable member for his question and for giving me the opportunity to clear up some misunderstandings and, frankly, some racist sentiments which have been expressed, fanning illegitimate fears about the so-called Aboriginal take-over of Fraser Island. The Fitzgerald report quite rightly suggested that the legitimate interests of Aboriginal people on Fraser Island should be taken into account in the island's future management. The comments and recommendations of the Fitzgerald inquiry are also quite consistent with the Aboriginal Land Act that passed through this House in the last sitting. To clear up some of the misconceptions that exist, I point out that, under the Aboriginal Land Act, the only claims that will be possible by Aboriginal people will be those over vacant Crown land and national parks.

Mr FitzGerald: You've sold them out, haven't you? You promised them more and sold them out.

Ms WARNER: I invite the honourable member opposite to suggest what other tenure should be put into the claims process. I suggest to him that in no other jurisdiction is other than vacant Crown land and national parks available for claim.

Mr FitzGerald interjected.

Ms WARNER: I wish the honourable member would make up his mind which side he is on. He clearly has a touch of schizophrenia when trying to make a political point.

To return to the very serious issue of the fears that have been generated in the Maryborough area about the comprehensiveness of possible Aboriginal land claims--under the Aboriginal Land Act, they are confined. I wish people would read that legislation and understand what it means. It means that claims can take place over national parks and over vacant Crown land but only when they are gazetted for claim by the Government, and at this stage that has not happened. I assure Aboriginal people that their legitimate interests, which for the first time have been recognised by this Government and by the Fitzgerald inquiry, in the future management of Fraser Island will be taken into account, as will the claims of other interest groups which have legitimate interests. Clearly, Aboriginal people have a big stake and a big interest in maintaining the beauty and future benefit of that island not only for themselves but for the world as a whole.

Distribution of Administrative Cheques to Schools

Mr SLACK: In directing a question to the Minister for Education, I refer to the politicisation of schools funding via the distribution of administrative cheques to schools in Labor electorates by Labor politicians with political letters prepared by the Education Department, and I ask: will he acknowledge this politicisation has created an administrative nightmare by the late arrival of cheques and that the solution dreamed up in the Minister's office is to send cheques to members earlier? Will he assure the House that he will put a stop to this practice and censure the person in his office responsible for this unworkable political approach to school-funding?

Mr BRADDY: I thank the honourable member for the question. In relation to Government funding, it is applicable for the department to know when it is relevant

for a community to know not only when a cheque arrives but also how much money is involved.

Mr Elliott: So we can expect to get the cheques in our offices next week?

Mr BRADDY: I will come to that. I will deal with the honourable member in a minute. A decision has to be made. Is it in the interests of the community to know? The cheques that are being spoken about were substantially made up of school grants. As honourable members will know, we have delivered on our promise to increase substantially the amount of money which would go to school grants. We increased by \$7m the amount of money that was given to schools by the National Party when it was in Government. We have been saying to the school principals and to the schools that the school communities must not only know how much money is going to them but they must also be involved in the budgeting and the decision process. When we adopted the policy of sending our cheques straight to the principals, I found that some of the principals were not telling their school communities that the cheques had arrived and they were not telling them how much money was involved. As Minister for Education, I have been in a meeting----

Mr Littleproud: They only go to Labor electorates, though.

Mr BRADDY: Why don't you listen to the answer? Mr Speaker, do they want to hear the answer or not?

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

Mr BRADDY: I have been in a public meeting at which the president of a p. and c. association stood up and said, "I don't believe you have increased the money for school grants because my principal tells me that you haven't increased them by more than one half of 1 per cent." Of course, the truth is that most of the cheques that have gone through are an increase of 100 per cent on what was being given by the National Party when it was in Government. We are saying to the people, "You must be involved." By doing it this way, we are saying----

Mr FitzGerald: Why Labor electorates only?

Mr BRADDY: I will come to that in a minute, if the honourable member will be quiet. We are sending the message out to the people. For example----

Mrs SHELDON: I rise to a point of order. As I understand it, the question asked of the Minister was: why were letters and cheques given only to Labor members to present to their schools? Why were they not given to Liberal and National Party members? The Minister has not answered the question.

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

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The Minister has said four times, to my hearing, that he is going to get around to answering that. I suggest that he is going to, but it is his prerogative how he answers a question. I suggest----

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Question-time is being wasted again. I am not going to allow question-time to become a shambles. I would like the Minister to be heard. I would like to hear the answer. If members are quite ready now to be quiet, I will call the Minister again.

Mr BRADDY: These cheques go to all schools. The situation clearly is that some principals and some school communities are not working closely together.

Mr Stoneman interjected.

Mr BRADY: I will come to that in a minute. Just wait for it. For example, in the electorate of the member for Burdekin, a phone call was made when the cheques went out, and press releases were associated with it, to get the message through that the school communities are supposed to be in there working. The honourable member rang the office of the Minister for Health and asked, "Is it correct that school p. and c. cheques go out, and is it correct that we are supposed to be involved in the process?" That was the first he knew about it.

An Opposition member interjected.

Mr BRADY: He decided that he probably could not get the answer from the honourable member who just interjected so he rang somebody whom he knew could give him the answer. We are having a trial, which is working because people know about it, to bring this home to the whole community. People know how much money is being spent. We are delivering Government money through Government members, the policy that the National Party adopted when in Government. For the benefit of members, I table a photo and an article----

Mr Veivers interjected.

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

Mr BRADY: I table a photo and an article from the *Innisfail Advocate* of 1 August 1989. The photo shows Mr Max Menzel, the then local member, presenting a cheque for educational purposes to TAFE college representatives. I also table a photograph and an article from the *Tablelander* of 18 July 1989. The photograph shows Mr Tom Gilmore, the member for Tablelands, presenting a cheque to the Tableland Women's Centre. The article says--

"The program is a Queensland Government funded effort and is administered by the Department of Family Services."

It goes on to explain why. On behalf of his Government, he wanted to involve his community in the spending of the money. We are doing the same. We are involving school communities, which raise money in schools, in the budgeting and spending of the money. This is being done by Government members. This is a trial. We will make a decision in future as to whether----

Ms SHELDON: I rise to a point of order. The Minister still has not answered the question, which asked why non-Government members were not given the same letter.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! There is no point of order. I will name the honourable member for Landsborough the next time she does that. She has already taken the same point of order. I answered her last point of order. She then took the same point of order. I warn her under Standing Order 124.

Mr BRADY: The point is this: this is Government money, not parliamentary money.

Mr HARPER: I rise to a point of order. For the second time, the Minister has misled the House by claiming that this is Government money. It is taxpayers' money, and he should refer to it as taxpayers' money.

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

Mr BRADY: This is Government money designed to be spent by school communities, and they must be aware----

Opposition members: It is not Government money.

Mr BRADY: Members opposite are not members of the Government. They never gave us cheques to hand out to anyone when they were in Government. If they do not know that they are in Opposition, it is about time they found out.

Mr HARPER: I rise to a point of order. The Minister should have regard----

Mr SPEAKER: Order! What is the point of order?

Mr HARPER: The point of order----

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I warn the member for Auburn that the point of order has to be a legitimate one. He is entitled to take a point of order at any time. If he is about to make a political argument, I warn him also under Standing Order 124.

Mr HARPER: I am taking a point of order. The Minister has been referring to all members on the Opposition benches as Government members. EARC clearly defines Government party members and Government members.

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

Education

Mr SLACK: Following the answer to that question, I direct a further question to the Minister for Education. Does he approve of his private secretary ringing a principal and chastising that principal for bringing a complaint to his member of Parliament?

Mr BRADY: I have no information or evidence that that allegation is correct. If the honourable member wishes to make a specific allegation about a specific person, I will investigate it. But I will not go on some unnamed and back-stabbing rumour.

Commissions Charged by Farm Produce Commercial Sellers

Mr HAYWARD: Is the Minister for Primary Industries aware of concerns expressed by fruit-growers and vegetable-growers over a proposed increase of 1.5 per cent in commissions sought by licensed farm produce commercial sellers at the Rocklea Markets? If so, what course of action does he propose to resolve the claim, and grower opposition to that claim?

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

ART UNIONS AND AMUSEMENTS AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from 29 May (see p. 8136, First Session).

Mr STONEMAN (Burdekin) (11.35 a.m.): On behalf of the Opposition, I rise to speak to the Art Unions and Amusements Amendment Bill. At the outset, I make the point that the Opposition will not be opposing this Bill. In fact, we support it. I have made that point clear in conversations with the Treasurer. I make the further point that the Bill underscores the fact that some time ago the National Party commenced this study and the processes that led to this increase. In 1989, the National Party Government's Green Paper on the conduct of art unions and other matters pertaining to art unions and amusements was circulated. I agree with the Treasurer that the Act commenced in 1976 and that there have not been any substantial changes to it since that time. The Act prescribed limits in respect of certain minor art unions. It is entirely appropriate that those minor art union limits be increased in line with the proposals set out in the Bill.

I also make the point that the Bill certainly underscores certain future developments in Queensland's gambling laws and is a reflection of the times. I make the particular point that those sectors of the community such as service clubs and organisations which have played such a tremendous part in support of the community have increasingly come under strain and stress as a result of the increased calls on them not only for general services but also for financial contributions to a wide range of vital and necessary community support groups.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Campbell): Order! There are too many audible conversations taking place. The member speaking cannot be heard.

Mr STONEMAN: It is certainly a reflection of the times. Throughout both my electorate and, I am sure, electorates of members on both sides of the House, representations have been made for the increases contained in this Bill to reflect the times not only in terms of the change of the financial values that was originally reflected in 1976 but also in terms of the stresses on the community. There is no doubt that the community is coming under increasing physical and financial stress. Often, when I speak to service clubs, I make the point that the demands that are being placed on community organisations--those community support structures which are always expected to be able to deliver--are increasing to such a degree that crunch day will come sooner or later.

The fact is that organisations such as Lions, Rotary, Apex and all the groups that play such a magnificent and significant role in modern-day society are not only experiencing increasing strains upon their services and demands upon their capacities but also, in many cases, facing the dilemma of diminishing numbers because the original charter of the service organisations is being overcome and swamped by the demands that society is putting on them. The average age of Lions club members has increased dramatically. The numbers of people in some of those service clubs---

Mr Beattie: Have you joined?

Mr STONEMAN: I take the interjection. I am proud to support Lions clubs throughout Australia. They do a magnificent job, particularly in my electorate where I have a wonderful relationship with them. I am proud to be an honorary member of Rotary, but that does not necessarily mean that I have adjudged Rotary to be a more significant club. It was just a quirk of fate that I joined the Rotary Club instead of a Lions club or any other club. I am sure that the member for Brisbane Central would agree with me and endorse the fact that Lions, Rotary, Apex, ESA and all the service organisations play a magnificent part in the community. However, the part that they play is increasingly being taken for granted by the community in that, when there is a deficiency in the provision of financial support from Governments and other organisations, people say, "Let us then turn to the service organisations." An increasing amount of pressure is being put on those organisations.

On a number of occasions when I have spoken to service organisations both in my electorate and in other electorates, I have made the point that they have to be very careful not to adopt what I would call a scatter-gun approach to the way in which they pick up the problems of the community, because that further exacerbates the situation wherein the community has an expectation that the service clubs are able to help, will be able to help and will continue to be able to help, in the future. However, that is not the case. Because of the physical membership structure and the competition in the community for the finite number of dollars available, those organisations have a decreasing capacity to help. That leads me to observe that the increases anticipated as a result of this legislation are timely.

The move to introduce poker machines will absorb a greater amount of the funds that currently go into minor art unions and the funding activities of service organisations and non-profit organisations generally. The same community dollar will be channelled into a different area. The problem is that a greater percentage of the profit from poker machine operations will be directed towards the Government--regardless of the colour of the Government of the day. There will be a shift away in the amount of money that stays in the community via the processes of those fund-raising activities. The recession has certainly reduced the income for those non-profit and service organisations, and it has made it more difficult for them to raise money for charitable and community work, so they are having to rely more and more on art unions. Unfortunately, in the first instance there will be a domino effect, but the community will see a gap in the availability of funds to service those facilities.

In my electorate--and I am sure that the same occurs throughout the rest of the State--a tremendous amount of work is done by those organisations, both individually and collectively, which supports the community and which would not otherwise be able to be funded by the processes of Government, no matter how clever or benevolent the Government was. In the end, the community is in the best place to assess the needs, for example, for old people's homes, the Blue Nursing Service and all of those types of facilities. The local community should be given every opportunity to appropriately raise funds, to appropriately distribute those funds and then to appropriately continue to support the organisations that manage the operations as a result of that fund-raising activity.

I guess that the Bill is really about getting in first, before the impact of the poker machines. The operation of poker machines will result, effectively, in less money being available in the community to support the minor art union area. One has only to consider the effect that that could well have. On 20 November 1990, in the *Gold Coast Bulletin*, an article headed "Salvos Hit by Funds Crisis" stated--

"A funding crisis has forced the Salvation Army to shut its Southport welfare office which hands out 50 emergency food vouchers daily."

The article continued--

"Vouchers have been reduced from \$20 to \$15 for a single person. A married couple receives \$30.

Food vouchers cost the church between \$800 and \$1000 a day."

The additional cost of living has compounded that problem. In that instance, the Salvation Army and the people who are serviced by it will be even worse off.

In June last year, an article titled "Homeless youth an 'epidemic crisis' " stated--

"One in five teenagers in a band of Brisbane southside suburbs regularly wag school, break into houses and go on drinking binges.

Youth workers from the Logan West Community Centre, the largest in Queensland, said the crisis was reaching epidemic proportions."

This is an example of the way in which the community is increasingly being put under threat because of the economic crisis that has been created as a result of the recession we had to have and the management of those terrors, those opponents of genuine development in this nation, who reside in Canberra. Everyone remembers Mr Hawke's statement that no child would live in poverty. A further article titled "The young and the desperate" stated--

"The demand for emergency accommodation has risen by as much as 50 per cent in some States--with most of the increase attributed to youths.

Emergency relief centres have reported an unprecedented increase in demand for beds and meals in the past two months, traditionally their quietest period."

Such people are increasingly turning towards support organisations in the community for assistance. These organisations are not only being strained, but also are being put in a position where inevitably the pressures will become so great that they will be unable to continue to wave the flag, even in nominal terms. A further article in the *Australian* headed "Welfare groups win \$2m relief for needy" illustrates that there is a recognition that these groups cannot keep up. The only way in which community organisations can keep up is to have their processes facilitated in order to draw money from the local communities, which is being done under this Bill. However, when poker machines are introduced, the result will be a net loss in terms of the funds available in every community to support themselves and those organisations.

In a recent article in the *Courier-Mail* dated Wednesday, 19 June, Archbishop Hollingworth warned of a recession crisis. The article stated--

"A violent under-class without jobs and social skills could emerge from the recession, the Anglican Archbishop of Brisbane said yesterday.

The Most Rev Peter Hollingworth said there was a danger this 'disenfranchised and unemployable' group would become withdrawn and prone to violence, mental breakdowns and suicide."

An increasing number of young people in my electorate are breaking into farmhouses and other houses whose occupants are unable to be at home during the day because of work commitments. They are virtually mobile pirates. A couple of days ago a neighbour of mine heard a loud noise in his canefield. He could not understand what it was. When he finally went to investigate and found his way into the cane, he discovered that his son's 10 or 12-foot tinny that he used down on the creek had been squirreled away during the night and left in the canefield. The boys were coming back the next day to pick it up. These are the sorts of things that happen and increasingly put pressure on the community. If those young people are caught, they must not just be chastised but charged and put in correctional institutions. The whole matter snowballs.

It is vital that we get to the nub of the matter and facilitate the funding process so that the funds go right back into community organisations. They are the ones that can identify the local issues and priority needs and make appropriate funding adjustments. Again, I make the point that this will become increasingly difficult for them. I compliment the Treasurer, because the changes in the Bill are the least the Government can do to help these associations that support the community. Under normal circumstances, I would have referred to some of the cut-backs in rural services that exacerbate the problems in the rural communities, which in turn puts more pressure on the small towns in which Jaycees, Lions and other organisations operate. However, I think it is more appropriate that that matter be left for the debate on the Appropriation Bill later on. Nevertheless, the situation becomes even worse in the small towns because they are serviced by volunteers who do not have an organisational structure to back them. The towns or villages that they live in are not big enough to support formal organisational structures and their jobs are structured in such a way that they are often unable to attend meetings.

However, I do make one point concerning the rural crisis which is extremely important. Many Government employees in courthouses, schoolteachers, police officers, DPI officers and the like bring their expertise or knowledge with them into small communities. They could well found a Lions, Apex or Rotary club in those communities. They show the people in those communities the way to proceed. It is important to understand--and I am sure that many members in this House do understand--that the backbone of many of those organisations are the itinerant or roving public servants who come into the town as part of their jobs. They live there for two, three, four or five years, set up the structures and stimulate the local community. If that community is not then able to continue on its own, it is supplemented by the new public servant who comes into the town. The banks supply a large number of officers who are Lions, Jaycees and the like. As the business in those small towns and communities contracts, then the banks contract also. They become minor branch offices and in many cases close down either because of amalgamation or through lack of business. It is most important that this be recognised in the context of this Bill.

Finally, under no circumstances should this Bill not be supported. I make the very valid point--and I am sure that other speakers will support me in this--that the problem we are now confronting relates to poker machines. The minor art union structure will be put under further and quite incredible pressure because of the advent of poker machines into Queensland. This Bill needs to be supported so that the money available under the art union ceilings can be increased.

I reiterate that the Opposition supports this Bill and the principles underlying it. When the National Party formed the Government, it began the Green Paper process leading to the changes contained in the Bill, which are so necessary. I commend all the organisations that play such a major and significant part in supporting those people in the community who are, perhaps, less well off than most, not only in financial terms but also physically. If it were not for the support of these organisations, those people

would have to leave the towns where their loved ones, family and friends reside to obtain assistance elsewhere. All those factors combine to make the art unions structure and the support it provides in the community a vital component of contemporary society.

Mr BEATTIE (Brisbane Central) (11.54 a.m.): This morning, I will speak briefly in support of the Bill. Firstly, I congratulate the Honourable Treasurer for introducing this legislation. As many members of this Parliament would know, in spite of the fact that a great need has existed for changes to be made, no changes have been made to the Act since its introduction in 1976. Although I did not ever expect to find myself in the position of agreeing with the Opposition member who preceded me in this debate, I must say that the comments he made on service clubs, particularly Lions and Rotary, are dead right. A number of community service organisations have approached me because of their concern about the monetary upper limit for gross proceeds of minor art unions. Because this Bill increases the upper limit of gross proceeds for minor art unions from \$500 to \$5,000, all those organisations will be delighted with the introduction of this legislation. When honourable members consider the increases in inflation rates and events that have occurred since 1976, I am sure they will recognise that this legislation is long overdue. However, it does not address the issue of bingo and lucky envelopes.

My second reason for wishing to speak during this debate is not only because of my wish to support the claims made by Lions and Rotary, but also because of my particular interest in the effect of the introduction of poker machines, to which the Opposition spokesman referred earlier. It is timely to increase the upper limit of gross proceeds for minor art unions because, during the early stages of the introduction of poker machines, the ability of non-profit organisations to raise funds could be affected. My view is that, because there are two different fund-raising bases, in the long term the impact will not be significant. The Lions, Rotary and social clubs attract a traditional support base because of the nature of their organisations, whereas poker machines attract people because of the recreational activity they offer and because of their more "sporting" nature. I do not believe that community service clubs need to be as concerned as some of them are, but it is nevertheless appropriate that the upper limits of gross proceeds for minor art unions be increased from \$500 to \$5,000 so that those organisations are in a position to compete effectively.

I totally agree with the comments of the previous speaker on the value of non-profit organisations because they do an excellent job in the community. It is important that they be given the opportunity to raise significant amounts of money. The limit of \$500 was chickenfeed and totally inadequate. Until the limit of \$5,000 was set, those organisations were not in a position to properly compete for support. It should also be said that not only is the Act overdue for review but also that a number of its provisions are archaic. Although no-one condones illegal raffles and art unions, they have been unavoidable because the Act has not reflected changes in society and in community standards. I am hopeful that when the second stage of the legislation is brought forward, the Government will examine some of the broader aspects of community standards so that the legislation reflects those standards. I congratulate the Honourable Treasurer on the remarks he made in his second-reading speech when he stated--

"This Bill is the first stage of a major overhaul of the Art Unions and Amusements Act."

This Bill will provide many non-profit organisations with the ability to derive increased gross proceeds from art unions because they will have to pay less in permit fees and the costs of special audits. Those measures will be welcomed by non-profit organisations. The Green Paper on the conduct of art unions that was circulated in 1989 stimulated discussion on the upper limit for minor art unions and the administrative burden imposed through the regulations applying to voluntary associations. I must say that I am a strong supporter of reducing the administrative burden borne by non-profit organisations, in particular, and of simplifying the regulations as much as possible. Those

measures make good sense from the Government's point of view and also from an organisational point of view. I conclude my remarks by stating that the community groups that have slaved for decades will be delighted to at last have the opportunity to run art unions in a way that will attract the support they so desperately need to carry out their community work.

Dr WATSON (Moggill--Deputy Leader of the Liberal Party) (11.59 a.m.): I rise to indicate the support of the Liberal Party for the Bill. In common with other members of this Parliament, members of the Liberal Party recognise the importance of voluntary organisations in society and that most of the worthwhile activity in our society is conducted by individuals and private organisations. We are particularly concerned that private, voluntary organisations--which are probably the most compassionate organisations in the community--maintain a healthy financial state to enable them to carry out their activities.

Mr Beattie: Hear, hear!

Dr WATSON: Part of the problem, of course, which the honourable member for South Brisbane----

Mr Beattie: Brisbane Central.

Dr WATSON: Brisbane Central. It is difficult to distinguish between the members for South Brisbane and Brisbane Central as their philosophy is so similar. The issue of inflation is part of the problem to which the honourable member for Brisbane Central referred. The inflation issue is a very important issue in Australia. Much of our inflation was caused by one individual. That individual, of course, is Bob Hawke. It was caused, first of all, by him as leader of the ACTU and some of the absolutely tragic----

Mr Beattie: What has inflation got to do with it?

Dr WATSON: The member for Brisbane Central raised the issue of inflation. I am telling members the central reason for the rise in inflation, which was the absolutely atrocious decisions made by Bob Hawke when he was President of the ACTU, surpassed only by his absolutely atrocious performance as the Prime Minister of this country. This Bill is necessary partly--not completely--because of the inflation-driven policies of the Federal colleagues of those opposite.

Mr Beattie: That is the longest bow since Adam and Eve were in shorts.

Dr WATSON: It is not. It is quite clear. The member's party is in Government. His Federal colleagues are in Government. The member's colleague the Prime Minister was head of the ACTU. In the 1970s, particularly in the early 1970s, he wreaked havoc in Australia, and, because of that, he even helped to destroy one of Labor's own Prime Ministers. The inflationary cycle which dogged Australia in the 1970s and 1980s goes right back to some of the decisions made when Bob Hawke was head of the ACTU, and that, unfortunately, has led to the necessity to introduce Bills such as this, which raise the upper limits of things such as bingo and other kinds of games. The Liberal Party supports the Bill. We do so with a degree of enthusiasm because of the importance of voluntary organisations in our society.

Mr PITT (Mulgrave) (12.03 p.m.): It is great to see that this Bill has tripartisan support, as it should have. It is the first stage of what will become a complete and thorough overhaul of the Act which covers art unions and amusements. In my mind and in the minds of others in this House, there is no doubt that it is long overdue. I am sure that it will be welcomed by a wide range of community groups who in recent years have experienced increasing difficulty in gaining any real financial reward from their fund-raising efforts.

This unfortunate situation has resulted, by and large, from what can only be called artificially low ceilings on the gross proceeds of minor art unions. It is a shame that, since the Act was first introduced in 1976, it has not been monitored more closely and

the ceilings raised in accordance with community expectations. Obviously, some sort of ceiling must be placed on art unions. However, the \$500 limit, which may have been appropriate in 1976, does not serve present needs.

The system whereby art unions are divided into minor and major art unions is an excellent one. It recognises the fundamental differences between the types of organisations which tend to raise funds by this means. Over the years, minor art unions have been the bread and butter of countless small community organisations throughout our State. These groups rely almost entirely on the dedication and participation of a band of voluntary workers. They include organisations such as p. and c. associations, local branches of the CWA, pensioner groups and a myriad of junior sporting clubs, all battling to get their share of the available dollar. Because the number of workers is usually small, and because quite often these people are called upon to play multiple roles, it is little wonder that such organisations have shied away from becoming involved in major art unions because of restrictions that are placed upon them regarding bookwork, etc.

This category of organisations has been, in most circumstances, the preferred avenue for larger bodies with more than localised membership. Groups such as the surf life saving associations, the Mater Hospital organisation and the like are quite able to draw upon the services of paid organisers or perhaps even promoters and sellers on commission. Therefore, it is quite proper that major art unions should be the subject of a more rigid system of accountability and should have stricter conditions placed upon their conduct. The stakes are obviously much higher and therefore the temptation for mal-administration is greater as well.

However, as I said before, the \$500 threshold has become ludicrous. Very few organisations at the local level would find it an attractive proposition to adhere to the rigorous administration and audit requirements for major art unions. Over the last decade, more and more organisations have opted to ignore the major art union option and have tended to conduct a series of minor art unions. More significantly, in many cases, they have chosen to breach the conditions laid down and, therefore, risk prosecution. My colleague the member for Brisbane Central alluded to that in his speech. The penalties provided for conducting an unlawful art union forced many clubs and associations to seek other forms of fund-raising. The penalties are quite clear and were distributed widely by the Government of the day. I accept the need for some deterrence; when the previous Government was faced with a situation wherein the minor art union system was being abused, it had to do something about it. Quite often, individuals were profiting themselves by using the good name of community organisations.

I want to refer to some sections of the Justice Department handbook in relation to art unions, which appear under the heading "Offences and Penalties". Each of them has a fine and/or imprisonment option. The first concerns the conducting of an unlawful art union. For the first offence, that could attract a \$600 fine or imprisonment for three months. The penalty goes up from there, to a \$1,200 fine or imprisonment for six months, or both. There are also offences and penalties for fraud in relation to art unions--making false entries in the books and records, omitting information, destroying information, etc. There are penalties for the stealing of art union prizes and proceeds, which did occur. The handbook says--

"A person shall not fraudulently take or fraudulently convert to his own use or to the use of another person any of the prizes in an art union or a part of a prize in an art union or any of the proceeds of an art union."

Again, the penalties are quite severe--a \$1,500 fine or imprisonment for six months, to be increased to \$3,000 or imprisonment for three years for a succeeding conviction on indictment.

The fourth area, of course, was the one that caused the most problems, that is, the failure to keep records or returns or to answer questions. That is where I, as a member of many community organisations, had difficulties. It was hard to get people who wanted to run a major art union to actually go about the process of keeping all those records and filling in all the returns that were required. I find that to be one of the most difficult

sections in the current Act. When there are fines, and threats of imprisonment attached, that certainly begs the question that people should not actually become involved in running major art unions.

I have no argument with the imposition of penalties against those who would cheat or misappropriate. Unfortunately, though, the penalties notwithstanding, many otherwise law-abiding citizens did choose to risk prosecution because the provisions of the Act had become far too restrictive. In a minor art union with gross proceeds of less than \$500, the amount of effort required to obtain a meagre return had, quite frankly, become too great. Since 1976, the cost of printing tickets has not decreased; it has increased many times. The cost of the prizes themselves has increased. If one is going to get people to buy a ticket, one must offer a worthwhile prize. Not everyone makes donations. Many people do look at the actual prize before they decide whether or not to buy a ticket in a particular art union. There is also the cost of advertising the winner in the local press. Media costs certainly have not remained the same since 1976.

Under the current system, the major beneficiaries are certainly not the worthwhile community organisations which actually conduct the raffles. The prize-winners are happy; the prizes have improved. The printers of the tickets are happy; they are being paid. Of course, the media is also getting its dollar from the system. However, the people who do all the hard work, those organisations which the system was designed to assist, are finding that they are receiving an ever-diminishing return. The raising of the threshold from \$500 to \$5,000 will be welcomed by thousands of hard-working fund-raisers. This will provide substantial administrative relief for those groups that are already somewhat apprehensive about the impact of poker machines on the availability of the gambling dollar. I noticed that the member for Burdekin spoke at length about that. I agree that there is a great deal of concern regarding the impact that the introduction of poker machines will have on ventures such as minor art unions and the running of bingo. As the member for Brisbane Central pointed out, there is no guarantee that that effect will be long term. I understand that the people who will frequent places where poker machines are the main form of attraction and the main form of gambling are not necessarily those people who walk up the street on a Saturday morning, put their hands in their pockets, take out a few dollars and spend them on a local community organisation.

Quite sensibly, this Bill also addresses difficulties being experienced by those who conduct the smaller type of bingo session. Most of those groups are groups such as the local QATB, as it was, old people's homes, or whatever the case may be. Significantly, the upper limit has been raised from \$500 to \$1,000. As was pointed out by the Minister in his second-reading speech, this ceiling was considered appropriate "to ensure that the integrity of the game is maintained for the benefit of players and associations." That is a fairly important aspect. It has also been said that amendments will be made to the conditions governing the conduct of minor bingo to reflect the proposed increase and maintain the nexus between prizes and jackpots. That is very significant in the case of bingo. Changes to minor bingo conditions have a flow-on effect for major bingo, and changes are also made in that area. The initial jackpot has been raised from \$200 to \$300. The aggregate value of subsequent jackpots therefore moves from \$1,000 to a new figure of \$1,500. However, the \$4,000 gross proceeds limit will still apply. That is as it should be. The Bill does not provide for changes to limits which apply to lucky envelopes. They are a separate issue altogether.

The introduction in 1976 of the Act which is undergoing minor amendment today was a major advance. I must congratulate the previous Government on the way in which it changed the Act at that stage. Prior to 1976 we had the ridiculous situation in which people wanting to run any small art union had to traipse off to the local clerk of the court and get a permit. Sometimes that was not easy to do. Ensuring that associations had to be confirmed as approved associations and that they had to apply for one permit per year in order to run those things was a major step forward. The only criticism I would make is that, having made that great start, no significant monitoring of the situation was carried out in the intervening years. The Act has come under quite a deal of criticism from many organisations because of its regulatory requirements, which have

proven to be onerous, to say the least. They are time-consuming and place an intolerable burden on already overworked community-minded people. I look forward to the final outcome of the review that is currently being undertaken. However, as an interim measure, this Bill delivers some respite and, as such, it has my support.

Hon. K. E. De LACY (Cairns--Treasurer) (12.13 p.m.), in reply: I thank honourable members for their support for this legislation. It is certainly much-needed legislation and, as one honourable member said, its introduction is not before time. The legislation has the support of a whole range of community organisations. In summary, it changes the definition of a minor art union to increase the gross proceeds so that community organisations, charities and sporting organisations and what-have-you can run minor art unions or simple raffles without all of the paperwork and costs associated with a major art union. In my second-reading speech I said that this was really only the first step, that the Government is carrying out a comprehensive review of the Art Unions and Amusements Act and that I intend to introduce modern legislation which will adequately reflect the needs of the community well into the twenty-first century.

I advise honourable members that that review is well under way. In fact, we have completed a review of the various sections of the Act to determine their relevance, and we have had a look at all of the interstate legislation to determine its relevance to art unions in Queensland. We have developed a basic framework for a new Act which is practicable and user friendly. We have identified major cost-saving initiatives in relation to the conduct of minor and major art unions. Further investigation is being undertaken to simplify the record-keeping and reporting requirements for associations, and we are just about to commence major consultations with interested parties in relation to all of these initiatives and test our new legislation against them in the marketplace, as it were.

I can confidently say that the new legislation will be introduced into this House in the spring session of Parliament, the Budget session, and will be passed before the conclusion of this calendar year. Again, it is not before time. Some members did make reference to the large increase in gross proceeds, from \$500 to \$5,000, and the need for that to keep up with inflation. I advise honourable members that the new legislation will introduce a CPI component so that organisations and charities are not disadvantaged by what appears to be the inexorable creep of inflation--albeit at a much slower rate than it used to be. Once again, I thank honourable members for their support of this legislation.

Motion agreed to.

Committee

Clauses 1 to 7, as read, agreed to.

Bill reported, without amendment.

Third Reading

Bill, on motion of Mr De Lacy, by leave, read a third time.

ROBERTSON PARK TRUST VARIATION BILL

Hon. T. J. BURNS (Lytton--Deputy Premier, Minister for Housing and Local Government) (12.18 p.m.), by leave, without notice: I move--

"That leave be granted to bring in a Bill for an Act to free certain land vested in the Brisbane City Council from a trust for the purpose of dedicating the land as road."

Motion agreed to.

First Reading

Bill and Explanatory Notes presented and Bill, on motion of Mr Burns, read a first time.

Second Reading

Hon. T. J. BURNS (Lytton--Deputy Premier, Minister for Housing and Local Government) (12.19 p.m.): I move--

"That the Bill be now read a second time."

This is a very simple Bill, which has been requested by the Brisbane City Council. The facts are that Brisbane City Council owns 2.1 hectares of land at Indooroopilly which was given to it by a private citizen. The land is held in trust by the council as parkland. The council has maintained the land as park for more than 40 years and will continue to do so as far into the future as can be foreseen. A problem arose, however, when the council decided to improve traffic safety at the busy intersection of Indooroopilly and Lambert Roads. A traffic roundabout was seen as the logical solution, given the circumstances, but a small area of parkland--86 square metres--is also required for its construction. Because the land is held in trust as parkland, the council is not at liberty to use it for road purposes. Accordingly, the Bill simply provides that this small area required for the roundabout will be excised from the park and discharged from the trust. The balance of the land will remain as parkland and be maintained by the council.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate, on motion of Mr Stoneman, adjourned.

AIR NAVIGATION AMENDMENT BILL

Hon. T. M. MACKENROTH (Chatsworth--Leader of the House) (12.21 p.m.), by leave, without notice: On behalf of the Minister for Transport, I move--

"That leave be granted to bring in a Bill for an Act to amend the Air Navigation Act 1937."

Motion agreed to.

First Reading

Bill and Explanatory Notes presented and Bill, on motion of Mr Mackenroth, read a first time.

Second Reading

Hon. T. M. MACKENROTH (Chatsworth--Leader of the House) (12.21 p.m.): I move--

"That the Bill be now read a second time."

On behalf of the Minister for Transport, I seek leave to have the second-reading speech incorporated in *Hansard*.

Leave granted.

Mr Speaker

The purpose of this Bill is to amend the Air Navigation Act 1937 of this State to give legislative recognition to changes which have taken place in Commonwealth Law relating to certain aviation matters.

The Air Navigation Act 1937 currently provides for the adoption as State Law of regulations made under the Air Navigation Act 1920 of the Commonwealth Parliament.

Aviation matters covered by the Commonwealth Air Navigation Regulations have historically included the safety of air services, the use of aerodromes and airports, the registration and airworthiness of aircraft, air traffic rules, the licensing and competence of pilots.

To ensure that the laws in relation to such matters are uniform throughout Australia, the Air Navigation Act 1937 and similar legislation in other States, was enacted following agreement between the States and the Commonwealth in 1937.

In recent years the Commonwealth has restructured its administration of air safety, established new administrative authorities and passed the Civil Aviation Act 1988. Under that Act new regulations have been made to deal with many, but not all of the matters previously covered by regulations made under the Commonwealth's Air Navigation Act of 1920.

Because of these changes by the Commonwealth it is now appropriate for the Air Navigation Act 1937 of this State to be amended to acknowledge that Commonwealth regulations relating to air navigation are now made under the Commonwealth's Civil Aviation Act 1988 as well as under the Air Navigation Act 1920 of the Commonwealth. The Air Navigation Amendment Bill 1991 achieves this purpose.

I commend this Bill to the House.

Debate, on motion of Mr Stoneman, adjourned.

PUBLIC HOSPITALS (THIRD PARTY PATIENTS) VALIDATION OF FEES AND CHARGES BILL

Hon. K. V. McELLIGOTT (Thuringowa--Minister for Health) (12.22 p.m.), by leave, without notice: I move--

"That leave be granted to bring in a Bill for an Act to validate public hospitals third party patients fees and charges"

Motion agreed to.

First Reading

Bill and Explanatory Notes presented and Bill, on motion of Mr McElligott, read a first time.

Second Reading

Hon. K. V. McELLIGOTT (Thuringowa--Minister for Health) (12.23 p.m.): I move--

"That the Bill be now read a second time."

On 22 August 1981, regulations pursuant to the Hospitals Act 1936-1988 were introduced to raise charges for hospitalisation of third-party patients. Third-party patients are persons who have been hospitalised as a result of an injury, illness or disease and who receive care and/or establish a right to receive payment by way of compensation or damages, including payment in settlement of a claim for compensation or damages, in respect of the injury, illness or disease. The daily bed charges are those based on the average cost of treating a patient and have been amended from year to year in line with increased costs incurred in providing such treatment. In recent years, the charges have only increased in line with the CPI movement.

Upon admission to a public hospital, a patient is asked if the injury, illness or disease is a result of an accident, and whether he or she intends to pursue a claim for compensation or damages. If so, a daily bed fee is charged. In many cases, a good period of time may elapse before the compensation or damages claim is either settled through court action or as a result of an out-of-court settlement. In November 1990, the District Court handed down a decision in a damages claim. While the court acknowledged the intent of legislation in this area, it found no liability existed for third-party patients in relation to hospitalisation costs. As a consequence, on 15 December 1990, an amendment was made to the Public Hospitals (Fees and Charges) Regulations and a further amendment made on 22 June 1991. However, these amendments were prospective, becoming effective from date of gazettal.

To ensure that outstanding fees and charges owed to many public hospitals throughout the State are still payable, it has been necessary to validate the intent of legislation giving hospitals the right to impose such relevant fees and charges. Of course, many charges payable by third-party patients have been received and debts finalised. In these cases, this Bill will validate the receipt of these fees and charges by public hospitals. I stress that the Bill in no way affects court decisions as to the liability of a third-party patient to pay fees and charges. It simply clarifies the intent and right to impose such charges for these patients and validates legislation which has previously been introduced. It needs to be clearly understood that this Bill in no way represents retrospective legislation. What it does in fact is validate the intent of regulations introduced by the then National/Liberal Government in 1981. For many years, similar rules have been adopted and followed in other States, and this legislation simply corrects an error contained in previous legislation which was not identified until the court case of November last year.

To not pass this legislation would be to deny hospitals their legitimate right for reimbursement of costs incurred in the treatment of third-party patients, an amount of which goes back to charges raised under the previous Government. I am sure that honourable members opposite will understand, therefore, the necessity for passage of this essential legislation.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate, on motion of Mrs McCauley, adjourned.

DENTAL TECHNICIANS AND DENTAL PROSTHETISTS BILL

Hon. K. V. McELLIGOTT (Thuringowa--Minister for Health) (12.26 p.m.), by leave, without notice: I move--

"That leave be granted to bring in a Bill for an Act to provide for the establishment of the Dental Technicians and Dental Prosthetists Board, the keeping of registers of dental technicians and dental prosthetists and the regulation of dental technical work and dental prosthetic services and for related purposes."

Motion agreed to.

First Reading

Bill and Explanatory Notes presented and Bill, on motion of Mr McElligott, read a first time.

Second Reading

Hon. K. V. McELLIGOTT (Thuringowa--Minister for Health) (12.27 p.m.): I move--

"That the Bill be now read a second time."

The purpose of this Bill is to provide for the registration of dental technicians, and suitably qualified dental technicians to be known as dental prosthetists, by the establishment of a Dental Technicians and Dental Prosthetists Board. For many years, a number of untrained, unsupervised and uncontrolled dental technicians have been operating illegally in Queensland by supplying dentures directly to the public. Ironically, if many of those same dental technicians--or prosthetists as those who supply dentures and mouthguards are more appropriately called--had been operating interstate, they would have been operating legally. The Government is therefore introducing this legislation to register, regulate and upgrade the skills of dental prosthetists to improve protection of the public health. The introduction of this legislation honours a pre-election commitment of the Goss Government to enable dental prosthetists, dealing directly with the public, to provide full and partial dentures. It also provides dental technicians with improved status, increased recognition and a proper career path.

This legislation is the result of extensive consultation with industry, including the Australian Dental Association, the Dental Technicians Association, the Australian Commercial Dental Laboratories Association, the Dental Prosthetists Association, the Dental

Technicians Standing Committee of the Dental Board of Queensland, and the Federated Miscellaneous Workers Union. I believe it represents a satisfactory outcome between the concerns of the dental profession and the aspirations of dental technicians in that it ensures that only suitably qualified dental prosthetists will be able to deliver specified services directly to the public. The Bill provides for the establishment and composition of a registration board as well as the qualifications and requirements of registration of dental technicians and dental prosthetists. The board will be comprised of representatives of dental technicians, dental prosthetists and dentists, a barrister or solicitor of the Supreme Court and a person representing the public interest. Once again, the inclusion of two dentists on the board is designed to help safeguard the public health.

There is widespread agreement between dentists and dental technicians about the need to upgrade current training courses and to provide for improved career advancement. The present training for dental technicians is an apprenticeship course and the Department of Employment, Vocational Education, Training and Industrial Relations is proceeding via a curriculum development advisory committee to upgrade this basic training. Post-basic courses will be developed in dental technology and in clinical dental technology. It is by successful completion of a course in clinical dental technology that students can apply for registration as dental prosthetists. There is provision in the Bill for recognition of the qualifications of dental prosthetists trained outside Queensland if in the opinion of the board their training course was of a standard at least the equal of the course conducted in Queensland. In addition, "grandparent" arrangements will operate for a period of two years from the commencement date of the legislation, whereby dental technicians who apply for registration as dental prosthetists can undergo rigorous theoretical and practical assessments and, if successful, achieve registration. The legislation provides that dental prosthetists may provide full upper and lower dentures and mouthguards and partial dentures, subject to the patient first obtaining from a dentist or medical practitioner a certificate that the mouth is suitable for the fitting of a partial denture. It is important to emphasise that any denture may only be provided in a healthy mouth and no treatment may be carried out for a patient other than the provision of dentures and mouthguards.

The Government's decision to include partial dentures was taken only after much consultation and deliberation. It was decided that partial dentures could be justified on the grounds that a rigorous, theoretical and practical examination will be required before dental prosthetists will be allowed to deal directly with the public, and the Australian Dental Association will be involved in setting that examination. On practical grounds it would be difficult for prosthetists to fit only full dentures and refer partial dentures to dentists because both full and partial dentures can occur in the same mouth. Thus the exclusion of partial dentures would result in many prosthetists continuing to operate outside the law. The Government believes it has reached a workable compromise by requiring a certificate from a dentist or medical practitioner before a partial denture can be fitted. This requirement for certification is to lapse after a period of five years from the commencement date of the legislation.

The Dental Technicians and Dental Prosthetists Board will have power to conduct inquiries under specified circumstances where it believes this to be necessary. It also has disciplinary powers and may impose penalties where appropriate. The legislation does not apply to any dentist or medical practitioner who, acting in accordance with the law, practises dentistry or medicine.

Paramount in the Government's decision to introduce this legislation is concern to ensure public safety. I am advised that at present Queensland is the only State where properly qualified and registered dental prosthetists are operating illegally by supplying services directly to the public. In Tasmania, dental prosthetists have been registered to supply dentures directly to the public since 1957; in Victoria, since 1972; in New South Wales, since 1978; in South Australia, since 1984; in Western Australia, since 1985; and in the ACT, since 1988. In Tasmania, New South Wales and the ACT this includes both full and partial dentures. In Victoria, South Australia and Western Australia, only full

dentures are included, although I understand Victoria has made the decision to extend the area of practice to include partial dentures. In line with considerations which I outlined earlier, this followed concerns that patients were continuing to go to dental prosthetists for their partial denture requirements and dental prosthetists were continuing to make partial dentures in response to their patients' requests.

The Government believes that if we are to ensure public safety it is important to include both full and partial dentures under the legislation with appropriate inbuilt safeguards so that the provision of dentures--whether full or partial--can be properly monitored and regulated. The Government therefore believes this legislation is important in that it will enable regulation of the industry and ensure that those prosthetists dealing directly with the public provide a high quality and safe service.

Let me say, in conclusion, that information from other States indicates that the cost of dentures provided by dental prosthetists is up to 20 per cent less than those supplied by dentists. The legislation, therefore, will not only regulate any uncontrolled industry, but also make these services more available and affordable to the public. I commend the Bill to the honourable members of this House.

Debate, on motion of Mrs McCauley, adjourned.

UNIVERSITIES OF CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN QUEENSLAND AMENDMENT BILL

Hon. P. J. BRADDY (Rockhampton--Minister for Education) (12.34 p.m.), by leave, without notice: I move--

"That leave be granted to bring in a Bill to amend the University of Central Queensland Act 1989 and the University of Southern Queensland Act 1989."

Motion agreed to.

First Reading

Bill and Explanatory Notes presented and Bill, on motion of Mr Braddy, read a first time.

Second Reading

Hon. P. J. BRADDY (Rockhampton--Minister for Education) (12.35 p.m.): I move--

"That the Bill be now read a second time."

I present to the House a Bill to amend the University of Central Queensland Act 1989 and the University of Southern Queensland Act 1989 to provide for membership of the chairs of the academic boards on the governing councils of the institutions. The University College of Central Queensland, formerly the Capricornia Institute of Advanced Education, and the University College of Southern Queensland, formerly the Darling Downs Institute of Advanced Education, were established and incorporated under the relevant legislation from 1 January 1990. The legislation was promulgated in compliance with the funding requirements of the Commonwealth Government's unified national system of higher education in which the advanced education sector of higher education has ceased to exist, and former colleges of advanced education have been amalgamated with existing universities or are seeking to gain university status in their own right. The two university colleges are in this latter category. The enabling legislation makes way for the establishment and incorporation of the University of Central Queensland and the University of Southern Queensland at a later date.

The university colleges are being assisted and monitored in their progress towards the attainment of university status by a panel of visitors comprising three persons who have had distinguished academic and administrative careers in the higher education

sector. Concurrently, the search activities and infrastructure and postgraduate programs of the two institutions are being developed in consultation with the University of Queensland under an agreed sponsorship arrangement. The panel of visitors for each of the university colleges has expressed the view that the status of the academic board should be enhanced by providing for ex officio membership of the council by the chairs of the academic boards. The councils of the university colleges have requested that the relevant legislation be amended accordingly.

The most recent Australian Vice-Chancellors Committee summary paper on academic boards and similar committees of councils of universities throughout Australia was compiled prior to the commencement of the Commonwealth's unified national system of higher education. Of the 19 universities then established, 10 had direct representation on the academic board, or similar committee, of the council of the university. With respect to Queensland higher education institutions--the chairs of the academic boards of the University of Queensland and the James Cook University of North Queensland are members, ex officio, of the senate and the council respectively; while in the case of Griffith University and the Queensland University of Technology, the chairs of the academic boards have rights of audience and debate at meetings of the councils. The Bill will implement the desire of the councils of the two university colleges to enable the academic boards to report directly to the governing councils of the institutions through the chairs of the boards as ex officio members of the councils. I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate, on motion of Mr Stoneman, adjourned.

ACTS REPEAL BILL

Hon. D. M. WELLS (Murrumba--Attorney-General) (12.39 p.m.), by leave, without notice: I move--

"That leave be granted to bring in a Bill for an Act to repeal, and terminate the application of, certain obsolete Acts."

Motion agreed to.

First Reading

Bill and Explanatory Notes presented and Bill, on motion of Mr Wells, read a first time.

Second Reading

Hon. D. M. WELLS (Murrumba--Attorney-General) (12.39 p.m.): I move--

"That the Bill be now read a second time."

The objective of the legislation is to repeal certain Queensland statutes and remove the application in this jurisdiction of certain New South Wales statutes which have been identified as obsolete and/or unnecessary. The Public Sector Management Commission conducted a review of legislation as part of its functional review of matters that have no specific agency focus but which have implications across the State public sector. After consultation with all Government departments and some local authorities, a number of statutes were identified as obsolete or unnecessary and warranting repeal in the commission's final report. At the same time, the Law Reform Commission, pursuant to its reference on statute law revision, was conducting a similar exercise with a view to recommending the repeal of any obsolete and unnecessary enactments.

The last review of this nature was conducted in 1975 by the Queensland Law Reform Commission and resulted in the Acts Repeal Act 1975. It has thus been over 15 years since the Queensland statute book has been systematically reviewed. The results of the extensive revision have identified almost 200 Acts which are unquestionably obsolete or unnecessary. As part of the Government's commitment to make the law

accessible and concise, the proposed legislation is important. The removal of some 200 statutes from the books substantially reduces the maze of legislation that the ordinary person must weave amongst in order to determine his or her rights and obligations. I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate, on motion of Mr Littleproud, adjourned.

CORRECTIVE SERVICES AMENDMENT BILL

Hon. G. R. MILLINER (Everton--Minister for Justice and Corrective Services) (12.41 p.m.), by leave, without notice: I move--

"That leave be granted to bring in a Bill for an Act to amend the Corrective Services Act 1988, and for related purposes."

Motion agreed to.

First Reading

Bill and Explanatory Notes presented and Bill, on motion of Mr Milliner, read a first time.

Second Reading

Hon. G. R. MILLINER (Everton--Minister for Justice and Corrective Services) (12.41 p.m.): I move--

"That the Bill be now read a second time."

This Bill represents another step along the path towards a more equitable and common-sense approach to the treatment of fine defaulters. The threat of gaol has been traditionally regarded as the mechanism to compel or, at the very least, encourage offenders to pay fines imposed by the courts. It is now almost universally considered that this approach is inappropriate for the following reasons--

1. The offences for which fines are imposed are not generally offences against the person. For example, many of them are simply traffic offences.
2. While in prison, fine defaulters may be exposed to physical harm from hardened inmates. That is one factor associated with fine defaulters which creates additional problems for gaol administrators.
3. Costs associated with gaoling fine defaulters represent a significant burden on the taxpayers of this State. That aspect is exacerbated by the fact that, as gaol terms served by fine defaulters are less than those served by the average gaol population, administration costs connected with their processing are also disproportionately high.
4. In those cases where fine defaulters simply cannot afford to pay the fine, gaol could be seen as a penalty for poverty. That is a concept which simply cannot be allowed to survive.

For those reasons, a system of fine option orders, whereby a court orders community service in lieu of the fine, has been introduced. The Bill extends the availability of such fine option orders. Currently, a person can apply for a fine option order only at the time when the court imposes the original fine or during the period allowed, if any, for the payment of the fine. Now, under this Bill, where a fine has been imposed in the Magistrates Court, an application will be able to be made after that period has elapsed or even after a warrant has been issued or executed. If a fine has been imposed in a higher court, an application for a fine option order will be able to be made when a fine defaulter is brought before a court to show cause why a sentence of imprisonment for default should not be imposed.

These proposals are aimed at encouraging persons who would otherwise be gaoled to undertake community service for the welfare of the community and for their own

benefit. That approach was developed as an outcome of the Green Paper published by the Attorney-General and myself last year. The strategies outlined in the Bill flowed out of the submissions made in response to that Green Paper. Submissions were received from a number of interested persons and bodies, particularly those associated with the Magistrates Courts service. Those contributions facilitated the development of the legislation, and I would like to thank all those who made the effort to draft submissions. I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate, on motion of Mr Stoneman, adjourned.

SUPPLY

Vote of Credit--\$4,115,000,000

Mr SPEAKER read a message from His Excellency the Governor recommending that the following provision be made on account of the services for the year ending 30 June 1992--

- (a) From the Consolidated Revenue Fund, the further sum of \$2,236,000,000;
- (b) From the Trust and Special Funds, the further sum of \$1,879,000,000.

Committee

Hon. K. E. De LACY (Cairns--Treasurer) (12.46 p.m.): I move--

"That there be granted to Her Majesty, on account, for the service of the year 1991-92, a further sum not exceeding \$4,115,000,000 towards defraying the expenses of the various departments and services of the State."

Motion agreed to.

Resolution reported, received and agreed to.

WAYS AND MEANS

Committee

Vote of Credit--\$4,115,000,000

Hon. K. E. De LACY (Cairns--Treasurer) (12.48 p.m.): I move--

"(a) That, towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty, on account, for the service of the year 1991-92, a further sum not exceeding \$2,236,000,000 be granted out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Queensland.

(b) That, towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty, on account, for the service of the year 1991-92, a further sum not exceeding \$1,879,000,000 be granted from the Trust and Special Funds."

Motion agreed to.

Resolutions reported, received and agreed to.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 1)

First Reading

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

Second Reading

Hon. K. E. De LACY (Cairns--Treasurer) (12.51 p.m.): I move--

"That the Bill be now read a second time."

This Bill appropriates an amount of \$4,115m for expenditure for the normal services of the Government until the passage of the 1991-92 Budget legislation. An amount of \$2,236m is provided for the Consolidated Revenue Fund and \$1,879m for the Trust and Special Funds. The total amount of this Bill is in addition to an amount of \$4,310m which was appropriated by Appropriation Act (No. 2) of 1990. This legislation is necessary to provide sufficient Supply to cover the expenditure requirements of the Government until completion of the processes of discussion and debate on the Budget and the passage of Appropriation Bill (No. 2) later in the year.

I would like to take this opportunity to comment on the Budget result for 1990-91. Last September, I had the pleasure of presenting the first Queensland Labor Budget in 34 years--a Budget that was generally acknowledged as the most fiscally responsible Budget of all the Australian States. The Consolidated Revenue Fund Budget outcome for 1990-91 was an accumulated surplus of \$12.9m. Revenue for 1990-91 totalled \$8,025.9m and expenditure totalled \$8,042.4m. The excess of expenditure over revenue of \$16.5m was more than offset by an opening surplus at the start of the year of \$29.4m. The fund position of an accumulated surplus of \$12.9m compares well against the Budget estimate of a surplus of \$0.8m. This has not been an easy result to achieve and has required careful and disciplined financial management in a very difficult national economic environment.

As a result of the impact of the recession, revenues came in at \$86.8m, or around 1 per cent below the Budget estimate of \$8,112.7m.

The main items contributing to the shortfall were--

stamp duties which fell \$57m below the Budget estimate;

payroll tax which was \$28m down on the forecast arising from the wage/tax trade-off in January 1991; and

royalty income, which was \$30m lower than expected, due to difficult world commodity conditions and lost production due to industrial disputes in the coal industry and the Queensland floods.

A less fiscally disciplined Government may have ignored the clear, early signs of a deeper than anticipated national economic downturn and not tightened the reins to maintain outlays in balance with revenues. However, this Government was never going to allow that to happen. We made a commitment not to borrow to fund recurrent expenditure or social capital, and were determined to fulfil that commitment.

Despite additional cost pressures from substantial award increases for nurses, teachers and police and relief assistance and restoration works associated with severe flooding during the year, the Government has been able to contain outlays to some \$99m, or 1.2 per cent below Budget estimates. This result largely reflects general savings effected by Government departments due to general award increases, which were lower than expected, flowing from the wage/tax trade-off implemented during the year. It also reflects the closer control of expenditure both by departments and Treasury. The savings on outlays have not come at the expense of reduced services in key service-delivery areas such as education, health, police and welfare. Instead, they simply represent the product of prudent financial management by a Government that is committed to producing Budgets that are both fiscally and socially responsible. The result also reflects measures taken to avoid wasteful end-of-year spending, with departments being allowed to carry forward firm expenditure commitments to the following year. This means, however, that the accumulated surplus will be fully required to meet this expenditure in 1991-92.

I will not take up the time of the House today detailing the 1990-91 Budget outcome because honourable members will have access to full details of the 1990-91 result through the 1991-92 State Budget papers, the Treasurer's Annual Statement and detailed reports

on the accounts of each department. However, the significance of the 1990-91 Budget result should not be underestimated or dismissed as an unremarkable achievement. The fact is that, compared to the Budget results to be reported by the other State Governments, it is a remarkable result and one that demonstrates that Queensland is leading the way in fiscal management. The recent New South Wales and Victorian mini-Budgets provide good examples of the stark contrast between Queensland's financial management and that of the other States. At the end of 1990-91, New South Wales is expecting its position to be a deficit of around \$900m. On a no-policy-change basis, New South Wales was facing forward estimate deficits of between \$1.75 billion and \$2 billion per annum over the next three years. Even with the measures announced by the New South Wales Premier, the New South Wales State Budget is expected to operate a deficit of around \$900m per annum over the next three years. The bulk of the reduction in the deficit will come from \$3.24 billion worth of asset sales and special dividends on Government-owned enterprises. Even after these proceeds have been consumed, New South Wales will be left with a structural deficit of close to \$1 billion per annum. While New South Wales is hoping that a rebound in the property market will reduce the deficit, if this does not happen, that State will be in no better financial shape in the future than it is in at present, and it will also have a substantially depleted asset base. The Victorian Government is facing an outlook similar to that of New South Wales. Despite also recently taking remedial action to improve its Budget outlook, the Victorian Government has announced that it is expected to incur a deficit for the 1991-92 financial year of \$360m.

Given the difficult economic circumstances prevailing in 1990-91 and the poor results achieved in other States, the outcome for 1990-91 is a particularly good one for Queensland and demonstrates the financial responsibility for which the Goss Government is recognised throughout Australia. Our commitment to financial responsibility will again be reflected in my second Budget which will be delivered on 5 September. That Budget will be brought into balance without resorting to the desperate measures taken in other States. There will be no new taxes, tax increases, borrowings for social infrastructure, fire sale of assets, mass sackings of public servants or cuts in essential services. However, balancing the Budget will require a redoubling of the Government's commitment to a keener, more efficient public administration and a better return on assets owned by the State's taxpayers.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Sitting suspended from 12.59 to 2.30 p.m.

Mr STONEMAN (Burdekin) (2.30 p.m.): I rise this afternoon to speak in the debate on Appropriation Bill (No. 1) 1991-92, which was presented by the Treasurer before the luncheon adjournment. In doing so, I acknowledge that this is a traditional part of the process of government. There is a need to continue the operation of government by the provision of funds so that the services required by the people of the State can be continued. It is probably traditional that there will be no opposition in that respect, but I want to make a number of comments this afternoon.

First, I would like to mention the Treasurer's statement about the surplus and the heraldic statement he made about the way in which this Government is not only fiscally responsible, but is the best in Australia, and so forth. We hear that every time a speech is made. Unfortunately, one swallow does not make a summer. We have just completed the first budgetary year under the Goss Government. For about one and a half years, however, the Government has claimed to be the best operational Government and the best managed and most disciplined Government in Australia. John Cain, Brian Burke, John Dowding, Joan Kirner--you name them--have all made those sorts of statements. We know what happened in their States. At the end of the day, when we shift the major emphasis of Government spending, certain things have to happen.

In his second reading speech, the Treasurer said--

"The fund position of an accumulated surplus of \$12.9m compares with the Budget estimate of a surplus of \$0.8m."

The Treasurer went on to say--

"This has not been an easy result to achieve and has required careful and disciplined financial management in a very difficult national economic environment."

I agree with the Treasurer that it is a very difficult environment. We are in extremely difficult times, so discipline is required.

I am not suggesting that there has not been a fair degree of application. The State Budget 1990-91 Budget Paper (No. 2), *Estimates of Receipts and Expenditure*, in the summary on page 35, indicated an accumulated cash surplus to 1 July 1990 of \$29,431,000. If we go through that, we can see that it was estimated that there would be a deficit of some \$28.653m, which was projected to give an estimated cash surplus in the Consolidated Revenue Fund of some \$778,000 as at 30 June 1991.

In terms of matching the figures laid down in the estimates of receipts and expenditure, the Treasurer can say, "Yes, in accounting terms, that has been achieved." But I do not believe there is any basis for self-congratulation. Some of the statements that have been made--and I refer particularly to some of the statements in today's papers--contain some quite misleading, erroneous statements. This morning, the *Townsville Daily Bulletin* indicated that the Government has had a marvellous result--better than the previous Government had achieved--because, instead of \$0.8m, nearly \$13m was left over. That hides many facts. The journalist who wrote that article got it monumentally wrong. As I indicated, and as was indicated in last year's estimates of receipts and expenditure, the opening balance was \$29.4m. Any housewife knows that one goes into a budget year or any financial period with a certain amount. Let us say we start with \$100. At the end of the year, after one has operated, one has one's income and has made one's expenditure. If one ends up with 58 per cent less in the kitty than one had at the commencement of the year, quite frankly that would not be something to crow about.

In the total context of the Budget, I acknowledge that the amount is minimal, but the State is some \$16.5m worse off in terms of the Consolidated Revenue Fund than it was at the commencement of the year. Instead of saying that--and I acknowledge that it was the budgetary structure as outlined in the papers--the Treasurer and the Goss Government are congratulating themselves on being the best managers in Australia. They are making comparisons with the New South Wales Government in particular. They are speaking about a deficit of \$900m, or almost \$1 billion--a deficit that could continue for the next two or three years. Let us remember that the present New South Wales Government is following on from 8 or 10 years of Labor Government in that State, which is a much larger State than Queensland in terms of population. We have to acknowledge that in the amount of money and the number of services that are provided. I am not making an excuse for the Greiner Government or condemning previous Governments, but I believe we should be comparing apples with apples and not comparing apples with oranges. In making his statements, the Treasurer is undertaking a subterfuge which many gullible journalists are trying to take up.

Mr Randell: Didn't Unsworth strip New South Wales--every hollow log, every superannuation fund--and leave nothing?

Mr STONEMAN: Exactly. That is the problem that the people of New South Wales and the Greiner/Murray Government are confronted with. But that is their problem; we should be concentrating on Queensland. In this instance, the raw comparison between Queensland, with \$12.9m in the Consolidated Revenue Fund, and New South Wales, which looks like having a deficit of almost \$1 billion deficit, is not a fair or reasonable comparison.

The receipts for the year as outlined by the Treasurer were \$8,025.9m; outlays were \$8,042.4m. Those figures are very similar to the figures that are summarised on page 35, which show estimated revenue of \$8,112.7m as against estimated expenditure of \$8,141.4m. So, in those terms, it is not an unreasonable result. Even though at this stage there is a marginal difference in that the Consolidated Revenue Fund has decreased

from \$29.4m to \$12.9m, the people of this State should be told the truth of the matter. That is a closing balance. However, because the Consolidated Revenue Fund deficit is really the difference, the closing balance is irrelevant for the purposes of the argument. It should be noted that that deficit will not necessarily equal the Budget deficit in national accounting terms, because the Consolidated Revenue Fund accounts for only about 45 per cent, or slightly less than half, of the State Government's receipts and outlays. When one is assessing the impact of what has happened, all those matters have to be encapsulated in any debate.

The fact that bills have not been paid must be viewed most seriously. People throughout the State can cite instances of moneys that are spent by the Government on vital and basic items. I will cite a particular instance. A few weeks ago the Opposition offices were telephoned by a desperate grandmother of a three-year-old quadriplegic child. I do not know how the grandmother came to be responsible for the child. Obviously, the mother was incapacitated, was no longer about the place or was not available. The grandmother explained that she could no longer lift the child and that she had applied to the Health Department for the loan of a special stroller called a Conrad Cruiser. The public servant to whom she spoke told her that the service had run out of money in February and that the department would be unable to help her until the 1991-92 financial year. Stories similar to that are being told around this State. I am sure that members who follow me in this debate will cite similar instances. In primary industry areas and fisheries patrol areas people have been told, "Do not put any petrol in the machine. The funding for that has been cut off." Those instances put the Budget result in context. At the end of the day, those are the sorts of things that matter, not the accounting procedures. Let us face it, everybody knows that one can leave the bill in the drawer for a little while, and that is fine. It might show the bank manager, the accountant or someone else that things are not quite so bad as they may appear to be. The fact is that, in the long run, one gets caught out; accounts have to be paid. It is fair enough to say that there will be no increases in taxes, fees, charges and so on. I noted that, in his second-reading speech, the Treasurer indicated that the 1991-92 Budget would not include any increased taxes or charges. I expect that he will maintain that position. However, if there is a diminution of services and there is not a diminution in the amount that the community is contributing by way of taxes, fees, fines and the various charges that form that part of the State's revenue structure, and a disparity arises, there has been an effective increase in the taxation rate, because people are paying the same amount for a lesser service.

I wonder how many times the story about the old lady who could not obtain the Conrad Cruiser could be told across the State. I have raised in this Chamber, and I raised a number of weeks ago in the public arena, the predicament of the north Queensland emergency response group. Because that group is located in his electorate, one would have thought that the member for Townsville would have been to the fore in raising that matter. It is part and parcel of what should be, I guess, an ecumenical approach to emergency responses in north Queensland. I understand that, after I raised the issue, a bit of action was taken. However, there is still no cheque in the mail; no money has been forthcoming. One would imagine that, if the money was going to be forthcoming, it would come from this appropriation.

The fact is that a monumental number of bills are being left in the drawer. I have not returned to my office to ascertain the position with members' electorate allowances, but I understand that they are three weeks behind the usual time. I suppose it could reasonably be argued that members of Parliament should be able to adjust to that or organise credit. But what about the ordinary people who do not have the capacity to make those adjustments? What can they do about payments that are not forthcoming? Those matters need to be considered in the context of the statement by the Treasurer that the resources and the finances of this State are being managed brilliantly. In making these comments, I do not cast any reflection upon the officers of the Treasury Department. Those officers are beyond reproach, and they are a group of people who can proudly hold their heads up anywhere in Australia. They are the people who form the foundation

of the support service that has brought this State into pre-eminence in terms of fiscal management and financial structure. Thirty-two years of conservative Government, or the processes of Government, cannot be wiped out overnight, nor can any Government suddenly claim to have it right, as the Treasurer did last year in his Budget Speech. He said, "We have got it right. We are responsible. We are disciplined." That is fine. Let us see how things are going in a couple of years' time.

It is all very well to blame floods, fire and famine, but they are part and parcel of life in a State as vast as ours. Where there is such a huge coastline in a tropical area, there will be floods and cyclones. Unfortunately, with our huge inland area, we will have not only floods that wreak unbelievable devastation but also, more often than not, droughts. That is all part of managing the State. I am sure that the Treasury officers have taken all those matters into consideration.

Mr Prest: Tell the graziers that.

Mr STONEMAN: That is an interesting interjection. All our primary producers, whether large or small, know that the level of services they now receive has diminished. I am pleased that that eminent spokesman on primary industry and the production of the nation, the honourable member for Port Curtis, has interjected. I refer to commodity prices as shown in an excellent document put out by the Queensland Treasury, the *Economic Review*. It shows that for the March quarter of 1991 export commodity prices, with one exception--admittedly for a large commodity, coal--have fallen. I say, "Thank God for coal." But there is not a coal-miner in the State who feels that he is in a particularly robust situation. The coal industry is coming under increasing pressure from the world market, and I wonder what will happen a little down the track when South Africa enters the market. By any standards South Africa has much cheaper labour costs than we have and, regardless of the reforms being undertaken in that country, they will continue to be relatively low. It has much lower costs of production, and in some cases it is better situated to service the world market, although Australia is conveniently placed for the Japanese market. But our costs of production and our freight and royalty structures which have been put in place over the years have ceased to have the relevance they originally had. That is why it is vital that we introduce processes to keep our exports competitive.

The price of gold has generally come down over the period covered by this March quarter review. There are a number of major goldmines in north Queensland--including Kidston and Carpentaria, in my electorate--and west through Charters Towers. They are huge providers of jobs and they also provide services such as local shops, carriers, hotels, boarding houses and vehicle-suppliers. That has a huge impact. The *Economic Review* shows that gold is dipping, and over the page we find that beef prices are similarly dipping. Although there is relative buoyancy compared with some other commodities, the overall picture is not good. In an area such as Charters Towers, those industries cover a big slice of all operations. Sadly, sugar prices are continuing to decline. It was not long ago that the Minister for Primary Industries, Mr Casey, said that there was no rural recession; that sugar and beef were quite okay. He totally disregarded all the other disaster areas, particularly wool. We have also a problem with the beef industry, with uncertainty of market access. We do not know how much beef we can sell into the Japanese system. There is a range of imponderables that cannot be assessed; they cannot be dealt with by delivering a throwaway line such as that used by Mr Casey.

Mr Randell: He got them all off the back of a truck.

Mr STONEMAN: Exactly. It also needs to be understood that sugar is not just a viable industry in the State--and I am sure the honourable member for Mirani will take this up in more detail later--but it is important for rural communities as well as for the exports of this nation. The tariff structure has placed the industry under fire, and it is criminal that people have supported that structure. I include in my condemnation those members of the coalition who did not see fit to support the maintenance of the structure that was promised and who went with this so-called free trade policy. They

are running the risk of having imports compete against one of our most vital industries. It is putting the sugar industry at risk. Tariff barriers have been used in the past to protect the inefficient and the weak, and I agree that they should be diminished. But no-one can tell me that the great sugar industry in this State is anything but one of the most productive in the world. If we allow a flood of cheap imports from subsidised countries, the viability of 6 500 cane-farmers and their families, as well as the communities in which they live and which support them, will be put at risk. They could be devastated.

That is what we need to consider when looking at the framework of our commodity industries. Look at aluminium and copper prices, as well as the prices of lead, nickel and wheat. When we combine that problem with the devastation of the wool price, we can imagine what it is doing to the inland areas of the State. While I am on nickel prices, it would be remiss of me not to comment briefly on the Dallhold situation, and apply my comments to the nickel treatment plant at Yabulu near Townsville. One of the major considerations we have is the structure of this industry in Queensland, and particularly north Queensland. There are 850 or so jobs involved with this plant, plus a huge investment—an investment in which the Queensland State Government holds 28 per cent. This huge investment is being put at risk because of the unreasonable demands placed upon the industry by the State Government, aided and abetted no doubt by some well-meaning groups. But this has been done, it seems to me, based on no factual evidence that has been put forward concerning the proposed unloading facility.

The former Labor Mayor of Townsville, Mike Reynolds, who is currently Chairman of the Townsville Port Authority, and the Government have decided that it would be a good thing for Queensland Nickel if it spent the lion's share of \$80m-odd in constructing a new outside unloading facility at the port of Townsville. Many people do not support that. I support it if it can be done so that the Government pays its fair share and contributes through the normal processes. I support it if it can be implemented in such a way that there is no major disruption to a whole range of people in the town. In that regard, I draw attention to the community, to the traffic flow and to the difficulties faced by a number of small schools, such as St Mary's in West End, which have major problems. All of those things have to be added up in order to determine the real cost not only to the local community and to Dallhold but also to the community of Queensland as a whole. I believe that the way in which the State Government has approached the facilitation of the need to maintain the flow of ore into Townsville so that Queensland Nickel or Yabulu can continue to operate has been appalling.

Now that Queensland Nickel is in receivership, one of the problems is that the banks will be looking for someone to buy the operation. It is reasonable that they do that. However, will they have much success when they find that a large share-holder in the form of the Queensland Government is forcing that company into making a huge investment that has not been shown to be necessary? I acknowledge that the appeal process is now under way. I do not blame the responsible management of that company for trying to get at least access to the independent umpire to see whether or not all of those processes have been observed. The Treasurer is saying that the responsible thing to do is to forget all about that and put the whole company operation at risk by putting the lion's share of that \$80m-odd into constructing an outside facility. That is totally irresponsible.

It is all very well to try to milk companies such as Dallhold. The fact of the matter is that, in the present environment, every company is in a fragile state. Under those circumstances, not only the 850 or so direct jobs are affected but also the whole of Townsville is affected.

Mr Davies interjected.

Mr STONEMAN: The member for Townsville should understand that that could send the economy of that area crashing through the floor. He will not give the support that those people and that company need. He should be standing up and shouting from the rooftops about the need for that company to be supported and the need for this

Government to make decisions on the basis of reality rather than using the throw-away line that the company should forget about appeals. They are the sorts of things that send into the community signals that make investors nervous.

I will not go through the process of drawing to the attention of the House the unbelievable charade that the Treasurer engaged in earlier this year in respect of foreign investment. We all know what happened in that case. We saw Daikyo almost go home. We saw Kumagai-Gumai say that, because of financial matters and so on, it was not worth fiddling around in Queensland. We saw many negative signals going out to the community. The Treasurer is the person who complains and says that members of the Opposition in this State are the merchants of doom and gloom. I remind honourable members that we are the very people who, in consultation with our conservative colleagues, brought this State to pre-eminence in terms of developing it to the extent that it has put Australia on the map of the world and of having the capacity to lead this country out of the recession, as the Treasurer says, provided that people are given an opportunity, provided that the Government gets its hand out of the pocket of business and provided it takes its hand off the steering wheel and allows free enterprise to do its own thing. That is what Governments should be about—facilitating, approving and making sure that free enterprise and the private sector can get on with spending money and developing the State. In this whole city, we do not see one crane. One needs a microscope to find any building operations. This State cannot afford to allow the people who work in the building industry to be idle. Work has stopped. It is all very well for the Government to lampoon previous administrators who said that people should count the cranes. However, when one can count the cranes, one can count the businesses that are going forward positively. I say to the Treasurer that his economic grasp of the things that need to be done has to come under question. It is not simply a matter of balancing the Budget in terms of a statement or a document that might be correct in accounting terms but which in terms of the management of the State has no respectability whatsoever.

There are a few other matters to which I want to refer. As I said, by the Government not paying the bills but shelving them until after 30 June, a balanced Budget will come to fruition. Let us consider a number of the programs that have been put in place by this Government and which have proved to be a costly waste of time. I refer to the women's sport advancement unit and grants to conservation organisations so that they can stifle development. At present, impact studies are such that a developer is frightened away before he starts. The cost of an impact study will break a developer. As we saw in the north just recently, at its whim this Government can say, "Sorry, boys, you've done your money." That is the sort of environment in this State into which investors have to come and in which they have to make decisions about whether they will operate here or move to New South Wales and other States where they know that they will get a better crack of the whip.

I am sure that my colleague the Deputy Leader of the Opposition will speak about the Indy race. It is a pretty good effort for the Government to put on a race and lose \$19m that it owns up to. I wonder what the real figure will be.

Mr Borbidge: The Treasurer says it is not a cost to the taxpayer because they have only borrowed the money.

Mr STONEMAN: I must admit that I was somewhat amused by the Treasurer when he said, "It is not a cost to the taxpayer, it is just borrowed." If the Government is not responsible to the taxpayer by way of borrowings, who is? The restructuring and reform programs are verbiage that do not amount to anything productive. This State has to get back into a productive mode so that more money is produced by the product of the farm than it costs the farm to operate. That is the key. That is the fundamental point. That operates households and businesses. The State is no different, except that it is larger. If the Government is spending more than it is generating in terms of real revenue, it is going backwards. This year, in net finance terms, we have not seen a huge change from the previous year—and this is year one. Although on 30 June last year the Treasurer claimed to have done a marvellous job, the fact is that he was spending from

and following through on programs initiated by the previous Government. Members of the National Party are proud of those programs. We know that the Government juggled things, but it could not pull the plug on the responsible processes that had been put in place. In many instances, those processes have been followed.

The Government talks for the first time about adopting responsible attitudes to capital works and non-recurrent expenditure on social infrastructure, etc. Those are very fine words. That had been going on for years. Weak guidelines have been put in place for Japanese and foreign investment. In Queensland, Japanese controlled and owned businesses do not always mean jobs for Queenslanders and money for the Queensland economy. We must make sure that the guidelines are such that the businesses are productive. I do not think anyone would disagree with that. We have had a fine booklet put out. We had the big fracas with the Japanese in Cairns and across the State. At the end of the day, they still do not know where they stand; nor do the people of Queensland. We need to get those matters back on the agenda and to make sure that they are firmly in place so that investors who come into this country, productively spend their money, create jobs and create further investment opportunities receive a fair return for their effort and investment. The entire State will be infinitely better off. For the past three decades that occurred, and it will occur again when we are returned to the Treasury bench. And there will be a recognition of that.

Another issue that is causing a depressant in the economy is the land tax debate. I do not know the final figures, but I assume that they will be coming to hand soon. Receipts for land tax are approaching \$200m. That will be in excess of the Budget forecast. That money is coming directly out of the embattled business community. It is all very well to say that land tax charges should not be passed on to tenants, that that is unfair and the charges should be taken from profits. That is an incredible statement. Businesses have to absorb all costs. They add up all their borrowings, their capital costs and their recurrent costs. That is the basis of their investment. If it costs them more than they are getting out of rent, if they want to survive, they have no alternative other than to increase rents. Land tax charges are part of the total cost. They have to pay insurance, rates and all the factors that are part and parcel of the operation of any investment. Land tax in this State needs to be brought under control.

Recently in Cairns, the Leader of the Opposition, Mr Cooper, gave an unequivocal undertaking--it had been given previously on a number of occasions--that the National Party would phase out land tax. As part of the phasing-out process there will need to be a far more equitable structure. Some areas of this State provide a tremendous amount to its economy. I think particularly of the Gold Coast and the north coast. Small shops, businessmen and entrepreneurs are being crippled by the impost of a land tax. That was never envisaged. When a matter such as this is brought to the attention of the Government, something should be done about it. All that we hear from the Government is that it cannot wipe out \$200m without creating damage somewhere else. I refer to the abolition of death duties. It was said that death duties could not be abolished; it was impossible. The moment that death duties in this State were wiped out, an unbelievable boom occurred. The Government has to make appropriate for the times the taxation structure so that a further incentive to investment in this State is created. That is what the National Party in Government will be doing.

We need greater support for regional bodies. When the Goss Government came to power, it talked about regionalisation. The Cape York enterprise zone was wiped out and replaced by a body that does nothing and cannot do anything. It is stifled. There is no money. We had a couple of seminars. Then there was nothing. Although it is all very well to talk about the regionalisation of Government services and to say that this Government is putting more people out into the regions and closing down jobs in the cities, relative to the position which previously existed, I invite honourable members to go to the small towns and ask the people what they think.

I refer to the position in one of the small towns in my electorate--Home Hill. Outside the courthouse the beautiful palm trees are dying and the lawns are dead. The

place is becoming derelict. They are the signals that are being sent to the community. The police services are under threat. There may be more policemen and more court officers in the region, for all I know, but that is not apparent in those small towns. As I said in the earlier debate on art unions, the bankers, the courthouse officers, the police, the schoolteachers and the railway officials--all those people--form a vital part of the community that otherwise would not exist.

Mr Randell: The Government is ripping the heart out of country towns.

Mr STONEMAN: Exactly. If those few officials leave, it means that a lot of those towns will not exist as they did previously. We all know that Birdsville is one of the famous places to which public servants like to be transferred. Birdsville has a lot of romance associated with it. It is a harsh environment. I recall the story of the policeman, Bob Goad, who was stationed at Boulia and who wanted to be transferred to Birdsville. The authorities said, "We cannot send you there until you have four or five kids", or the school will close. They are the things that are not understood. As the member for Mirani said, when the policeman or the barrier fence inspector is removed from a small town such as Birdsville--there are dozens and dozens of those people--the heart of that community is torn out. Part of the process involved in responsible management is making sure that those small towns are supported by Government, that they have access to basic services and that the people there play a major role in the structure of that community. Governments have that responsibility. It is not simply a matter of saying that such communities have to be more efficient and more cost effective. If we said that--if we were talking about absolute cost efficiency--we would be selling the school playgrounds and constructing high-rise buildings on them. If that were done, imagine what would happen. If we take those sorts of statements to their full conclusion, they result in that scenario.

It is reasonable that the Treasurer takes comfort from the Queensland June 1991 unemployment figures. They have improved. That is great. Of course, we must also recognise that, in some instances, the figures are affected by seasonal employment. The sugar industry is now in full swing and providing many jobs right up and down the coast. Additional people are being employed to service the physical machinery of the sugar industry. A number of other operations are the same. Unfortunately, however, we could expect that to be somewhat short term. The housing industry has shown no major or significant sustained upturn. Although the number of housing approvals rose 14.8 per cent in May--and that is often a reliable economic indicator--it does not mean at the end of the day that it will be the stimulant that we would have hoped. I suggest to the Treasurer that he may be pinning his hopes too much on housing, but I say in the spirit of the best interests of this State that I hope that trend is not only sustained but also increased, because that is vital.

I say to the Treasurer that he is attempting to score cheap political points by saying that Queensland is the best-managed State financially. We are the best-managed State if we maintain the protocols of the past, and that is why Treasury plays such an important role. Whilst the Treasurer is correct in saying that Queensland has the best net debt ratio to gross product and population, he should admit that he inherited that situation from the previous Government. He cannot forget or overlook the 32 years prior to this Government coming to office. It is just not possible to do that.

Mr Prest: We will never forget that. We keep on reading the Fitzgerald report.

Mr STONEMAN: I take that interjection. I can tell the honourable member one thing with great certainty: the people in the community are remembering it. They are saying, "Wait a minute. We voted for a change in the personalities, but we did not think we would get a change in the processes." The public service is in total disarray. Literally hundreds of top personnel, people with a tremendous amount of expertise, are leaving the public service in disgust and dismay. It is affecting their families. The services of those people are being lost. People in Queensland are remembering, all right. When the time comes for the next poll, they will remember.

The other point that should be noted--and I guess that we will not have to wait long to find out--is that the estimate for the next Budget, we hear, looks like being a deficit of some \$200m. The dogs are barking that. The problem is that there is not only a depressant on the provision of further services to small towns and those value-producing areas of the State but also the next round of pressures are coming on and the bills that were left in the drawer will have to be picked up. I know that primary industry will have some real crunches. We must consider the problems that are being created by the diminution of those services not only in the real loss of those services but also in the signal that they send out to the community. In the last year, there were massive increases in some sections of Government expenditure, up to 12 per cent on the previous Budget. That was as a result of the Labor Party in this State trying to push through as many reforms as possible. I refer to the reforms in local government. That certainly created a major backlash against the State Labor Government, so it is attempting to fix that up by again twiddling the knobs of management. I assure honourable members on the Government side that those things are also being recognised in the community. People can see that tinkering. To the average person, local government is the most visible tier of Government. People can see the disruption. They are hearing about it. I have a letter here from the Burdekin Shire Council discussing the way in which the Grants Commission provides funding. The Burdekin Shire Council is acknowledged as being the worst treated in the State in respect of the new criteria. Those are the sorts of things that are disrupting shire councils. However, shire councils are being disrupted not only in those ways but also in terms of their management, in terms of the election processes and in terms of the structure of internal and external boundaries. All of those matters are being recognised by the community, and the community will make a noise about it.

The Government is frantically cutting expenditure in what are seen to be non-essential areas to balance the Budget that has run off the rails in terms of its application to those reform processes. The normal operation that is run by the Treasury has no problem. It is business as usual. The way in which the State's finances are managed and the way in which investments are made are going along well because, over the previous 30-odd years, the processes were in train. Education spending has increased by 30 per cent, and spending on welfare has increased by almost a quarter. As I mentioned earlier, other areas have been treated abysmally. I know that the Treasurer has freely acknowledged that those cut-backs will mean the death of many small rural towns that are dependent upon services. That is an unbelievable statement to make. Department of Primary Industries offices, ambulance services, fire brigade boards, courthouses, rail services and hospital care will all be administered regionally from major provincial centres. That is quite ludicrous. The North Queensland Electricity Board is now chaired by a gentleman from Mount Isa. He could well be a marvellous administrator. Lo and behold, the defeated Labor candidate for the seat of Flinders is a new member of the North Queensland Electricity Board. He lives in Cloncurry. The chairman of the parks and gardens--I am not too sure what Mr Noel Wilson is, but he is a nice gentleman and a Labor alderman--is another member of the North Queensland Electricity Board. He is without commercial expertise.

Mr Randell: The State Treasurer of the ALP is the chairman of the Mackay Hospitals Board.

Mr STONEMAN: That is incredible. Those are the sorts of things that are sending shock waves and signals out into the community about the way in which this Government is operating. These measures have been forced on the Goss Government because of its pre-election pledge of no new taxes or increases in existing ones. The public service union has pleaded with the Government to broaden its tax base. The Labor Government is trying to disguise this so-called discipline under the no new tax pledge, but quite frankly it is failing to fulfil its responsibilities to all Queenslanders. There is a great deal more I could say, but the Budget will soon be introduced and there will be plenty of time to debate that in due course.

I wish to conclude by again raising the grave concerns that I have in relation to the State Public Sector Superannuation Fund. This is something that is giving rise to the gravest of concern not only in Queensland, but also across Australia. As I mentioned in my speech to this House in the Adjournment debate on Tuesday evening, Q Super is telling its members that they can leave their benefits in the super fund and draw down against that fund as though it were an approved deposit or roll-over fund in the normal way. The industry is quite adamant and senior observers within the industry say that this process breaches the Commonwealth Occupational Superannuation Standards Regulations in two ways. I will repeat those for the benefit of members. The superannuation regulations state that scheme members may leave their benefits in their super funds only while they remain in the labour force. Scheme members who permanently retire must withdraw their ETPs in cash or roll them over into approved deposit funds. I am told that Q Super is advising its retiring members to declare that they are looking for work, even when they are not, in order to take advantage of the draw-down offer. Unfortunately, the member and not the fund is legally responsible for the declaration. The regulation contained in circular 18 (10) states--

"Where a member decides to take a benefit before any maximum age that may apply, the entire benefit must be paid, or, in the case of a pension, commence to be paid. A superannuation fund may not act as an ADF and retain part of a benefit while allowing the remainder of a benefit to be paid."

On Tuesday night, I asked the Treasurer to do what he could and that the board of trustees be urged to suspend those retirement offers until the Insurance and Superannuation Commission can rule on the legality of those processes. It is a serious matter. It is putting the taxation structure of those funds at risk and the livelihoods of hundreds of dedicated and honest people are being put at risk.

Those are the sorts of things that must be confronted in any budgetary structure for the management of the State and the way in which matters dealt with in Appropriation Bills are put in place. I look forward with interest to seeing the structure of the State Budget which is to be brought down on 5 September. Every member of this House must understand that things are very difficult. I acknowledge that the Treasurer is structuring the Budget framework at a difficult time, but, nevertheless, Queensland's lot will not be improved and the State will not be returned to the position it once held unless we accept that the productive sector, that is, the wealth-producing sector, must be supported.

Mr D'ARCY (Woodridge) (3.20 p.m.): I congratulate the Treasurer on his understanding of Queensland's economy at this very difficult time. The Treasurer has outlined in detail what the Labor Party has been able to do in a budgetary sense in the present financial climate in Australia. It is a tragedy to see the National Party in its death throes putting forward a speaker such as the honourable member for Burdekin, Mr Stoneman, who obviously has no concept of either Treasury or budgetary matters or what is happening in Queensland. It amazes me to listen to him refer to what the National Party has handed to the Labor Party, because after 32 years of National Party Government, Queensland should have had a thriving manufacturing industry, it should have been engaged in the tertiary treatment of its minerals and Gladstone should have been the centre of one of the most thriving industries in the world. All we can see is where the National Party spent the money. The National Party Government appointed its minions and told the superannuation funds which companies to invest in throughout Australia; for example, the failed companies of Qintex and Bartletts. One could go on and on listing the areas in which Queensland Government money was spent. The Labor Party has corrected a lot of that and it will not happen again. Under this Labor Government, Queensland will be in a much better position during improved fiscal times.

If the former National Party Government had invested in targeted areas with a view towards long-term investment, particularly in the Gladstone area, many new industries would now be established in that area. The tertiary treatment of minerals would be under way and other industries would have been established in that region. Instead, we have railway lines to nowhere and port facilities that do not have the

equipment and cannot handle the ships that they need to handle. This Government will be paying this off for the next two decades, yet Mr Stoneman says, "Look at what we have left you." The Labor Party knows what the National Party left for the State of Queensland; it left the greatest economic tragedy that this country has ever seen. This is the best State in the Commonwealth with the greatest potential during boom times, yet the National Party Government wasted the opportunities. Mr Stoneman referred to Greenvale and the nickel mine and letting Bond invest in those industries. At that time, hundreds of millions of dollars of taxpayers' money was spent by the National Party Government in an attempt to prop up investments. It allowed people such as Bond and his company Dallhold to invest in the industry. Yet Mr Stoneman wants us to bail Bond's receivers out. What a lot of rot!

The National Party has not changed its style one iota. Although the National Party was not the subject I chose for my speech, I cannot help criticising its performance so that the people of Queensland will understand what the National Party is all about. National Party members have not even woken up to the fact that they have lost Government. In spite of the fact that 18 months have elapsed since the election, the Opposition does not understand its function. Let us hope that having sufficient time to learn will make a difference because members of the National Party will be in opposition for a damned long time. In Australia presently, some very serious economic problems exist. Many of them stem from the operations of financial institutions. I will outline some of the problems that have occurred involving financial institutions, and some of the ways in which those problems can be resolved.

Mr Veivers: They don't like Labor Governments.

Mr D'ARCY: Why would they? The Labor Governments know that, to a large extent, financial institutions are responsible for what has happened to the Australian economy. The banks, which are the leaders of a large group known as financial institutions, have done virtually nothing for this country. People are totally disillusioned by the trouble that banks have got this country and themselves into. The Federal Government is trying desperately to stabilise the economy by reducing interest rates, but the banks will not play ball. This begs the question: why are the banks not playing ball?

Members of the National Party, members of the Liberal Party and people of their ilk do not care about average citizens and small businesspeople, but it must be understood that those two groups are the people who are being asked to bear the burden caused by the high-fliers who allowed the banks to cream off an additional 2 per cent or 3 per cent above the interest rate that should apply in this country. Let me inform the House of the charges imposed by banks. The charges vary depending on which bank it is and the type of transaction but, generally speaking, up to 14 different charges can apply to a bank loan. For example, there are line fees on account; overdraft limit fees; account-keeping fees; settlement fees; loan administration charges; unused limit on overdraft charges; cheque returned, unpaid fees charge--which is a beauty because it is applied to a person's account when a dishonoured cheque is deposited and also to the account of the person who bounced the cheque, as though he has some money with which to pay the fee; and there is an excess transaction fee. Fees charges on loan accounts can add 2 per cent or 3 per cent to the actual interest charged on repayments. When a bank sets a rate of interest, does it tell the borrower when it intends to vary that rate? Of course not. The banks simply tell the borrower that the interest rate is variable. If a person goes beyond his overdraft limit, he will be charged an extra 2 per cent or 3 per cent in interest on the amount. The banks increase the rates of interest to suit themselves, but reduce interest rates very slowly.

Generally, people who have savings accounts with banks think that their money is safe and do not realise that the interest paid on those accounts is being juggled. If a bank's customer leaves funds in a savings account for a lengthy period without finding out the new rates that are applicable and the new conditions that apply, that person will find that he receives the lowest possible interest rate that can be paid on deposits. For various reasons, average businesspeople and the ordinary citizen are not able to take

advantage of the highest rates of interest paid on deposits, but fees and charges are nevertheless imposed on their savings accounts. The banks have a great deal to answer for in terms of the damage that they have caused to the economy of this nation. According to the *Australian Financial Review*, the ANZ Bank lent Warwick Fairfax \$1.2 billion without even meeting him and, obviously, without reviewing his accounts. The Opposition spokesman earlier sang the praises of the high-fliers such as the Bonds, the Skases, the Elliotts, and even BHP--Australia's most respected company. It should not be forgotten that BHP lent \$1.2 billion of its share-holders' money to keep big challengers off its back--in other words, it used that money for vested interests. The reason that BHP is still at the top of the market is that the banks--the vested interests--have enabled it to remain there. Moreover, the big media magnates had entree into the top financial institutions because they took bank executives for cruises on their boats and to lunch in smart restaurants. These are opportunities that an average person would never have.

During the economic downturn that Australia has just been through, the banks funded projects put forward by high-fliers that an average businessman would not have been game to put in front of a local bank manager. Small businesspeople had difficulty arranging bank finance and at this very moment the banks are not lending. They are pulling in their loans at a time when the average businessperson who wants to expand and try to contribute to the economic recovery of this country needs financial support. In this country, financial institutions have shown no initiative at all. They just want to collect the interest and count their pennies, and it is a pity that they did not adopt that attitude when they were dealing with the Bonds, the Skases, the Spalvins, etc. Their transactions with the high-fliers have rebounded on the Australian people. During the recent recession, the first thing that the banks did was panic and rush in with receivers to take over small businesses. They would not take the same kind of action these days for the simple reason that they cannot afford to do so. If some of Australia's leading financial institutions had to undergo close financial scrutiny, many of them would have a great deal of explaining to do to the Australian people and to the World Bank. Presently, the appointment of receivers results in the payment of additional fees and charges, and the end result is that many companies are being devalued and are vulnerable in the marketplace. These additional charges have compounded the effect that the banks created in the first instance. During the recession, the banks rushed in to appoint receivers to handle the affairs of many companies that should not have been subjected to that type of action and would otherwise have been at the forefront in the economic recovery of this nation.

Receivers, in particular, have done tremendous damage. There is no way that they can resile from that. On a personal basis, recently, I received a cheque from the receivers of Cambridge Credit. It goes back to some shares I inherited many years ago. The receivers for that company had been operating for 20-odd years. They had large tracts of land and had been paid during that whole period. There have been cases before the High Court involving rorts pulled through those receivers. It is absolutely frightening when we think that receivers will do the best thing by failed business or failed entrepreneurs.

We and the banks need to come up with a new system. Otherwise, we will be in the same situation as the one we see at the moment around Brisbane, the Gold Coast, Sydney and Melbourne, where there are bomb sites, craters and unfinished buildings. They can be seen in Sydney, Melbourne and Adelaide. They can be seen anywhere. They are even here in Brisbane and on the Gold Coast. It is a tragedy. The bankers tell us that such-and-such a building down the road can be finished for \$4m, \$10m or \$100m--pick a price. On today's market, if \$100m was spent on it, it would not return the 10 per cent that would be necessary for somebody to pick up on that investment. Probably some \$60m has been wasted on it. In the current situation, there are many such examples around this State. It is a tragedy that that is the case.

To some extent, I still blame the financial institutions and the people who run them. In recent times, it was very refreshing and rewarding to hear the Premier of this State talk about our financial institutions, because we have the potential for a great

future, particularly the way that our finances have been structured through our superannuation boards. By the turn of the century, our own boards will be holding probably something like \$600 billion in capital. Where will that be invested? If it is to be invested by the people who have been investing to date--the bankers, financial institutions and superannuation boards--God help Australia and God help Queensland, for the simple reason that they do not have enough initiative. They follow one another around like sheep. They have no training. They are superannuated clowns. They are salary-earners. We need men and women of initiative to take some steps in this direction to be able to guide some of that money. As I said, it was refreshing to hear the Premier of this State say that it is time that some of them looked at putting long-term venture or patient capital, as he called it, into some of the ventures that have proved and will prove beneficial to Queensland in the long term.

It is now pretty obvious to most people that even the space station on Cape York will be a financially commercial operation. If that is the case, why will some of the bankers and financial institutions not look at funding ventures such as the Cape York or the Gladstone projects? They will not look at doing so because the other sheep are not looking at those projects. If one is wrong, they all want to be wrong. They all want to be in the tin, and they are all in the tin at present. That is what we have been looking at with this type of investor, this type of person. We have failed entrepreneurs and failed accountants running superannuation funds. These people have never made a success of business in their lives. The only business they have made a success of is taking a percentage of other businesspeople's money. It is a tragedy to see some boards constituted the way they are at the present time.

I believe that Queensland has a tremendous potential in the financial field under this Government. We have the potential. In a difficult financial time, we have made a success of it and we are making a success of it. We are reorganising things to make sure that they are efficient and effective and that they have a fair financial base. In a better financial climate the people of Queensland will look forward to what a Labor Government can achieve for them and this State.

Debate interrupted.

DISTINGUISHED VISITOR

Hon. M. R. Polley (Tasmania)

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Campbell): Order! Before I call the member for Toowong, I would just like to recognise the presence of the Speaker of the Tasmanian Parliament in the public gallery.

Honourable members: Hear, hear!

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 1)

Debate resumed.

Mr BEANLAND (Toowong--Leader of the Liberal Party) (3.34 p.m.): Thirty-two years ago, Queensland was called the Cinderella State. Having listened to the previous speaker, I am afraid that it will not be long before, once again, we are being called the Cinderella State. If we look at the economic situation of this State and this nation--a situation created by Labor, I might add--we find that it will not be too long before, once again, we are back to being called the Cinderella State. The reality is that Labor's actions speak much louder than its words. Let us look at the current recession. I remind members that this is the "recession we had to have" to solve our balance of payments problems--problems that, I might add, are getting worse day by day. One has only to look at the way in which Labor has destroyed families, industry and the lives of young people. It is destroying the economy of this State and it has destroyed any hope for the future of the young people of this State and this nation. Labor itself, of course, continually

propagates the antiquated work practices ideas--work practices to ensure that there will be no productivity gain or competition in the marketplace in the future in this State. These are the sorts of policies which Labor has enunciated.

Government members interjected.

Mr BEANLAND: It is good to hear the noise coming from those on the other side. They know that what I say is true. It hurts to tell the truth. I throw the truth back to Labor. We know what Labor is like. We have the "recession we had to have". The recession is destroying Queensland, as you would appreciate, Mr Deputy Speaker. The problems which are confronting this State are growing day by day. Every week, we hear cries from the current Treasurer that he has to balance the books, that he is \$200m out in this year's Budget. Last night, I am sure he was very pleased to pick up the \$100m scam through the amendment to the Auctioneers and Agents Act. It showed that the Labor Government will go to any lengths to acquire additional funds to balance its Budget. Of course, the only concern of those on the other side is to keep themselves in office. They do not give a damn about the average citizen, the worker in this State. In the last 24 hours, we have seen evidence of that again in this State.

Let us look at the Labor Party's 10-point strategy for Queensland's economic future. According to Labor's election promises last time, the strategy means more jobs, better community services and improved quality of life. Let us have a look at what Labor has done. Let us look at that 10-point plan over the last 20 months, just to see what it says and what action there has been. According to Labor, it has made a commitment to increase the benefits received for primary industries through greater Queensland-based processing of minerals and agricultural products. Let us look at what has happened. One of the members who preceded me in this debate mentioned the Gladstone aluminium smelter and the fact that the Boyne Island aluminium smelter has been lost to Queensland and to Australia because of the actions of the Labor Party. Because the union bosses would not agree to the sale of the Gladstone Power Station to private interests, the whole duplication process--the Boyne Island smelter--was put off. That project would have created hundreds of jobs and hundreds of millions of dollars worth of additional export income. Billions of dollars worth of investment in the Gladstone area has been lost.

The Townsville nickel refinery is currently going downhill because this Labor Treasurer is failing to allow the industry to import nickel ore across Halifax Bay. The Government wants the company to bear most of the cost of the \$88m harbour works. That will make the nickel refinery non-competitive. I point out to members of the Labor Party that there is such a thing as international competition and the international marketplace. Today, it does not matter what we involve ourselves in; Queensland is part of the international marketplace. I know that Labor likes to sweep that under the carpet and pretend that it is managing some sort of island economy. However, I can assure honourable members that that is not the case. One only has to look at what happened in eastern Europe. It was a shock to the people of eastern Europe when they found out just how far behind the rest of the world they really were. In fact, unless we can improve our competitiveness in the international marketplace, the rest of the world will start to leave Queensland behind. That is what the nickel refinery at Townsville is all about. It is about importing the nickel ore, processing the nickel ore and selling the nickel ore at international prices. A 10c additional cost per pound of nickel will mean that, at the end of the day, the company is not competitive and it will be forced to close its doors and go on its way.

I turn to railway coal freights and the effect that they have had on the Collinsville coalmine. The promise that the Government made in that regard has not been kept. Associated with that is the commitment to the diversification of Queensland's manufacturing and service industries. That is something that has gone completely by the board under Labor. It was a nice, easy motherhood statement on which it has not delivered. Then there was the commitment to the further development and promotion of the Queensland tourist industry. Let us examine what has happened to Queensland's

tourist industry under Labor and see what the reality really is. There is a complete lack of confidence in the tourism sector. It is in the doldrums. One only has to consider what the Treasurer is doing in relation to land tax to see that he is ripping the guts out of the tourist industry in this State. The Treasurer has turned land tax into a tax on the tourist industry. In the last three years, land tax has risen by some 400 per cent. It is a wealth tax. It is a major tax for the Government. No attempt has been made whatsoever to ameliorate that tax on the small-business community. If Labor thinks that by passing a piece of legislation so that property-owners have to bear the brunt of that tax it will stop it from being passed on, I can assure it that that is fallacy. It will be passed on. At the end of the day, the small business owners will cop it and they will then have to attempt to pass it on to the consumer. If one examines the other aspects of the tourist industry and promotion of Queensland's tourist industry, one finds that Labor has again fallen flat on its face because over the last 20 months tourism has certainly been in the doldrums.

The Government made a commitment to enhance Queensland's trade performance. I cite the example of the coal rail freights as another example of an election promise that has not been kept. At present, Collinsville is in desperate straits. Other Queensland coal-miners are starting to go down that track. The South African coalmines are coming into play. The coalmines in Asian countries are coming on stream, and they are far more competitive in the international marketplace than Queensland coalmines because of these hidden additional costs that are being passed on. Prior to the last election, Labor promised that in Government it would, as a first priority, review coal rail freight charges in the context of a comprehensive review of all State taxes and charges. It is now 20 months since that promise was made. The Treasurer has washed his hands of it. It is not a first, second or third priority; it is not even a 100th priority. Labor has swept aside that election promise. What is at stake here is not just a few coal-miners but a huge export income for this nation. The largest export industry in this State is at stake. Hundreds and thousands of jobs are at stake. The livelihood of whole towns depends upon the coal industry. Yet Labor has turned its back on Queensland's coal-miners.

The Government has made a commitment to foster a cooperative industrial relations environment. Honourable members know what has happened in relation to that promise. It is another one that went out the door. The first thing that Labor did on coming to office was to abolish voluntary employment agreements and the practice of enterprise bargaining. Since that time, the union bosses have again taken over and the clock has been turned back. I invite honourable members to consider what has happened elsewhere in this nation where enterprise bargaining has been allowed to blossom. I cite the example of the SPC canning factory in Victoria. As a result of enterprise bargaining, within six months the management of that factory was able to turn that non-profitable factory--in fact it was about to close its doors--into such a profitable factory that the management was able to repay to the workers their foregone wages over that six-month period. Of course, that is the sort of thing that we should be seeing here in Queensland. Instead, what we are seeing is the enforcement of compulsory unionism, no increases or improvements in productivity at all and Labor sweeping the whole thing under the carpet. Labor does not want to go forward. It wants to go backwards and force Queensland's industries back to the dim Dark Ages. The Government has made a commitment to increase Queensland's capital resources by expanding the State's financial infrastructure. Of course, it put paid to that when it sold out Queensland companies by allowing the provisions of the Corporations Act to be implemented and all those powers to be transferred to the Federal arena. That has meant it is now more difficult to get head offices and company structures up and running in Queensland, as well as the additional financial resources that we need to be brought into the State. Labor has done nothing since that time.

The Labor Leader, Mr Goss, in more recent times has tried to get superannuation companies to invest in risky venture capital projects. He talks about that as though it were the superannuation funds' own personal money, and not that of the policy-holders.

We all know what a farce that is. We have seen what has happened to the Labor States that have tried that on; we have only to look at Victoria, South Australia and Western Australia. Only today the South Australian Premier, Mr Bannon--the man the Labor Party turned to after John Cain got into so much trouble--has had to inject hundreds of millions of dollars into the State Government Insurance Commission because of the problems it has got itself into, having been involved in various risky ventures. Many are in the State of Victoria, which has gone down the tube. So we can see that that commitment also has not been met.

There is then a commitment to revitalise Queensland's public sector. One has only to look at the turmoil and low morale in the Queensland public service to see what Labor has done to that once great organisation, once admired as the best public service in the nation. Morale is so low that people are leaving in droves. Of course, others are being chased out by Labor because they are loyal Queensland public servants who have done a great job for the State for many years. When we look at some of the people who are coming into the public sector, it is fair to say that there are rough times ahead for the Labor Government. Maybe it will fall on its own sword as a result of the people it is appointing to various public service positions. These people have come from ministerial staffs and from Labor State departments. They are people who have been responsible for many of the ills that have befallen the John Cain Government in Victoria, the South Australian Bannon Labor Government and the Western Australian Labor Government. Many of those people now find themselves right here in Queensland, running the Queensland public service and this Labor Government. So we can look forward to a number of problems cropping up in the public sector; problems that will send Queensland further down the Victorian road. We are already heading in that direction.

Labor has made a commitment to expand job training and skills development. What wonderful rhetoric! But where are the jobs? There are no jobs. The private sector has been kicked at every turn; there is no encouragement at all. Recently, the Noosa north shore development was approved by the local authority and then by the Local Government Court, the umpire. It was approved in many respects by Mr Fitzgerald, because even though he had had a look at the area he did not include it for declaration as a World Heritage area because it had a low conservation value. That north shore project proposed by Leisuremark is a prime example of a development that has been approved by all the umpires. But along came the Government, interfering and saying that the project could not go ahead. It was ministerial interference in the rezoning process. That is again a clear message to all developers and the business community in the State. Those sectors are treated like lepers by this Labor Government. I understand that that is a term now being taken up elsewhere, not just in Noosa, because the Labor Government is treating the business community right throughout the State, from Coolangatta to Thursday Island, like lepers. But nowhere is there a clearer example than that of the north shore of Noosa. No jobs are being created in Queensland because at every turn this Government tries to discourage development. One in every three young people is unemployed in Queensland; in some parts of the State it is more than that. That is hardly a record to be proud of. Indeed, it is a despicable record.

Labor has committed itself to implementing a comprehensive regional development strategy. What a farce that has turned out to be. The north Queensland regional zone was given the boot, and the Government has done nothing at all to replace it. The Labor Government's 10-point economic future for Queensland, written no doubt by Wayne Swan with the rhetoric provided by Wayne Goss, has fallen in a heap. Nothing has flowed from it to encourage private enterprise jobs and economic growth. There has been no new industry; no new economic future has flowed from the plan. Business is leaving Queensland because this Government has not yet recognised that there is more to Queensland than simply talking about the Queensland Budget and managing the State's finances. The economic future of Queensland is in economic growth and development, and that will come about only through the private sector. All we get from Labor is more doom and gloom.

The backlog of court cases in Queensland is growing, and in the coming months only 12 judges will be sitting on the bench of the Queensland Supreme Court when in fact there should be 18. So we are six below complement. Three judges have not been reappointed even though the Government has been asked to reappoint them. Everything we have said has fallen on deaf ears. I appeal to the Government in the name of justice in this State--although I know that might be a little foreign to the Labor Party--to appoint those three extra Supreme Court judges so we can get on with dispensing some justice in Queensland and reduce that long queue of court cases. It has got so bad in recent times that even the Chief Justice has been forced to write to one of the Queensland newspapers pointing out the backlog and the problems, including the lack of support and resources provided by the State Government. Even though some eight weeks ago assistance was promised by Mr Goss, nothing has happened to relieve the situation. It has only become worse, because now we find that one of our Supreme Court judges has gone off sick and the number, because of leave and so forth, has been reduced to 12. The situation becomes more parlous by the day.

The other matter upon which I want to touch briefly is that of the Queensland racing industry. This year, the Government's coffers will be boosted by at least \$73m from the racing industry, including at least \$53m from the TAB. Yet all we have heard from Labor is "gimme, gimme" more from the racing industry. Labor wants to take more from the industry and give little or nothing back. This year, the TAB pay-out to the clubs in the three racing codes will be in the region of \$37m, which is at least \$16m less than the Government takes. Given this fact, I believe that the Government and not the clubs should fund the reduction in turn-over tax. That is a promise that was made by Labor--yet another broken promise. That will affect every aspect of Queensland's racing industry, which is the fourth largest industry in this State. Yet, each year we find that the Government's take from TAB turn-over revenue is continually boosted. This year, because of the higher percentage that will be derived from the exotic betting pools, it will be boosted even further. The Government has figured out a way to receive more funds from the racing industry yet at the same time put less back into it. At a time when racing is feeling the cuts, the problems of the economy and the recession brought on by Labor, that is not good enough. Now the racing industry is expected to bear a bigger burden. That is the case even though back in 1989 Labor promised that that would not happen. I know that, to date, Labor has reduced the turn-over tax, but that does not go far enough.

Time expired.

Mr PALASZCZUK (Archerfield) (3.55 p.m.): This afternoon, I intend to take up time in the debate on the Appropriation Bill to refer specifically to the Criminal Justice Commission's Report on a Public Inquiry into Certain Allegations against Employees of the Queensland Prison Service and its Successor, the Queensland Corrective Services Commission. In my speech, I will refer specifically to a certain member of this Parliament who, through his wild allegations, has wasted thousands of dollars of taxpayers' money in needless investigations that were carried out by the Criminal Justice Commission. At this stage, I pay tribute to the report that was produced by the Criminal Justice Commission. I believe that it is the best report I have seen.

Mr T. B. Sullivan: Where is he? Is he in the House?

Mr PALASZCZUK: I will come to him shortly. On 25 October last year, the honourable member for Nerang stood up in this House and made a series of allegations relating to drug-running in correctional institutions. Mr Connor said--

"There is a conspiracy to cover up anything that might be in any way critical of the present prison reforms . . . That is only the tip of the iceberg.

. . .

This videotape was made available to a senior member of the staff of one of the prisons, but no action was taken . . . This is embarrassing for the commission . . ."

I am quite sure that all members who were present in the House at that time remember those allegations by the member for Nerang.

A Government member: Disgraceful.

Mr PALASZCZUK: Disgraceful; of course. Well, today I suggest to the honourable member for Nerang that the embarrassment is all his. He and his grubby little games that he plays with his old guard prison officer mates have ended. He and his mates have finally been caught out.

Mr Pearce: Discredited.

Mr PALASZCZUK: Discredited; of course.

Let me refer to what the Criminal Justice Commission had to say about how that video and related allegations came to Mr Connor. Page 95 of the Criminal Justice Commission's report states--

"It is clear that most of those present at Connor's office had a motive to undermine the work of the Queensland Corrective Services Commission. O'Connor, Challis and Mr Gates had been made redundant. At least Challis and O'Connor were clearly from the 'old guard', as it appeared from their evidence. They extolled the virtues of the old prison philosophy."

Page 97 of the report details the meeting that took place with the member for Nerang and states--

"Given the motives of these current and past correctional officers who had teamed together to provide Connor with the video tapes and the telling fact of the media being present at the meeting in Connor's office, it is reasonable to conclude that, in an attempt to embarrass the Queensland Corrective Services Commission, Connor was duped into the belief that the video tapes had a significance which they did not possess. The Commission is fortified in its view by the fact that, when Connor made his statement in Parliament, he claimed that the E.I.U. were not aware of the material on the video tapes and further that the material had been stopped by the Queensland Corrective Services Commission management from reaching the police. Assuming that Connor was acting upon information given to him, and there is no reason to suggest that he was not, he had been fed information which was clearly wrong and inconsistent with the documentary evidence that was available to his sources."

Mr Fenlon: Do you think the Leader of the Liberal Party might have been able to advise Mr Connor?

Mr PALASZCZUK: I will get to the Leader of the Liberal Party shortly. Let me put into perspective the types of people upon whom Mr Connor was relying for his information. Those sources are identified in the CJC report as being old guard. Page 181 of the report states--

"However, what is of great concern to this Commission is that there may be some officers of the 'old guard' who, although providing no positive assistance to inmates to escape, have 'turned a blind eye' to indicia of forthcoming escapes hoping that the Queensland Corrective Services Commission would be discredited by any eventual escape. Although this may sound far-fetched, it must be remembered that in his evidence Correctional Officer Neville Miller admitted that he tried to cause a riot in the prison as he was aggrieved at the proposal to disband the Security Squad."

What this thorough investigation has done is set out in black and white what we on this side of the House have known about Mr Connor for some time.

A Government member: He's a goose.

Mr PALASZCZUK: Not only is he a goose, but also his record on law and order is not all that good. Despite his holier-than-thou attitude and mantle, on a number of

occasions he has frustrated investigations. First, it was information relating to the escape of a dangerous inmate by the name of Pernich. Mr Connor claimed that he had information relating to that escape but, because he was worried that his information sources would dry up, he refused to provide police with access to them. He was more interested in publicity than in working with police on a serious criminal matter. That media addiction continued last week when, on the ABC and a number of other media outlets, he said that he knew three days before Tuesday's mass prison break-out that it was going to happen. Yet again, he did nothing about it. The result of that prison break-out is that one policeman is dead, one prison officer is dead and possibly a family will have nightmares for the rest of their lives after being terrorised while held captive by two of these prisoners overnight. He did not learn from that.

Yesterday morning, the honourable member rang the Henshaw program to pass on information, through the radio program, to the police. Yes, that was the right thing for him to do, but he did not wait for confirmation that the police and prison authorities had been aware of the matter and had, in fact, taken steps early on Sunday morning following the discovery of a number of items. No, Mr Connor was more interested in publicity than public safety and was quite happy to detail delicate security matters on the airwaves. Mr Connor's credibility, or lack thereof, is now totally non-existent. His failure to check his facts, as is comprehensively detailed in this CJC report, was further exposed this week.

On Tuesday morning, Mr Connor tabled in this House what he said was a list of prisoners who had escaped but had not been charged with an offence. I am sad to say that Mr Connor again had his facts wrong; all he had to do was check with the Magistrates Court. That is a very simple process, but Mr Connor, despite being caught out before, again failed to check his information. All honourable members will remember that incident, when Mr Connor tabled in this House a list of supposed prison escapees who had not been brought before the courts.

At this stage I intend to table a list, compiled through checks of the courts, which, while it is not complete, represents another piece of incriminating evidence in terms of Mr Connor's credibility. Fourteen of the 17 people on Mr Connor's list were in fact sentenced to a variety of punishments. However, not all of them, as suggested by Mr Connor, were in court for escaping or being illegally at large. I am still awaiting information relating to three of the offenders named by Mr Connor--Nish, Bugmy and Endy--but this loose list overturns the allegations made by Mr Connor in this House on Tuesday.

The Criminal Justice Commission found that there was absolutely no evidence of any cover-up or impropriety by the Corrective Services Commission or that there was any justification for Mr Connor using that phrase. All Mr Connor has succeeded in doing since last November is create concern and uncertainty in the Corrective Services Commission. He has given a forum for disgruntled, old-guard prison officers to vent their frustrations and anger at the commission. I will tell the House who these people assisting Mr Connor were. They were a couple of former, disgruntled prison officers of the old-guard set who accepted redundancies and then expected a second bite of the cherry and wanted to be reinstated. When they were refused, they decided to take it out on the commission by building a network within the prison services with other disgruntled members. They found one sucker in the Parliament of Queensland, and that sucker was the member for Nerang. He did their bidding. He never checked out any information given to him by them.

Let us look at the effects that this break-out has had on the general public. On Mr Connor's own admission, by Mr Connor's non-giving of evidence to the police, as I mentioned earlier, one police officer and one prison officer are dead. I would like to see Mr Connor walk into the house of the family of the dead police officer and tell the widow, "I had the information three days ago, but because I wanted to score some cheap political mileage out of it I did not report it to the police." I ask him to go to the family of the prison officer who died of an asthma attack during the break-out and say to that

family, "I am sorry I did not inform the police of all that I knew. I was told three days ago that there was going to be a break-out."

Dr Watson: You should have sacked the police commissioner who knew about it.

Mr PALASZCZUK: The member for Moggill is defending the member for Nerang. The member for Nerang is a disgrace to his party and to himself. The sooner that members opposite decide to do something about the member for Nerang, the better this Parliament will be. I strongly suggest that the member for Nerang be disendorsed. In the short term, he should be put so far back on the back bench that his backside dangles in the Brisbane River.

Mr BORBIDGE (Surfers Paradise--Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (4.06 p.m.): Today, I acquaint the House with the major security problems associated with the Government's handling of Treasury tender C118, the dial-up monitoring system for the Machine Gaming Division, which is the key security aspect of the operations of poker machines in Queensland.

Mr W. K. Goss interjected.

Mr BORBIDGE: I say to the Premier that Treasury tender C118 smells. I invite him to listen. It may have been the lowest tender, but it falls far short of the commitments given to this Parliament in respect of the operation of poker machines. The Treasurer has given Queensland a tacky, second-rate security system which is 20 years out of date, which lacks integrity and which centralises control in a Nevada-based company which has been and still is the subject of an Australian Federal Police investigation. This system, embraced in a scrooge-like endeavour to save money, provides for ad hoc monitoring only and rejects the concept of real-time monitoring where a poker machine is subject to constant surveillance. The Goss Labor Government could have chosen a security system developed in Australia that is as safe as a bank. Instead, it has effectively handed over control of the poker machine industry to US interests, and this State has lost an opportunity for a local consortium to export home-grown technology to the world. This Government, which promised the safest poker machines in the world, has compromised its standards and accepted a non-conforming tender. This Government now runs the risk of large-scale computer fraud by way of information-substitution and loss of revenue for the Treasury Department.

Let us look at the sorry history of the security system for the world's safest poker machines. Treasury tender C118 was announced just prior to Christmas--on 19 December, in fact--but copies of the tender were not made publicly available. That curious timing followed a visit to the United States by Machine Gaming Division officers in October and November 1990. Surprise, surprise--State Stores closed down on 23 December and did not open until 3 January, with tenders closing three weeks later, placing Australian bidders at a distinct disadvantage. When the tenders were opened, prices were not called in accordance with normal procedure. The IGT proposal does not conform with the tender specifications in several respects. The Government stated that the monitoring system must comply with Australian banking standards. Eracom, a partner in an Australian consortium, handles all electronic funds transfers for major banks in this country, as well as Eftpos security. IGT, the Treasury-approved tenderer, does not have an encryption system that is approved for use in Australia, although its system is under trial at the Seagulls club at Tweed Heads.

The tender documents state that there must be compliance with the laws of New South Wales, therefore only approved networking systems should be eligible. The IGT system is approved in casinos but not in New South Wales or the ACT. The Government tender was also issued in a quite unprecedented fashion without a new technology clause. In addition, the 20 per cent preference for Australian companies was not applied to the IGT tender, despite the fact that IGT Australia is a wholly owned subsidiary of a US company.

A major problem for Queensland will be access by hackers through the public switch telephone network. It will be open to attack through the PSTN by the following method. Firstly, one finds the fingerprint of a modem. Secondly, one accesses a PC and a mobile phone. Thirdly, one taps into the system and advises a partner, who can then play a machine. Fourthly, as there is no real-time or continuous monitoring, the MGD would not even know that the machine had been tapped. This puts to rest the Government's claim that its poker machines would be the most tamper-proof in the world. Organised crime figures are wringing their hands with glee as they take one look at the security system to be installed in Queensland. If, on the other hand, one does not want to invest in a mobile phone, a lap-top computer or a modem, the only piece of equipment one will need to clock up additional credits on poker machines under this system is a normal, every-day drawing pin. By inserting a pin into the communications cord running out the back of the poker machine, the player will be able to clock up additional credits to his heart's content; or, in respect of those poker machines that operate on a fibre optics system, a record needle could be used.

It goes further. This is all possible because the system approved for Queensland does not monitor on real time. Readings can be taken only when the machine is not being used--or is closed down--and therefore people can have their jackpot paid out and be on their way to the next job before anyone uncovers their act of fraud. It gets better--or perhaps worse. Computer literates will be able to crash the Treasury computer system systematically, effectively making all machines in Queensland unworkable. Legal club operators will be able to turn machine monitors on and off to distort meter readings and therefore reduce their payments to Government. Illegal club operators will, by the flick of a switch, be able to transform machine displays from poker machines to space invaders, or the other way around. The Queensland Government has purchased a flop. It has purchased a bicycle when it could have had a Rolls Royce. It has purchased a system which is yet to be approved for operation anywhere in Australia. It has purchased a system which does not conform with the tender in the most basic of parameters. Regularly, in this place, we heard the Minister for Tourism talk about how we were going to have the most secure poker machines in the world. He said that we would not have them if that were not to be the case. Way back on 6 January 1990, the Minister for Tourism said that Queensland would have the world's toughest laws in a bid to keep poker machines clean. On that day, he said in the *Australian*--

"I want absolute security, complete honesty and the most security-conscious legislation in the world."

To break any crime connection, Mr Gibbs said that the Government intended to control and guard the coin machines itself. He told us that we would have the most stringent security system that money could buy. He told that to this Parliament and to the people of Queensland. In this House, he confirmed it over and over again.

In reality, what we will have in Queensland is a system so archaic, so out of date with modern technology, that one need not even be a computer hacker to tamper with the system. So, why has that happened? We need to go back to Minister Gibbs' statement that Queensland would have the safest machines in the world. He knew that he had to sell it that way because of the many sceptics within his own Cabinet and within the electorate generally. The tender specifications released in late 1990 adhered to the ultimate safety provision by setting out criteria which would result in poker machines which were safe. Unfortunately for the Government, the degree of safety that it specified would cost big money. Then, after the passage of the legislation, we had the change-over in ministerial responsibility from the Tourism Minister to the Treasurer. We now know why the Tourism Minister had a smile all over his face.

The Treasurer, who now assumes control, finds out that he has no money left in the kitty to pay for the expensive security system that his ministerial colleague promised. Therefore, he instructs his Machine Gaming Division that machine security must be compromised in the name of saving money. In order to get the costs down we will get an inferior machine, but with the option of a costly security upgrade at a later stage.

This is important, because the system the Government has purchased will prove within months to be the greatest shambles of all time. Who does the Government think will pay for this expensive security upgrade? It will not be the Government, it will be the clubs, pubs and the manufacturers. What options did the Government have in front of it when it announced its successful tenderer? Basically, it came down to the IGT bid and an Australian consortium that included Olympic, Sigma Data and Eracom, Netcomm, Q-Net and Precision Power Products. The basic difference between the two tenders was that one conformed and the other did not. One tender stuck quite specifically to the tender document and developed the Rolls Royce of security monitoring systems, whilst the other produced an inferior system that is well known within the industry as the bicycle of security systems. There was a difference in price, but why would there not be a difference in price if one of the tenderers played it by the book and the other put in a non-conforming tender?

Mr Elliott: One would work and one wouldn't.

Mr BORBIDGE: Yes, one would work and one would not, as my colleague said. There are a number of questions that the Treasurer needs to answer and he needs to do so today. With the acceptance of the IGT contract, I ask: has the Government been indemnified in the event of a major system breakdown or in the case of new technology development that may render the system obsolete? Was a risk assessment of the IGT network carried out by independent experts? Why was the 20 per cent preference for Australian companies not applied in respect of this tender? Has the Treasurer been made aware of certain Federal police inquiries into the activities of IGT? Will the Treasurer table full details of a visit to the United States by a senior officer of the Machine Gaming Division and an officer of CITEC between 2 April and 15 April? Will he also provide information about the companies visited and details of the hospitality accepted by the officers concerned?

As I said, Treasury tender C118 smells. The IGT system means that a machine can be tampered with. It can be accessed by hackers, false information can be fed in and fraud can be committed before it can ever be detected. The IGT tender of \$2.258m is difficult, if not impossible, to comprehend. Quite simply, it is commercially unfeasible. The tender was \$2,258,968. The most basic central computer system would cost \$500,000. A conservative estimate of software and software development would be another \$250,000. Therefore, the unit cost per machine for 2 000 machines would work out at \$754 per machine. How can they do this when the cheapest encrypted modem per machine is \$380 and the cheapest CCU per machine--that is, the black box--is \$1,000? How is it that IGT can provide \$1,300 worth of equipment per machine when at the very minimum they tendered at \$754 per machine? Perhaps it has something to do with the fact that IGT had 2 000 poker machines already manufactured and stored in Sydney before the machine tenders closed. This raises an overriding concern. Anyone in the industry will say that, unless someone is the beneficiary of inside knowledge, a machine cannot be manufactured until the machine protocols for each manufacturer have been advised. There are 2 000 machines sitting in a warehouse in Sydney which are destined for Queensland.

I wish to refer to a letter directed to the Australian consortium by a major security consultant. The letter states in part--

"During the meeting with the MGD of the Queensland Treasury on Monday 27th May 1991 comments were made to the effect that security may not be able to be justified in the project.

As the security consultant to the consortium I am concerned that the security of the network is not being given the importance that I believe it deserves."

In other words, it is not being given importance by the Queensland Government. The letter continues--

"The network is more than merely passing a static meter figure which by itself is 'unimportant to any outsider'. The ability to present a series of figures to a central

system which believes it is getting correct information and which 'balances' according to the accounting practices--can pose significant problems to the integrity of the system.

Other gambling agencies such as the NSW TAB, NSW Lotteries Office and the Royal Hong Kong Jockey Club"--

which I know is very close to the Premier's heart--

"use (Eracom) Line Encryption to give confidence in the integrity of the data from remote locations. As I have said previously, only hardware DES based Security should be used.

In our submission to the consortium responding to Section .4 on data security I made mention of the need for an approved DES-based hardware security component. I further stressed the importance of an approved Key Management methodology. Additional comments were made that Eracom could customise the system so that the GMD has a security mechanism which can verify the identity of the remote site before transmission.

I believe the environment, the technology used and the capability of outsiders or 'insiders' to make significant capital gains means that security should be of prime concern to the Treasury."

This Government promised that security would be the prime concern of the Treasury. There are other security aspects that have been raised as well. The proposed network is particularly vulnerable when collusion takes place. While individual segments such as AAD, CCU, Communications Lines and the MGD Centre may be individually protected, the combination of an attack from two or more components creates a risk that the system will not recognise the attack. Only a strict security system will provide the maximum cover for this exposure. I am saying that, in respect of poker machines, the Government's entire credibility is now on the line. To save money, the Treasurer has compromised security.

Mr De Lacy interjected.

Mr BORBIDGE: The Treasurer said that that will cost the people of Queensland a deal of money. I refer to statements made by the Minister for Tourism, Sport and Racing, Mr Gibbs, when he was trying to sell the introduction of poker machines to the people of Queensland. He said that cost would not be a consideration because Queensland would have the most secure poker machines that could be found anywhere in the world. He said that this Government would make them safe, but today the Treasurer is saying, "No, that is all wrong. Cost is now the consideration." The principles, ethics and standards of accountability upon which the introduction of poker machines was based and sold to the people of Queensland have been compromised. If the Treasurer does not review the tender and goes ahead with this bicycle that he has bought, I can guarantee that the system will break down in a relatively short time.

Mr DAVIES (Townsville) (4.25 p.m.): It sounds as though the Deputy Leader of the Opposition is squealing because he lost out on a future job. I rise to speak in support of Appropriation Bill (No. 1). It needs to be said that in 1991, clearly, Queensland has not escaped the Australian recession. A quick glance at unemployment statistics confirms that fact.

Mr De Lacy interjected.

Mr Borbidge interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Hollis): Order!

Mr DAVIES: The preliminary State economic accounts that were compiled in relation to the December quarter confirm the obvious; that is, that the State's economic growth slowed down dramatically. They also confirm that Queensland's gross State product has shown less than 1 per cent real growth for the calendar year 1990.

Mr De Lacy interjected.

Mr Borbidge interjected.

Mr DAVIES: Mr Deputy Speaker, it is a bit difficult to get a word in.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr DAVIES: This rate of growth must be compared to the real growth of 5.5 per cent recorded for 1989, and represents a sharp downturn in activity.

Mr De Lacy interjected.

Mr Borbidge interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The Treasurer and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition will cease having a conversation across the Chamber.

Mr DAVIES: It will be nice to get a word in. I trust I may be permitted to be a little parochial for a moment when I mention that those State economic accounts have been compiled by Treasury in conjunction with the James Cook University in Townsville. Jointly, those organisations have developed a comprehensive set of quarterly State economic accounts, which provide a more aggregated picture of the performance of the State's economy. When looking to the future, the Government should concentrate on more than unemployment statistics. It is important to focus on the whole picture. Recently, the Treasurer said that while the 1990-91 financial year was a difficult economic period, 1991-92 can be seen as the road to recovery. Because Queensland has been in a trough caused by recession, understandably, confidence has declined. However, confidence, which is a very precious resource, is returning quickly. An examination of Queensland's economy reveals that there is good reason for optimism.

Firstly, Queensland has a solid foundation on which to build. Yesterday, the Treasurer announced a State surplus of \$12.9m for 1990-91. Earlier today, it was mentioned that New South Wales expects to record a deficit of \$900m. While the doom-sayers highlight the decidedly unhealthy coincident and lagging indicators of the State economy--such as unemployment, as I mentioned earlier--the focus should be on the range of leading indicators, not lagging indicators. The focus should be on indicators that tell us where the economy is going. A proper study of those leading indicators leads to the conclusion that the outlook for Queensland during the financial year 1991-92 is encouraging, and is much more encouraging than the outlook for the rest of the nation.

Let me examine some of the leading indicators. A key indicator is housing. Treasury believes that Queensland's housing sector will recover more strongly and will be well in advance of the national trend during 1991-92. Treasury bases that assessment on trends in a number of indicators, including housing finance, residential building approvals and established house prices. Overall, they forecast that residential building approvals in Queensland this financial year will increase by approximately 26 per cent, which is approximately 10 percentage points faster than the growth recorded for the rest of the nation. A similar picture in relation to the national average is emerging in key labour market leading indicators, such as job vacancies. Three main job vacancy series are available, and they are unanimous in their message, which is that Queensland presently shows an annual rate of decline that is very substantially below the national average. In addition, some time ago, the Queensland series stabilised and, for quite a few months, has shown signs of improvement--unlike the stagnant national picture. Those trends are not simply an academic curiosity. Historically, the indices of job advertisements correlate very well with actual trends in employment with a lag of approximately a year. Based on those indicators, Treasury believes that employment growth in Queensland over the next year could be up to 2 percentage points above the national average.

A range of other important indicators points to a more optimistic outlook. For example, the Australian Federation of Construction Contractors has forecast a rise of 3 per cent in non-residential construction in Queensland this financial year compared to a decrease of 11 per cent nationally. Business spending intentions data for this financial year suggest that the trend in Queensland's share of private investment spending, which was recorded over the last year or so, has increased, and will continue in 1991-92.

The State's rural sector should be cushioned from the nationwide slump in the wheat forecast for next year by an expected 11 per cent rise in the sugar crop. As the Premier said yesterday and as the Minister said this morning, tourism is clearly on an upswing. The State economic accounts showed that, despite the detrimental effect of the Gulf war, at the end of 1990 tourism was making its largest contribution to State growth for two years. As we heard from the Minister and the Premier in the last 24 hours, tourism is improving rapidly.

Mr T. B. Sullivan: The Leader of the Opposition got it wrong, did he not?

Mr DAVIES: The Leader of the Opposition has never got it right. Overall, there are some obvious macro-economic grounds for optimism. Not the least is the dramatic decline in inflation and interest rates; there is also, to a lesser extent, the current account deficit. However, there are no grounds for complacency. I do not stand here today saying that we should be complacent. We are still in the trough of our worst recession for many years. As a Government, we have not attempted to spend our way out of the recession, and I give credit to the Premier and the Treasurer for sticking to the line. Any recovery which is not sustainable is not a recovery at all; it is simply not possible to spend our way out of a recession. To cite the Treasurer, "That is a self-indulgent illusion." The Treasurer further said--

"The single most important thing that we, as a State Government, can do during a recession, is to ensure that we keep our financial management right; that we balance our Budget, that we don't get a blow out in debt levels, that we keep taxes down, and that we don't panic--all of the kinds of things you would advise a good business to do during difficult times."

Queensland is unique among Australian States in having its 1990-91 Budget remain on track, resulting in a surplus of \$12.9m, further enhancing Queensland's reputation as a State with strong financial management. While people such as the Treasurer and others in the Government have been assailed with advice to cut taxes on the one hand and, on the other, increase spending to stimulate growth, the only logical outcome of such a strategy would be a blow-out in the Budget that would result in escalating debt. This is absolutely the last thing we want at this time, and it has not happened. Not only would we be competing with the private sector for scarce funds, but we would be sending out all the wrong signals.

For the coming year, we must play to our strengths. Queensland has many strengths and many advantages. We have life-style advantages because people want to come here to work and invest. We have natural resources and, of all Australian States, we are located geographically closest to the dynamic and fast-growing economies of eastern Asia. We as a Government must create the right environment and then let the private sector capitalise on all of our great natural advantages. That is the basic strategy. In 1991-92, we in Queensland should be looking ahead with some optimism; during these tough economic times we should be positioning ourselves for the future. We should constantly remind ourselves, as the Treasurer recently did, that bad times are like good times; they do not last forever.

The Government's strategy will reap dividends. It is aimed at creating in Queensland an environment conducive to business investment. A primary plank in our strategy is to manage the State's finances responsibly--to do efficiently and effectively what Governments have to do and then get out of the way and leave it to the private sector. It is up to us as the Government to create the right environment for the private sector to capitalise on all of our natural advantages. To achieve those goals, we aim, firstly, to

keep taxes down to enhance Queensland's status as the low-tax State of Australia. Secondly, we aim to keep our financial management responsible and disciplined, keep debt levels down, keep our credit rating up, keep our Budget balanced--which it has been--and retain the community's confidence in our capacity to do things right. Thirdly, we aim to make the public sector more efficient. The public sector determines, to a large extent, the cost of inputs into private production. The more efficient the public sector becomes, the more competitive the private sector becomes.

While we keep those fundamentals on track, our next approach is, within the limits of responsible financial management, to increase funding on job-creating capital works. Our previously announced accelerated capital works program is a good example of that approach. This is the best time to spend Government money on capital works infrastructure, simply because we get better value for our dollar. At the moment, there is a great deal of under-used capacity in the building and construction industry because of the recession. Because of that, it is very competitive.

Mr Elliott: It is bleeding.

Mr DAVIES: The Government and the taxpayer get more value for money; at the same time, they assist companies to stay alive, maintain employment levels and, more importantly, put jobs into the private sector. For Mr Elliott's information, that is what the strategy is all about.

Finally, the Goss Government will never lose sight of the fundamental point that long-term sustainable employment is created in the private sector, not in the public sector. Earlier today, I listened with interest to the shadow Treasurer. I want to address some of the points that he raised. I was absolutely amazed at the lack of understanding by the alternative Treasurer--not that we will ever get to the position where he is Treasurer. I was absolutely disgusted by some of the comments that he, as an alternative Treasurer, made. He does not have a grasp of even basic book-keeping, let alone the Queensland economy. He made comparisons between Queensland and New South Wales. As I said earlier, New South Wales will have a Budget deficit of something like \$900m. The shadow Treasurer said that we should not compare Queensland with New South Wales because the latter is bigger. How much bigger is it? I am not sure how much bigger it is, but let us say it is three times bigger than Queensland.

Mr De Lacy: Twice bigger.

Mr DAVIES: The Treasurer says it is twice as big. That would mean that we would expect a deficit of \$450m. What is the Queensland deficit? This State has not got one. In fact, it has a surplus. Taking Mr Stoneman's argument a little bit further--and I must say that it was "little"--it just shows how good this Treasurer is compared to the Treasurer in New South Wales. Instead of a deficit of \$450m, Queensland has a surplus of \$13m. Closer to my home town, Mr Stoneman talked about the North Queensland Enterprise Zone. For a fair while, I have remained silent in this Chamber on the North Queensland Enterprise Zone ----

Mr Elliott: Your constituents have noted that, too.

Mr DAVIES: I note that they have noted it. What I have to say is this: the North Queensland Enterprise Zone never achieved a thing. If it was not achieving anything, why spend \$3m a year on it? Why not use the money more constructively? If it had achieved something, I may have held a different view. However, a lot of the projects that were on the list were phantom projects. They were projects that had been discussed once or twice; they were not real. So 18 months down the track--and I have been fairly close to this issue over the last 18 months--I am convinced that most of those projects were not real. One or two may have been real, and they are still being explored. One of those is the aircraft maintenance facility. The ball is now firmly in the court of the private-enterprise sector and the proponents from Hong Kong. I would like to see it happen. We as a Government are giving it all the assistance possible. I know that the Federal Government is doing likewise.

Mr Stoneman also talked about the North Queensland Emergency Response Group and the number of bills that the Queensland Government is now being asked to pay for maintenance facilities. First of all, let me say that the North Queensland Emergency Response Group, which came out of the failed National Safety Council, is to all intents and purposes doing a good job. But what I would like to know is where the shadow Treasury spokesman gets his information from. The emergency response group happens to be in my electorate. That group has never been to see me to talk to me about any of its problems. I just wonder whether it is coincidental that one of the directors of the North Queensland Emergency Response Group is a Mr Terry Bulger, who is the vice-president of the National Party in Queensland. I happened to see him talking to Mr Stoneman in the foyer this morning when I arrived.

Mr Randell: A good man, too.

Mr DAVIES: My comments do not reflect on the person. I just wonder how Mr Stoneman got information that did not get passed on to the local member. He also talked about Dallhold and Yabulu and showed that he really does not understand anything about receivership, liquidation and so on. There is nothing wrong with the operations of the nickel refinery. It is financially viable. What is not financially viable is Dallhold and the Bond group of companies. Those companies have variously gone into either receivership or liquidation. I do not know how Mr Stoneman can say that the Queensland Government is doing something wrong in regard to that refinery when it is a private-enterprise operation. As is its right, the company that owns the refinery is appealing to the AAT in regard to a decision of the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority. The Government has actually put in place an alternative strategy, which is the outer berth development. If the company wins that appeal in regard to Halifax Bay, that is fine. There are still things that it has to do as a company. It has to make application to the Queensland Government for the jetty in Halifax Bay, and at that time the Queensland Government will consider such an application. This Government has not done anything wrong in that regard.

In conclusion, I just want to say that I support Appropriation Bill (No. 1), because it continues the strategy, the plan, the three-year fundamental program announced by the Treasurer when he introduced last year's Budget. Finally, I congratulate the Treasurer on achieving a better result than an \$800,000 surplus--in fact, a \$12.9m surplus.

Dr WATSON (Moggill--Deputy Leader of the Liberal Party) (4.43 p.m.): In rising to join the debate on Appropriation Bill (No. 1), I think it is worth commenting upon a few things that have gone before and also looking to the future in Queensland under this Government. In my opinion, it is interesting because it seems to me, from a fairly objective viewpoint, that Queenslanders are faced with a Government that has no vision and no economic agenda for this State. It did not come to power with a vision and it did not come to power with any economic agenda.

The 1989 State election was dominated by only one thing, and that was the Fitzgerald report and the issue of corruption and electoral reform. So Goss and his then Labor Opposition were never subjected to any strong criticism or strong analysis about what Labor's economic priorities were. What were those priorities? When one considers the economic plan as laid out by the Labor Party, only a couple of things even come to mind. One was that Queensland was going to have closer ties with China. Despite the best of intentions, perhaps, Tiananmen Square continues to haunt the relationship between China and the rest of the world and, of course, between China and Queensland. The second aspect--and a very important aspect--of the economic agenda that the Labor Party was going to adopt was a State bank. Of course, that went out the window when the Victorian State Bank, the South Australian State Bank and the Western Australian Rural Industry Bank ran into trouble. That economic plank went out the window when those institutions went down the drain.

So what were we left with? The Treasurer had to look around for something to hang his hat on. He picked on a couple of things. It was interesting to hear the member

for Townsville say the Opposition Treasury spokesman could not do his book-keeping. This Government has grasped at a book-keeping mentality. It has been interested simply in balancing the Budget. It has been trying, in its own way, to control taxes--although when we look at the Estimates for last year, we see that that simply is not true. Taxes were not just indexed for inflation; in fact many of them went up by far more than the rate of inflation. The same principle applied to charges. So the Government is trying to put across the perception that it is controlling taxes and, as I said, it has this book-keeping mentality concerned with balancing the Budget. That is supposed to engender in this State economic growth, investment and, of course, a growth in jobs. But what has happened? There is more to making sure we have a well-run economy with economic growth than simply book-keeping.

Mr Davies: What about the future?

Dr WATSON: It may be good for an accounting practice up in north Queensland but it is not the appropriate attitude for the Treasurer of this State to have--not when it is the be-all and end-all. I will admit that that is part of it, but it should not be the end of a vision for economic growth. Investment in Queensland is starting to falter. The Australian Bureau of Statistics figures for the last few quarters show that new private sector investment in Queensland is falling. It has fallen by something like 14 per cent in the last year, and it is predicted to fall by 10.5 per cent over the forthcoming year. This morning the Treasurer was lauding the work of Access Economics. I refer to another publication put out by that economic consulting group in Canberra, called the *Investment Monitor*. The latest copy I have, from February 1991----

Mrs Edmond: Isn't there a later one than that?

Dr WATSON: The new one should be out this week.

Mr Foley: Pay your subscription.

Mr Beattie: Well done, the honourable member for Yeronga.

Mr Foley: Will he take the interjection?

Dr WATSON: I have. I am not a lawyer, but as an accountant I do pay. The latest publicly available issue shows the States' share of investment for the past 12 months. It is noticeable that Queensland stands out because its share is falling. New South Wales stands out because its share is rising. The other Labor States tend to have remained approximately the same, or are marginally down. Access Economics came to the conclusion that the fall in Queensland and, of course, the fall in Victoria, meant that New South Wales was now clearly the leading State in terms of attracting investment.

This is important because we cannot generate long-term growth and long-term employment if we do not get our investment patterns right. The evidence collected by those independent agencies such as the Australian Bureau of Statistics and Access Economics shows that investment is falling off. Certainly that will not affect employment right now, but down the track, in 1992, 1993 and 1994, we will find this fall-off in investment will have quite substantial and detrimental effects on Queensland. It is fine for the Treasurer and members of the Government to laud Queensland's current performance, but that performance owes much to the previous 32 years of non-Labor Government in this State. The difference between Queensland and New South Wales and the other States is that in this State we had strong financial management and pro-investment attitudes for 32 years, while down south Greiner was belaboured with 12 years of Labor rule beforehand. In Victoria, Cain was able, in a matter of half a dozen years, to turn around something that was good. He was able to hoodwink people, with the help of the media, at the last election and was able to get in again although everybody now knows that Cain misled the Victorian people deliberately because Victoria was in fact an absolute mess. The same thing is occurring in Western Australia and South Australia.

The difference between Queensland and the other States is that Queensland has not been left with a Labor legacy resulting from the past 30 years, and in fact the Labor Party is a major beneficiary of the strong policies of the previous non-Labor Government in this State. It is no wonder, with the projections of falling investment, that the Premier is parading his brand of new intervention by Labor Governments in the investment patterns of this country. Yesterday, in this Parliament and in the media he paraded his grand obsession about having the Labor Party, in Canberra or wherever, intervening to make sure that private sector superannuation funds invest some of their funds in Labor--

Mr Dunworth: He is an economic illiterate.

Dr WATSON: He definitely is, but that is the least of his problems. The Premier is now trying to ensure that investment is going to take place in Queensland not because we provide the right economic climate and not because we are doing something positive but because, in typical interventionist fashion, he has created the rules and forced private sector superannuation funds to invest in particular areas. We have heard it all before. In fact, it is absolutely amazing.

On page 2 of today's *Australian*, an article relating to South Australia is headed "Premier forecasts capital aid for SGIC", which is the South Australian State Government Insurance Commission. Because of its investments, the SGIC in South Australia is getting into trouble. That is interesting, because the investment strategy was overseen by Mr Bannon, who personally approved many of the main investments and therefore must take responsibility for the accumulation of some \$700m worth of questionable investments. That is the typical Labor legacy to each of the States. That is the kind of legacy which this Premier would like to try to inflict on all Australians and on all Queenslanders.

Let us look at it differently. Let us look at what this Premier and this Treasurer are prepared to do. What hypocrites they are! They talk about the issue of patient capital. Earlier, other members, including the member for Woodridge, talked about it, and probably even the member for Brisbane Central and others will want to talk about it. When the Government asks businesses to take a long-term view of their investments, it ought to look at the kind of decision that it, as a Government, is making. What do we see when we look at those things? What is the record when it comes to important kinds of decisions--decisions which make or break the private enterprise in this State? What kinds of decisions do we see coming out of this Government and this Premier? The first decision that had to be made related to the Ensham coal project. In that case, there was a major argument between the joint venture partners. What did the Premier do? He said, "We can't wait for private enterprise to work out the details. We can't wait for them to make a decision. We are going to intervene and we are going to force a conclusion." That is what the argument was. There was no patience. What has happened? They are in the courts. No development is going ahead, and there will not be any development going ahead until those partners resolve their differences. When it comes to talking about patience and such things, this Treasurer and this Premier do not practise what they preach.

Let me refer now to coal rail freights. Time and time again, we in the Liberal Party have raised that issue in this House. What has been the response from the Treasurer? His response has simply been: in the short term, we cannot afford it. We cannot afford, in the budgetary context, to take a cut in the short term. He understands that the Queensland Coal Association and the Queensland Chamber of Mines put proposals forward to the Labor Party when it was in Opposition. Those organisations have again put forward the very same proposals now that Labor is in Government. In Opposition, the Labor Party said that it would do something about it, but in Government it has done nothing. The proposals stated, "If you cut the coal rail freights in the short term, we will ensure that we increase tonnage, market share and we will guarantee that in the longer run you will have more revenue." But, no, the Government wants to preach to private enterprise that it has to take a long-run perspective. However, when it comes to a decision on coal rail freights, the Government does exactly the opposite. It says that

it is not willing to take a short-term cut in revenue for long-term gain. No way! The Governmenteschews making a decision, does not change the rail freights and makes sure that Queensland coal companies are under a great deal of cost pressure and competition and will not be able to compete on the world market.

A problem exists in that regard, because competition emanates from Indonesia, South Africa and now from New South Wales. That has occurred because Queensland companies are flat out maintaining market share. They cannot compete in a cost-effective fashion. Yet this Premier and this Treasurer have the audacity to get up and suggest to private enterprise that they have to take a long-run viewpoint. The first thing they ought to do is sit down and examine their own decision-making and look at the kind of mess they are creating and the kind of pressures they are putting on private enterprise. One could go on. I refer to Gladstone and to the Boyne smelter and the question of the privatisation of the power station. In that case, there was a difference of a couple of hundred million dollars, yet this Government was prepared to let that get in the way of a billion-dollar expansion. The Government was not prepared to compromise, nor was it prepared to take a reduction in the price. It was not prepared to take a short-run loss for a long-run gain for the benefit of Queensland. The Government was not prepared to encourage a billion-dollar expansion, 1 200 construction jobs and 400 jobs in the longer run. When members opposite talk about short-run decision-making, they are the experts. They have no right to attack superannuation funds or any group of business managers and talk about their investment policies. When it comes to its own decision-making, the Government does not have the guts to make any decision, nor has it the guts to make any long-run decision for the benefit of this State.

The issue that stands out in this matter is the absolute hypocrisy of this Government. It has done nothing for the superannuation funds for which it is responsible. If the Premier believed what he was saying, he could have done something with the QIC Bill or the superannuation funds. I do not agree with the Premier's statement. I believe that the QIC has been managed properly. It is absolutely hypocritical of the Premier to say, "I expect the Federal Government to do one thing, but I am not prepared to do it when it is in my area, in my back yard. I want the Federal Government to take the flack. I do not want to do anything, myself." That is absolutely typical of the way in which this Government operates. It is everyone else's problem; it is never the Government's problem. When the position is examined in detail, time and time again it comes back to this Government's problem and this Premier's problem. In the next couple of years, because this Premier and this Cabinet cannot make a decision, we will run into an investment hole. That is the kind of talk that is being heard around town at the moment. The public service is in a mess because the Government has been so wrapped up in changing things for the sake of change that it has not sat down and made decisions that would make the public service a better service in the long run.

What does the Government have to do? It is about time that this Government started to understand that, if it wants to encourage investment in Queensland and to create jobs, it has to get the fundamentals right; it has to be prepared to work and make sure that the taxation structures are correct. Earlier, the shadow Treasurer spoke about that matter. The Government has to think about real, long-term low interest rates and low rates of inflation. It has to make sure that its own Government decision-making is correct. It had better start making decisions and not put things off or put them into the too-hard basket, which is ruining this State.

Time expired.

Mr BEATTIE (Brisbane Central) (5.02 p.m.): I wish to introduce some common sense into this debate on the Appropriation Bill. I want to speak at some length about the CJC's budget. Before I do, I refer to comments made by the honourable member for Moggill. In doing so, I make this point very clear: he talked a lot about economic and financial accountability. He is a prissy little character. This morning, I heard him make disparaging remarks about the Premier. He is presumptuous indeed. He has never had any practical experience in the real world--no venture capital, no attempt to put

his dollars on the line. He is full of airy-fairy advice. He has no practical experience at all. Later, I will talk about the people in the Liberal Party who speak on economic matters.

On 13 July, the *Courier-Mail* contained an excellent article by a gentleman called Eric Risstrom, who, as many members would know, is the executive director of the Australian Taxpayers Association. He is not a member of the Labor Party; he is not a member of any political party. He is no friend of the Labor Party. I see my colleague from the National Party, the honourable member for Cunningham, agreeing. Mr Risstrom is very conservative. What does this conservative gentleman say about the Liberal Party? What does he say about its great plans for a value-added tax? What does he say about its great GST plans? He said--

"The shadow Treasurer, Mr Reith, argues he can swing people"—

Mr Hayward: Who?

Mr BEATTIE: Indeed "who"! The "Dr Who" or the "Mr Who" of Australian politics! The article continued--

". . . to a consumption tax as an element of far-reaching tax reform by offering 'substantial' income tax cuts.

But he concedes that one hidden feature is that savings, life policies and superannuation would have probably 15 per cent of their purchasing power ripped away."

The honourable member for Moggill supports cutting out superannuation, ripping into savings and ripping away purchasing power. That is what he and his wonderful Liberal Party stand for.

An honourable member: The Jeff Kennett of Queensland.

Mr BEATTIE: Indeed, the Jeff Kennett of Queensland. Mr Risstrom went on--

"For most people there would be an incredible personal cost, some of it hidden, and no economic windfall to help weather the financial drought."

He went on further--

". . . the flow-on effect on wages and overheads like payroll tax, superfund contributions, workers' compensation--and inflation."

Talk about ripping the country to pieces! What does he conclude? One of the conclusions is--

"It is a 'value added' tax and the taxing goes on and on and on until you buy the item."

The high-taxing party in Australian politics is the Liberal Party.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr BEATTIE: Hang on! Do not interject. National Party members agree with us. The National Party, at its conference, supported us. For once, it was right. National Party members have enough brains to know that this tax will ruin Australia. Their Liberal Party mates in Queensland do not know that. Here is another illustration--

"Having a house painted . . . a consumption tax would force up the price another 15 per cent."

Think of the young Australians who are desperately trying to buy their first home. What does the honourable member for Moggill support? He supports increasing the price by another 15 per cent. We hear all this economic claptrap in here, and he supports an increase of 15 per cent so that young home-buyers cannot buy a home. That is what he is about. Let me give Eric Risstrom's specific illustration--

"Buying a home? Say the house cost \$200,000, deposit is \$110,000, interest 14 per cent and repayments \$1,300 a month. Over 10 years, you pay a total of \$167,325 to pay off the loan.

With a projected 15 per cent GST added, the same house costs another \$30,000, and with the same deposit you need to borrow \$120,000."

Opposition members interjected.

Mr BEATTIE: I can see that honourable members opposite are in pain. They intend to inflict that sort of pain on the people of Australia. The article continued--

"Even upping the monthly repayment by \$1,500 to help cover the extra interest, it would take 20 years, or twice as long to repay, and total mortgage payments would double to \$350,000."

Members of the Liberal Party come in here and talk about economic responsibility. I did not hear the honourable member for Moggill once deal with that issue. Why is that? It is because he is an economic and political coward. He was not prepared to deal with what the Liberal Party will try to do to Australia. So, those wimps should not come in here with that blue chip economic nonsense and pretentious garbage about the Liberal Party running the economy. Look at them. They are grinning like a pair of cheshire cats with their tails in the trough. They must be kidding. That is what they will do to destroy Australia. I table that article for the interest of honourable members, because future members in this House should know exactly what the Liberal Party is all about.

I want to deal at some length with a matter of some seriousness, that is, the Criminal Justice Commission budget. As we all know, the CJC has five divisions. They are the Official Misconduct Division, the Misconduct Tribunal, the Research and Coordination Division, the Intelligence Division and the Witness Protection Division. One of the matters in respect of which I have a great deal of support for the CJC in terms of its operation is its tight financial management. The parliamentary committee has taken a great deal of interest in the financial management of the CJC. At a time of economic difficulty, we must make sure that even the children of Fitzgerald, such as the CJC, are financially accountable. I am here to tell the Parliament today that that indeed was achieved by the CJC.

Mr Elliott: How many public servants have you got on the CJC now?

Mr BEATTIE: If the honourable member waits, I will deal with how many people work there. He should take his shoe off and put it in his mouth. We will get there. The CJC has an establishment of 263, including some 94 seconded police officers, broken down into divisions. There is a difference between the establishment projection and the actual figure. At the outset, for the information of the honourable member for Cunningham, I point out that the establishment projection is 263. The actual--I repeat the "actual"--is 221, and it is not proposed to increase that significantly. In other words, there will not be a full staff contingent. For the executive, the proposed establishment was six and the actual is six. For the Misconduct Tribunal, the establishment was five and the actual is three. For the Office of General Counsel, the establishment was six and the actual is six. For the Official Misconduct Division, the establishment was 142 and the actual is 114. For the Witness Protection Division, the establishment was 32 and the actual is 26. For the Research and Coordination Division, the establishment was 18 and the actual is 17. For the Intelligence Division, the establishment was 17 and the actual is 14. For the Corporate Services Division, the establishment was 37 and the actual is 35.

The reason why the actual figure of 221 is different from the establishment figure of 263 is that, inevitably, people retire, people are transferred, appointments are made and so on. However, the CJC has endeavoured to keep itself within tight budgetary control, therefore, the actual numbers are less than the establishment projection. Not all positions have been filled. Those figures readily show the major role of the Official Misconduct Division in the overall work of the commission, and I emphasise that. Of the 221 people working at the commission, 114 work for the Official Misconduct Division. A large number of those people are involved in complaints involving police, local

government, the public service generally and anyone who fits within the parameters of the Official Misconduct Division.

Since the CJC was established, a significant degree of public confidence has been placed in its complaint division, particularly since it took over from the Police Complaints Tribunal, which, as we all know, was held in considerable disrespect except for that period when it was run by Judge McGuire and, to some extent, by Mr Justice Carter. There has been a rush of complaints to the CJC. In June--the last figures available--182 complaints were made. That is nine complaints a day. As a result of the public confidence in the CJC, a large number of complaints are coming in, and that is the reason for the recommendations in the report that was tabled in the House on Tuesday by the parliamentary committee in relation to the review of its own operations and the operations of the Criminal Justice Commission. It was the ninth report of that committee. We had asked the commission to talk about proposed changes to the Act. It has dealt with the complaints division and, in September, we will be making recommendations about the operations of that division.

In relation to the budget in specific terms--at the beginning of this financial year, the CJC received an appropriation of \$20m. In January 1991, as part of the regular review process of the CJC's financial operations, the chairman, Sir Max Bingham, foreshadowed to the Premier an anticipated surplus of funds as at 30 June this year. Following subsequent discussions with Treasury and the Premier's Department, the commission--that is the CJC--submitted a revised budget identifying an anticipated surplus of \$3m. Accordingly, the CJC is operating on the basis of a \$17m expenditure limit. So last year, the CJC returned to consolidated revenue--if I can put it in that general sense--\$3m. That clearly indicates the tight financial control that is being practised by the CJC.

Officers performing police work form approximately one-third of the commission's staff establishment. As all honourable members would be aware, salaries for those police officers are paid by the Police Service which, in turn, is reimbursed from CJC funds. Salaries and associated costs attributable to the police establishment are estimated to total \$5.9m, whilst that of the civilian component is approximately \$6.6m. Whilst the appropriation may appear a significant sum, it should be interpreted in the light of the commission's wide areas of responsibility, taking account of the following factors. I will go through them quickly. The sum of \$5.9m has been allocated to the payment of salaries for police performing police duties within the commission. Overall, the total costs associated with all police functions are approximately \$7m. Of that \$17m, \$7m is directly attributable to police responsibility. As I alluded to before, the commission has assumed the functions of the Police Complaints Tribunal and the Police Internal Investigations Section. Additionally, the CJC is obliged to investigate all cases--and this is one of the matters that we must consider--of alleged or suspected official misconduct by persons holding appointments in units of public administration rather than the police alone. That is set out in section 2.20 (e) of the Act which imposes a very serious burden on the CJC itself. I am not suggesting for one moment that it should shirk its responsibility, but it means that some discretion needs to be exercised as to the determination of the complaints. That is one of the things the CJC has raised in its submission to the committee and which is contained in part A of the report that I tabled in the House on Tuesday.

It is not possible to run an organisation with the responsibilities of the CJC on a shoestring. Everyone accepts that. In appendix 15, on page A212 of his report, Commissioner Fitzgerald stated--

"One possibility which will be discussed in due course in the Commission's report is a permanent anti-corruption commission, although it must be understood that it is not possible to have such an organisation for the cost of a handful of employed lawyers and police officers. The work which is involved is labour and resource intensive. Administrative, clerical and secretarial staff, specialists such as

information analysts, premises, computers, word-processors, fax machines, photocopiers, telephones, radios, cameras, motor vehicles, etc. are all basic necessities."

In other words, Commissioner Fitzgerald was saying that, if a criminal justice commission was to be established, it must be properly resourced. In a nutshell, it is fair to put the incremental costs of the commission for the 1991 financial year at approximately \$10m, if one takes off the police component. If one divides the population of Queensland into that figure, it means that the CJC budget is costing Queenslanders just under 1c per day or \$3.40 a year, which is a very small price to pay for cleaning up crime and corruption in this State.

Certain of the commission's activities have the potential to add considerably to revenue and contribute to efficiency in public administration. I want to deal with this because this is the future direction of the CJC. The CJC's existence and activities are intended to lessen corruption and organised crime and the economic and revenue losses from these activities, which can be considerable. For instance, in the very near future a report will come down from the commission concerning SP book-making. It is conservatively estimated that illegal book-making in Queensland costs the revenue \$16m and this State's legal economy \$30m. The CJC study will produce recommendations shortly that are aimed at minimising these losses. It is a matter of some concern that we end up in a position where conservatively SP book-making is costing revenue in this State the sum of \$16m.

I will move on to other ways of improving the finances. In conjunction with the Police Service, the CJC is active in the field of recovering the proceeds of crime. We have heard a lot about this, because this is one of the future directions in which we intend to move. The potential benefit to revenue from the increased use of proceeds of crime legislation is considerable. The CJC is actively researching the more effective use of the legislation and it may require improvement at a later date, which will be the result of an appropriate report. In addition, the CJC is engaged in a considerable body of research into the criminal justice system generally. One of the issues being addressed is the cost-effectiveness of current procedures, and recommendations will be made. There is a huge potential, not only for providing for a corruption-free State, but also for actually returning money to the State.

I turn now to pages 88 and 89 of the committee's report into the review of its operations and the operations of the CJC which contains the CJC's report to the committee. The commission refers to the development of a corruption prevention program and the appointment of a corruption prevention officer. That scheme will be similar to the one that is operated by the ICAC in New South Wales. By this means the commission will aim to reduce corruption, thus saving money in the long term. In its report, the commission referred to the rationale for the proceeds of crime legislation. Page 89 of the report states--

"The end result of twenty years of experience in the United States with this legislation may be properly described as extremely successful. The most recent figures incorporating the total assets retrieved for the relevant 12 month period:

1989--value of assets forfeited: \$331,200,000;

1990--value of assets forfeited: \$460,000,000."

Those are considerable funds and there is no reason why a similar story cannot be told here in Australia. I put on record in the most specific terms that the CJC's internal accounting procedures do provide for tight financial accountability. In addition to that, the proceeds of crime legislation and the attempts by the commission to use that as an opportunity to return funds to fight crime will be fundamental to the commission's future operations and a matter that will be applauded by all members in this House.

In the last few moments available to me I will refer to some matters that I believe are of some importance to my electorate. They relate to the allocation of funds to local schools. Under previous conservative Governments the schools in my electorate were run down in a very disgraceful way. I am delighted to say that the Goss Government has made significant funding allocations to these schools. Twelve State schools in my

electorate, that is, the Baroona Special School, Petrie Terrace State School, Brisbane Central State School, Kelvin Grove State School, Kelvin Grove State High School, Fortitude Valley State School, West End Infants School, West End State School, Brisbane State High School, Red Hill Special School, Mater Hospital Special School and Royal Children's Hospital Special School, have benefited significantly under the Goss Government and its achievements. I am sad to say that there have been years of neglect, but I am delighted that the p. and c. organisations in my electorate are responding to the increased interest being shown by this Government. They are responding in a positive way to redress some of the negligence and neglect of the past. Specific allocations have been made to improve facilities. For the information of the House, I table a number of letters and releases from the Minister which set out the large amount of funding that has been made available, particularly by the Department of Administrative Services, to improve the schools in my electorate.

In the short time available to me, I will conclude my remarks by mentioning the Red Hill Special School, which is attended by seriously intellectually handicapped and Down's syndrome children. Those children have to attend that school for the entire duration of their education, and it is sad that for some time the school has been underfunded. The people who work there are incredibly dedicated. They look after the worst cases of handicapped people, and they do that with love, dedication and concern. It is a sad fact of life that, when the children leave that school, they have nowhere to go. The Government should address that problem.

Time expired.

Mr ELLIOTT (Cunningham) (5.23 p.m.): I am compelled to respond to some of the platitudes that were mouthed by the Treasurer earlier today. It is quite amazing that he could come into this House and state that he will maintain staffing levels in the public service throughout Queensland, particularly in areas outside the south-east corner of this State. The basic reason why he will be able to maintain public service numbers is that an incredible growth has occurred in the numbers of public servants attached to bodies such as the CJC. The member for Brisbane Central has just indicated the growth in the work associated with the Parliamentary Committee for Criminal Justice, and the same applies to the work of EARC and all the other inquiries and commissions that are current. If the public servants involved in all those activities were taken out of the statistics, the real effects of the Government's policy of restructuring would be revealed. It would be clear that the Government is removing people who provide services in the country areas of this State.

I, for one, am not impressed by what is happening in my electorate. I predict that, by the end of the first term of this Government, not one single courthouse will remain in my electorate. I estimate that my electorate has lost more courthouses than any other electorate represented in this Parliament. The Treasurer should not expect me to cop his assertions about the Government maintaining public service numbers and services outside the south-eastern corner because all he is doing is appointing public servants to jobs that were previously carried out by volunteers who were happy to do the work in return for a cup of tea and a plate of sandwiches. Those people were running the hospitals boards, the fire brigade boards and the ambulance brigades, but this Government is replacing them with public servants who are receiving a remuneration package of \$80,000 a year plus a car. The Treasurer should realise that the number of public servants employed does not indicate the level of service provided. He has knocked out of the arena the people who were providing a good service to the community at very little cost.

I urge the Treasurer to review the Government's program in relation to courthouses. It is very easy for his Treasury number-crunchers to close down courthouses in Cecil Plains, Cambooya, Pittsworth and Oakey and reduce those costs on one side of the equation, but they should also consider the loss of those services as a cost to the community as the other side of the equation. It is very easy for Treasury to devise an equation that makes Government expenditure look smaller. I ask the Treasurer to

consider the simple example of a policeman transporting a prisoner from Oakey or Pittsworth to Toowoomba, or from Carnarvon to Warwick, which would involve a cost of at least \$150. After the offender appears in court, he would have to either be held in custody or be transported back to Oakey or Pittsworth. Does the Treasurer think that that can be done at no cost? Does he think that the Police Department would incur no expense in relation to the transportation of that offender?

In an effort to convince himself that he is doing a great job, this Treasurer is merely robbing Peter to pay Paul. The Government is appointing its supporters to key positions and is doing away with public servants who prided themselves on their political neutrality. From my experience as a member of Parliament, I would say that, in the past, public servants came from all points on the political spectrum. During the term of the previous National Party Government, there was no way that anyone could say that only National Party supporters held senior Government positions.

Mr Smyth: Hospital boards were all full of National Party people in my electorate.

Mr ELLIOTT: The member is referring to members of boards whereas I was referring to public servants. The member is saying that the volunteers who carried out community work for the various boards in return for a cup of tea and a plate of sandwiches should be knocked out of the arena because they are National Party supporters and are therefore no good. He is saying that they should be replaced by public servants who are Labor Party supporters and who will be given an important job with a remuneration package worth in excess of \$80,000 a year. The member for Bowen suggests that that is an honourable system, but I can assure him that in a few years' time, if I am still a member of the Parliamentary Committee of Public Accounts, I will take pleasure in recommending that an estimate be made of the cost of services being provided by public servants that were previously provided by volunteers. This Government has reversed a very effective system that involved local people who knew best the needs and requirements of their particular district. They performed these duties at no cost, but this Government wants to replace them with public servants. If the honourable member believes that that approach represents efficiency and will save money, then he must be away with the pixies. I guarantee he will soon discover that this is one of the most costly exercises that the Queensland Government has ever undertaken. I invite any honourable member to have a small wager with me--in kind, of course--on the outcome. I think that side of it is of great concern to those of us in rural areas. Not only those services but also DPI services and other services are starting to go. Does the Treasurer think that small country towns can continue to survive if he takes all the services out of them? Every time he takes one of those services away, another bill is not paid in the grocery store or the butcher shop.

Mr De Lacy: Could I just ask a question?

Mr ELLIOTT: Yes.

Mr De Lacy: I understand what you are saying. But do you think that's what the public servants should be there for--to maintain the population?

Mr ELLIOTT: No. The best analogy that I can think of is with the decision that we took in Government some time ago to equalise the cost of electricity right across Queensland. The Treasurer has an electorate in north Queensland in which many people probably find the cost of electricity a very large part of their overall budget. Those country people would be very concerned if they had to pay half as much again for electricity as the people in Brisbane had to pay.

Mr Katter: Not once upon a time.

Mr ELLIOTT: That is dead right. I remember only too well the days when people came into my office and asked when they would be treated as ordinary citizens rather than second-class citizens in the provision of services that every other person in the community took for granted. It is interesting that the Treasurer can mount that argument.

People who live outside the south-east corner of Queensland have just as much right to expect to receive various services as anyone else. They should not have to drive 100 miles, or even 50 miles, for services which have been provided over the years in their respective towns. It is totally unreasonable.

If the Government continues down that road, it will discover that country people consider the matter seriously and that that view will be reflected in the ballot-box. People might think that National Party supporters live on farms and so on, but the Treasurer is not just attacking National Party supporters; he is attacking the AWU workers and the shearers. He is attacking the navvies, who do a fantastic job under trying circumstances out on the railway line. When the temperature is 125 degrees in the water bag, they are in the boiling hot sun swinging a pick. The Government is attacking the people it purports to support. It keeps telling us that those people are its constituency. Yet, every time it turns around, the Government attacks those people. The Treasurer should hang his head in shame, go back to his electorate and rethink his policies.

Mr De Lacy: You won't listen to me.

Mr ELLIOTT: What did you say?

Mr De Lacy: I said, "If you won't listen to me, I won't listen to you."

Mr ELLIOTT: I just listened to the Treasurer and I gave him an example of why I do not believe him. I would also like to touch on some issues which have been mentioned this week. We are debating an Appropriation Bill. We are talking about saving money, and we are talking about where we are spending money and how we can do it best. If the Treasurer wants to save some money, I ask him to reconsider very seriously his decision about the Noosa north shore. Quite frankly, Government members have been sold a pup. They sneaked across. The ferryman knows exactly who goes across onto the north shore; he can tell exactly who is on the north shore and who is not. He can tell people what is happening. In order that people did not know they were there, Government members sneaked up in a boat and went along the shoreline. The greenies decided that they did not want Government members to know that there was any nasty country there. They took them up along the ocean front and did not show them the degraded country, the country that has been mined or the country that has been cleared of timber and where dairy-farmers---

Mr Stephan: They just had a look at the buffer zone along the foreshore.

Mr ELLIOTT: That is probably what they did do. I was not there, so I will try not to be too unkind. Perhaps people walked further inland. I suggest that those opposite should have a better look at the area. When I was Minister for National Parks, I extended the Cooloola national park so that it encompassed the whole of the Noosa River catchment. The whole object of that exercise was to ensure that the pristine nature of that river was retained. At that time, we examined the areas which the Government is now examining. We decided that those areas were, firstly, too degraded to go into the Cooloola national park and, secondly, that they were not worthy--they certainly are not now--to go into the so-called Great Sandy Region national park under World Heritage provisions. Basically, the Fitzgerald report says exactly what I am saying now. I do not know why the Government will not listen to Fitzgerald. It would save the Government a lot of money. The key point is that the Government will be liable for compensation. If the Government continues along its present track, it will cost it a fortune to compensate Leisuremark and the other land-holders in the area.

In this caper, the Government, through the press, is trying to convince the public that the area is pristine--of high-quality environmental status. That is a nonsense. Shacks and beat-up old cars are everywhere. There are run-out areas and areas that have been totally cleared--and I mean "totally cleared"; I do not mean partially cleared. People can see where the sand-mining ended, because they can see where the big melaleucas start on the shorefront.

If the Government was talking about pristine areas, I would have no argument. But it is not talking about those areas; it is talking about the other degraded areas. Unless the Government has a pocketful of money that it is prepared to spend, I suggest that it look very seriously at what it will cost to resume the land. The agenda is being run by people who are, in many instances, well meaning. But there is no good economic argument. We could have environmentally attuned, low-key, low-density development along the lines of the development constructed by Ruster and Day. That was suggested and worked out by the local shire council and the people who hold the land. I suggest that the Government should rethink its strategy.

The other financial matter that I want to touch on very briefly is the management of crocodiles by the National Parks and Wildlife Service. I believe that it will cost the Government a fortune if it continues with the very short-sighted policy that the Minister for Environment and Heritage has adopted. Under that policy, crocodile-farmers are being asked to pay a royalty of \$150 per metre or part thereof for every crocodile they catch. Quite frankly, it is a nonsense. A member of the Government--I will not embarrass him by naming him--is nodding his head because he has seen this in his own area---

Mr Schwarten: No, I am not nodding for that reason. I am nodding because I understand what you are saying. The National Parks boys caught that croc--"King Wally".

Mr ELLIOTT: They caught a crocodile, and they had the help of a gentleman. I know who was with them.

Mr Schwarten: He was caught by the National Parks boys. Pay credit where it is due. The National Parks boys caught that croc.

Mr ELLIOTT: The honourable member can bet his life that he will never hear me discredit the staff of the National Parks and Wildlife Service in this Chamber. I have great regard for them. I have worked with them over a long period. I know their capabilities. What I am saying is that these people were doing a public service. They were prepared to catch these crocodiles at no cost--in fact, they were prepared to pay \$30 per crocodile to catch them. People need to understand how much it can cost to catch these crocodiles. It is not just a matter of going out in a boat and instantly catching a crocodile. It does not necessarily work that way. Sometimes it is long, boring and arduous work. It can take three or four weeks of waiting before a crocodile comes to a certain area. Crocodiles are territorial, and they roam over certain estuaries. They come and go. A lot of factors come into it. In some instances it has cost up to \$10,000 to catch some of the really big crocodiles that have been causing a problem.

The cost will have to be borne from the National Parks and Wildlife Service budget. It will have to have boats, vehicles and men on stand-by. I would be interested to know where that crocodile was actually caught in Rockhampton. I believe that there was an edict that that exercise be costed to find out the real cost. I would like to know whether that costing included the cost of using Marine and Ports Division staff and their boats in looking for slide marks in the mud leading to the river and searching for the crocodile. I understand that at one stage an aerial survey was carried out. I would like to know whether the use of an aircraft was included in the costing and whether the time of all the people involved in the search and all the vehicles used was included in the costing. Unless that was done, there is no way of knowing what it is going to actually cost the taxpayer to catch each crocodile. If it fudges the figures, the Government can convince itself that it is not costing much money at all, but if it is honest with itself, it will discover that it will probably cost at least \$5,000 per crocodile. The crocodile-farmers were doing it for nothing. They were prepared to catch the crocodiles as a public service on the proviso that they were then able to utilise them for breeding. Such action has the backing of CITES and the international agreement under the CITES treaty.

Crocodile-farming is one of the success stories of the conservation movement. It has built up numbers right around the world, and people in the conservation movement

are very supportive of it. In my opinion, this whole agenda comes from a certain lady in the Minister's office. She and her friends are urging the Minister to go in this direction. I urge the Minister to reconsider this move, which will cost the taxpayers a lot of money. A lot of funds are going to be wasted unnecessarily.

Mr HAYWARD (Caboolture) (5.42 p.m.): The debate on this Appropriation Bill presents an opportunity to consider a matter that has become increasingly focused on in this State, that is, the role of Government in Queensland and the most desirable ways of delivering Government programs. There seems to be some confusion amongst politicians on the Opposition side about the concept of rationalisation as compared to the concept of and the discussions about regionalisation. There seem to be some differences of opinion about that. This issue has been raised in the media, and I think that the same misconceptions abound there. Today's editorial in the *Courier-Mail* describes the hostile reaction of rural communities to the wholesale reduction of rural and remote services. It is interesting to note that that newspaper distinguishes between the railway service--which I think it described as not being a Government service--and the closure of courthouses. In last night's Adjournment debate, the member for Warwick gave a thoughtful speech about similar sorts of issues. He talked about some of the rationalisation programs and how they are affecting his electorate. The subject has also been raised today by the member for Cunningham and other honourable members.

The issue that honourable members are really talking about is change. That debate is certainly not confined to Queensland. Change is happening the world over. It is happening now. It is even happening in the Soviet Union, to which another honourable member alluded earlier. The old way of doing things is being threatened by the availability of new technology, particularly technology as it relates to the distribution or the receiving of information. Governments are under pressure to privatise and corporatise many of the major Government activities which used to be considered a holy grail of Governments. Queensland is not insulated from that pressure for change. We do not live in a vacuum. The same pressures that are faced the world over are faced in this State. I cite the example of some of the obvious changes in the last two years in the State of Queensland. We have seen the creation of the Electoral and Administrative Review Commission and the Criminal Justice Commission. The most significant change in the last two years is that Queenslanders have elected a new Government to this State. Earlier today the shadow Treasurer, Mr Stoneman, referred to regionalisation. He went back to his old ways, his old habits--one of which is to try to pick winners. He kept talking about the north Queensland enterprise zone, putting the argument that regionalisation has been let down. He concentrated on the nickel refinery--another example of where a previous Government has tried to pick a winner. That is very difficult to do.

Dr Watson, the Liberals' spokesman on Treasury matters, concentrated his comments on superannuation. He failed to recognise one of the fundamental problems in a State such as Queensland when investment by the larger superannuation companies tends to go to large multinational companies rather than the smaller competitive companies that do have a product which is worth selling and certainly which in many cases may be important to regional Queensland. A number of members opposite would know of firms in their own electorates that have invented processes or products but have run into difficulty because of the impossibility of raising capital.

When the Premier raises these issues in the public arena, all we hear is knocking from the shadow Treasurer. With superannuation, we have to remember that we are dealing with other people's money--people's savings; money they have put away for their future. However, the State does make a significant contribution, albeit in a fairly indirect way, particularly with superannuation schemes for the self-employed. As most members would be aware, significant tax advantages attract to such superannuation investments. All members of the public are making a contribution through the tax system, so surely there should be some quid pro quo to enable that superannuation money to go to companies and people who have important ideas of benefit to the State and the country.

The Liberals' spokesman made some comments about coal freight rates. That issue has been well canvassed. Certainly it was those opposite who, when in Government, came up with the notion of coal freight rates. They realised, as this Government realises, that coal revenue was important to the running of the State. He cannot sit back with his nine or so members and make the blanket statement that he will abolish that freight rate, because he will never have the chance to do anything about it. He also referred to the Gladstone Power Station. He said that this Government had failed to deliver on that, but he described as a mere bagatelle the argument over the price differential of \$500m, or whatever it is. But if it is sold for less than what it is really worth, the constituents, the people of Queensland, are the ones who have to pick up the tab. It surprises me that a person of what we are led to believe is Dr Watson's ability can make such spurious claims. It indicates to me that he has never been out of Brisbane and into regional Queensland to see how people live and to see what services need to be provided.

As part of this Government's commitment to public sector reform, it has established the Public Sector Management Commission. The commission is charged with the review of all departments. At this stage it has completed a new classification and remuneration system for public servants. It has developed proper processes of recruitment, selection and performance assessment of staff. They are very important notions to be considered when developing the public sector in Queensland. Two significant factors make Queensland stand out from the rest of Australia. Because of our vast size, the community has a strong expectation about the services provided by the State Government. As I have said, last night the member for Warwick and earlier today the member for Cunningham spoke about some of those expectations. I think the honourable member for Warwick referred to courthouses.

Mr Springborg: Would you agree that part of the reason we have such a decentralised State and most of the people west of Brisbane is that we provided such good services to the country?

Mr HAYWARD: I will answer that in a moment. The second point I want to make is that Queensland has developed a public sector which is not used to change. The Opposition has to remember that Queenslanders do not readily accept change. That can be a real problem when one is in Opposition. Unfortunately--and I think this is the nub of the problem--the process of regionalisation of Government services is being confused with the rationalisation of Government services. Rationalisation is expressed in Queensland through the corporatisation of some Government operations. Some examples have been mentioned, such as Queensland Rail and the decision to establish a series of business units in the Department of Administrative Services. These decisions provide advantages to all Queenslanders because the more efficiencies we have in the operation of Government, the more opportunity there is to save taxpayers' money.

The other important point is that the self-funding of Government enterprises results in a greater income to Government for those essential services we all desire in our electorates, such as education, police and hospitals. These advantages are not completely understood by all Queenslanders because when the focus is narrowed to an individual and rationalising means the loss of his or her job as a result of the closing of an uneconomic office or, for instance, the courthouses that were alluded to before, suddenly there is concern about those issues. That is a problem that arises when rationalisation is introduced. We have a concern--and I am aware of the concern--in regional Queensland that, if rationalisation occurs in a smaller town or district, such actions may have an impact on entire communities. As I said, the member for Warwick spoke about that last night. One has only to travel round to understand the very fragile existence of some of those communities.

If we concentrate on the self-funding of a service which was previously free, we then have to face the question: will the community accept the trade-off that it has to pay for that service to provide schools and hospitals for the whole of the Queensland community? At this stage, from what one reads and hears in this place, that is certainly

unlikely. As I said before, some examples have been cited, such as the closure of courthouses. So far, the Government has closed some Magistrates Courts that have only one or two staff members. They were closed because they were not providing the full range of services that are available. The closures resulted from a Price Waterhouse review which basically found that the return of the Magistrates Courts exceeded public demand. Concern was also expressed by some members in this place--I think the member for Warwick was one--about the closures. I appreciate the honourable member's point. Some problems are created because the closures affect what one might call some non-judicial services that are provided.

The other example, of course, was the cutting-back on railway staff numbers. As all of us in this place know, this process has been going on for the last five years. Of course, it has impacted on many small centres. The obvious example of that impact is in the town of Cloncurry. Another example is the withdrawal of some DPI stock-inspectors. We know why that has happened. It does not matter what people say in this place and when they confuse rationalisation with regionalisation. Much of that has occurred simply because of the winding-up of the brucellosis eradication program. As members of Parliament, we all have a responsibility, I believe, not to deliberately confuse rationalisation with regionalisation. Regionalisation of Government activities involves placing the makers of decisions on service delivery and related matters closer to the clients. As members, we should be encouraging and supporting that activity. As all of us should know, the decision-making power is placed in the hands of public servants in regional and local centres. This is important, but it is often ignored. It results in a transfer of authority away from Brisbane to the country, thus boosting staff outside Brisbane.

Let me set the record straight. The previous Government presided over a Queensland public service which was the most centralised in Australia. Queensland is a decentralised State with regional centres, yet the public service based all of its decision-making in Brisbane. Departments which are pursuing major regionalisation programs in Queensland and which should be given credit for so doing are the Lands Department, the Education Department, the Health Department and the Primary Industries Department. Those departments are taking decisions out of Brisbane to the areas of service delivery. We do not hear in this place any support for that process. It is a process which is very important, particularly for members who represent regional areas. It is important because it is obvious that a properly implemented program of regionalisation should imply--and I think the member for Balonne would agree with this--an improved quality of service delivery in that area. It is logical that that should occur. As I said, it is obvious because decisions are made closer to the service delivery point, where the users are. All of us come into this place and say, "We want to make the decisions; we want to make those decisions locally." The regionalisation program provides the opportunity to make those decisions locally. However, that program is criticised all the time. But it is important that it be carried out.

Mr LINGARD: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I draw your attention to the state of the House.

Quorum formed.

Mr HAYWARD: As I said, those departments that I mentioned are pursuing a major regionalisation program. It is obvious how important that is because it means an improved quality of service delivery in a region. Decisions are made locally, where the users are. Importantly, as a result of that--and this should be understood also by members opposite--additional resources should be made available to users, because many of the resources that were previously used in head offices in checking, vouching and in processing functions should no longer be required. They should be able to be dealt with on a local level. As I said before, there are a number of examples of the regionalisation initiatives undertaken by this Government and where they are working. For instance, the Attorney-General, who is in the Chamber, would be aware of the Community Justice Program, which will be established in Mount Isa, and the Community

Justice Anti-Discrimination Unit, which has been established in Townsville. The Department of Business, Industry and Regional Development will open six new offices in Gladstone, Bundaberg, the Sunshine Coast, Ipswich, the Gold Coast and Mount Isa in addition to its existing offices throughout the State. That will necessitate the employment of an additional 24 staff members, which is very important.

This Government has indicated that there is a need to avoid--and this is important also--the creation of mini head offices in regional centres. Also, it has to be understood that regional centres such as Townsville, Cairns, Toowoomba, Rockhampton and Mount Isa contain a significant proportion of the total population of the State. One has to expect that, when one deals with any regional program, those services will be delivered to those areas. This Government's regional development program is important. It is important because it will breathe life into local towns and, even more importantly, it will provide an improved quality of service for all Queenslanders.

Sitting suspended from 6 to 7.30 p.m.

Debate interrupted.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Hon. R. T. McLEAN (Bulimba--Minister for Administrative Services) (7.30 p.m.), by leave: I wish to add to an answer which I gave in this House this morning. On the subject of the Senior Executive Service and use of Government cars by senior public servants, I am advised that while other jurisdictions, most notably New South Wales, have given their SES officers substantial increases in salary packages, Queensland has not.

Previously, senior public servants were given the private use, at no cost, of motor vehicles without that benefit being publicly declared. Under the SES arrangements, they are now required to pay for the private use component of their vehicles as part of their remuneration packaging. The cost of the vehicle to the individual executive is based on the private use proportion of the vehicle and operating costs. The Government estimates this private use component at 50 per cent. For example, executives entitled to a standard Falcon would contribute \$5,200 a year from their salary packages.

I am advised that some 280 executives have been appointed to the SES. Nevertheless, I am advised that it is not possible to talk in terms of savings as I did this morning.

Mr Lingard: So the \$5,200 was a fib?

Mr McLEAN: No. It is right. The \$5,200 is right.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 1)

Debate resumed.

Hon. V. P. LESTER (Peak Downs) (7.32 p.m.): There is no doubt in my mind that the ALP Government is treating country people as a joke. There is no other way to describe it. I wish to talk about the Central Highlands for a moment. The Central Highlands has 2 per cent of the population of Queensland but is responsible for some \$4 billion of total exports. That is half of the exports of Queensland. So the 2 per cent of the population in the Central Highlands is responsible for half of Queensland's exports. One would think that this Government would say, "Well done. Thank you, fellows and girls. We will give you a pat on the back." No way in the world! This Government seems hell-bent on destroying or taking away what we have achieved.

The Central Highlands people have as one asked me to come to the Parliament tonight and say that we are totally disgusted at what is happening in the Central Highlands and at the treatment that the ALP is dishing out to these people--this 2 per cent of the population--who work so hard to support people in the cities and all over the rest of Queensland. I am using the debate tonight to say that this Government's treatment of the people of the area is unfair and that we will fight it with everything we have.

Mr Springborg: So 2 per cent times the revenue adds up to no Government services for Peak Downs.

Mr LESTER: The Government is trying to take away every Government service that we have. I instance the brilliant TAFE college in the Central Highlands. It is the most cost-effective TAFE college in the State. If one takes the cost per student and the number of teachers per student and compares that with the figures for other TAFE colleges in Queensland, one finds that the Central Highlands TAFE college is far more efficient than any other college. But what did this Government do? It said, "We do not want a TAFE college in the Central Highlands." In fact, it has taken away our hair-dressing course and, believe it or not, transferred it to the Kangaroo Point college in Brisbane. People were on the waiting list for this very good course. The Government has not only done this to Peak Downs; it is also doing the same thing to Kingaroy. The local member is up in arms, and so are the people. They will vote this Government out at the next election. The people of Warwick have had the same deed perpetrated against them. As I said, the hair-dressing course has been transferred to Brisbane. That is hardly fair and that is hardly decentralisation.

I ask why this Government, which promised before the last election that it would decentralise all services, has taken away these services from the country. I would not mind if the services in the country were not being supported, but they are. There are people on the waiting list. These facilities are still being taken away. Recently, I learned that the Government is also considering taking away our diesel fitter course. The Central Highlands, with all its mining development, all its cotton industry, all its citrus development, all the cattle development and all the gemfields development, has a massive need for this course. Yet the Government is taking it away. I understand that diesel fitter courses of excellence will be offered in Rockhampton and in Brisbane. Lord love the lizards! Why on earth does everything have to go to Brisbane!

When I was Minister, in the interests of decentralisation I was able to get all these courses at the Central Highlands college. We have been able to provide two years of block training. I fear that that is now under very heavy threat. That has got the people up in arms. There are public meetings and marches in the street. Believe it or not, I had to march in the street with TAFE students who were very concerned about the rises in fees. Not only are our facilities being taken away, but also the Government is putting up the fees as well. I thought the Labor Government was for the poor people of the State, but the poor people are missing out. Only the wealthy can afford these new TAFE fees. I had to march with these students in the streets----

Mrs Woodgate: Backwards?

Mr LESTER: I marched forwards. Do not worry about marching backwards. It is about time that some members opposite became a bit more positive. I challenge them to come up to my electorate and march backwards with me. We will raise money for charity. I have done that in the past. That is why I continue to be re-elected. I am not frightened to do these things, because the people are as one. Furthermore, believe it or not, there was a great picture of me in the *Central Queensland News* on the weekend.

Mr Palaszczuk: There it is.

Mr LESTER: That is not the one, but that did a good job, as well. I participated in the Terry Fox walk. How many members of the ALP went in the Terry Fox walk at the weekend and, indeed, ran for 10 kilometres? I ran, and I had to support others. The caption in the paper stated that a fit member for Peak Downs helped others along and raised money. How many members opposite did that? I bet that neither Mr Prest nor Mr Hamill did it. Mr Hamill is too busy taking away our railway stations. In Emerald, the Minister is cutting the service down to the level of a C-grade railway station, with a net loss of nine people. When the Premier visited Emerald, the railway workers told him how concerned they were. He said that he would look at the matter, but what did he do? He gave the problem to Mr Hamill, who took those people away from an area that has 2 per cent of Queensland's population and is responsible for half of its exports.

We do not call that a very fair deal. It means simply that the ALP does not want us----

Government members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Campbell): Order!

Mr LESTER: I do not need your protection, Mr Deputy Speaker. Government members are jolly well not up to it. They cannot cop it; that is why they are carrying on. But thank you all the same. It is appreciated very much. The Government is closing down our trucking yards at Gindie, Anakie and Capella, for goodness' sake.

Mr Hamill: Is that you?

Mr LESTER: Yes. That will show the people of Peak Downs how frivolous the Minister is. All he can do is point out an article that has been written about me in the *Sun*, but that article gives me credit for achievement, too. The Minister should sit there and listen intently, but he is not concentrating on the deliberations. A good Oxford scholar should sit up and listen. He should immediately come to grips with the problems of Gindie, Anakie and Capella and the railway trucking yards that are being closed down. The workers have told me that they are not impressed at all with the ALP Government. They have all told me that, because of what has been perpetrated on their district by the ALP, there is no way in the world that they will vote for the ALP at the next election. The ALP does not want us there. The people are most concerned.

Withersfield is a very important place in my electorate. The people there have been told that their trucking yard could also be closed down. Furthermore, there is the railway station at Anakie--the gateway to the great gemfields. What is occurring? The Government is talking about closing it down. People travel in the Midlander train, which arrives at Anakie at midnight. If that station is closed, those people will have to get off the train at Emerald, where the train arrives at about 20 minutes to 11. They will then have to drive to the gemfields in the middle of the night amidst the kangaroos. That shows how little concern the Government has. If city people who were travelling at night in a new hire car struck a kangaroo, they would not know how to handle it. They would probably swerve, overturn their car and possibly be killed. Those are the possible ramifications of the closure of the Anakie Railway Station.

Trains passing through the Anakie Railway Station supply milk and goods for the shops. In addition, passengers who come to visit the gemfields get off the train at Anakie. They are very distraught. All over Queensland, people are concerned. I will say a good word for the stationmaster there, Mr Golledge. The other day, I went to the station, as I so often do when I visit Anakie. I had a yarn to Mr Golledge. I cannot say too much, or the Minister will sack the poor cow. However, he gave me railway brochures of even the Gulflander train. He is a good man who is doing what he can to promote the railways of Queensland. I take my hat off to Mr Golledge because he is a great man, but this action is leaving him completely devastated. Over the years, he has worked to build up that railway station, but it looks like being shut down. I understand that we might save it yet, and we are trying to do that.

Earlier, I mentioned that the hair-dressing course at the Central Highlands TAFE College has been transferred to the Kangaroo Point TAFE college in Brisbane and that it will possibly lose the diesel fitters' course to the Yeronga TAFE college. In addition, in the past 12 months, the Government cut the budget of the college by 7 per cent. It has a better ratio than anywhere else in the State, but the budget was cut by 7 per cent. Now, the teachers there tell me that the budget will be cut again. I just wonder how long the Government can keep belting a college that has done so well. If Government members do not think that is enough, what about the local government grants? I say to the members of the ALP: it is about time that they stood up to the local government grants commission. Funds for the Belyando Shire have been cut by \$200,000. Funds for the Peak Downs Shire have been cut, as have the funds for the Bauhinia Shire. Funds

for the Emerald Shire have also been cut back by more than \$100,000. This Government has done nothing to rectify that situation.

In a few years, those local authorities will not receive any local government grants at all. That will mean that the hostel that supports our students will not be subsidised, either, and might have to close. What about the students from Tieri, Capella, Clermont and Anakie who depend on this hostel accommodation when they attend courses at the TAFE college? Because of the silly way in which the rules work, some of these students do not qualify for Austudy. They will be denied an education. The Labor Party is responsible for this and stands condemned. As a result, the people in the Central Highlands wonder where they are going.

The Clermont-Charters Towers road is very important because it is an alternative route to the coastal highway. What on earth has happened to that road? The late Russ Hinze allocated \$4m a year for that road. He was as good as his word. What has Mr Hamill done? He has cut the funding back to \$2m a year. In addition, the work has slowed down a little and in effect the funding is approximately \$1.5m a year. There are only 67 kilometres of road to finish and, if the Minister could be a little generous and give us the money to complete that bitumen sealing, there would be an alternative highway to the coastal highway. This would mean that there would be fewer accidents on the coastal highway. I would have thought that members who represent coastal seats would rise as one to support me in seeking funds for the Clermont-Charters Towers road, because it would mean that there would be a lower density of traffic on the roads through their electorates.

At a school at Lockington in the Drummond Ranges the p. and c. association decided that it would install air-conditioning because it gets so hot in the middle of summer. The people asked for a small subsidy to help pay for this air-conditioning. This Labor Government said, "No. Furthermore, you had better make sure you fit it the right way or we will make you take it all out and pay for the cost of doing that." The people of Lockington were trying to assist but the Government would not even give them a small subsidy for the school which is down in the south-west corner of my electorate. Does the Government not realise that these people already have enough problems? They live near Bogantungan where the roads are bad, yet they are working hard to produce the beef that many Government members eat. The Government will not subsidise air-conditioning at this school, and it is a very poor show.

I turn now to discuss the School of Distance Education which was to have been established at Emerald. The National Party Government had it all ready to go, but this Labor Government mucked about with it for 18 months. We are still not sure what is happening. In fact, next Tuesday, there is to be yet another meeting of very angry people in Clermont who will have their say about this Government and what it is not doing. Why should the people in the Central Highlands go without? The Labor Government has forgotten what it is all about; it is all about supporting Charleville, Longreach and Charters Towers, because the schools in those areas are overloaded. We need a School of Distance Education in the Central Highlands. We do not need one in Rockhampton to appease Mr Braddy. It is tommyrot to even think about putting such a school in Rockhampton. Why on earth would a School of Distance Education be needed in Rockhampton when there is a school bus service in the region?

Primary producers are distraught about the cut-backs in staff that have occurred in the Primary Industries Department. This Government is cutting back on the number of research people rather than on the number of people in administration. This means that research will not be carried out into how to grow better grain and wheat and how to breed better bullocks, etc. The result is that Australia will compete on the international market at a distinct disadvantage. It will be way behind other countries such as Canada and the United States which produce beef and whose Governments support research. They will leave us for dead because we will not have done the research necessary to grow better wheat, grain, sunflowers, safflowers and beef. The consumer is becoming very discerning. He or she wants top quality beef and the requirements of our overseas

buyers change from day to day. We have to be up with it. Gone are the days when a producer could sell a herd of bullocks at the saleyards. These days that producer may not be growing the right type of beef or the beef might have too much fat.

In conclusion—this is a very sorry night, because I have had to explain to this Parliament what has been taken away from the people in the Central Highlands and what looks like being taken away in the future. The members of the ALP have made some inane remarks during my speech here tonight when I tried to illustrate the great distress experienced by the people of the Central Highlands.

Mr WELFORD (Stafford) (7.55 p.m.): And members of the Labor Party thought that the member for Peak Downs had stopped walking backwards! The member for Peak Downs referred to railways, so I will steal a phrase penned by Bob Dylan and describe poor old Vince as a "slow train coming". During this debate, members of the Opposition have railed heavily against the Government's action in the western districts of Queensland. The member for Moggill—the Liberal Party's professorial delegate from one of the universities—has informed members about the economic problems that have been wrought by Labor Governments. However, the fact of the matter is that the economic problems experienced by this State and this country are problems that have been around for many, many years.

Mr Stephan: Ever since Bob Hawke was elected.

Mr WELFORD: They have been around since the sixties. It was during the sixties and seventies that these problems were created, and the structural weaknesses of this State's economy are causing all the problems. Members of the Opposition complain about the courts system, the lack of sufficient judges and the reviews that are taking place in Government circles. However, the fact of the matter is that those reviews are long overdue.

It is true that this State's accounts are in a good position. To some extent, it is also true that that condition was bequeathed to this Labor Government by the previous Government, but members of that National Party Government were not by any means perfect managers. The Racing Development Fund is a good example of National Party management because it had massive debts that the present Government will have to deal with. The previous Government also failed to talk up the tourism industry, which was still operating at half throttle when the Labor Government came to office and still needs a great deal of work to bring it to the standard of industry that this State should be able to achieve, given its tourism potential. In spite of the so-called balanced budgets of the Bjelke-Petersen era, Queensland's economy provided Queensland's workers with the lowest wages and the highest unemployment levels of any State in Australia. Furthermore, when the Labor Party won Government, the social structure in this State was the weakest and most underdeveloped of any State in Australia. One has only to recall the schools system and the training and education system that were so inadequate—despite the pork-barrelling that went on for years under the National Party Government—this State's inability to deliver health services, and the environment that was degraded through years of neglect as a result of the former Government's cargo cult mentality. In spite of all the pretence about economic and financial integrity that the National Party purportedly bequeathed to this Government, the fact is that the social infrastructure bequeathed to the Labor Government in this State was at an absolutely abysmal low. The National Party Government had no commitment to education, health and environment—the essential services which, more than anything else, determined the quality of life for the people of this State. The National Party had no commitment to the qualities of life that make up the standard of living enjoyed by Queenslanders.

Mr Foley: Queensland had the lowest per capita education spending in Australia.

Mr WELFORD: Indeed. Queensland had the lowest per capita education funding and the lowest level of provision of public housing of any State in Australia. The people who were least able to afford housing or to fend for themselves were the ones who were left out in the cold by members of the previous National Party Government who ran

around providing Government-backed guarantees to the Mike Gores--the tax-dodgers of the world. They ran around promoting hydrogen cars of mystical capability, cancer quacks and other strange quirks that can be traced to National Party fundamentalist thinking.

During the period of National Party Government, the public sector was grinding to a halt. It was fat, inefficient and unproductive. This Government has had to turn that trend around and develop a new foundation for the delivery of public services in Queensland. Because this Government is working towards achieving a high level of efficiency and revitalisation of Government administration to enable real services to be provided from taxpayers' funds, members of the Opposition cannot take it. They cannot accept the fact that the public sector must serve the community, and that is what this Government is working towards. The Goss Labor Government does not want to burden the towns and cities of this State with ranks of idle public servants. If the Government puts public servants in the regions, it expects them to provide an efficient service. To his credit, the Treasurer of this State, Mr De Lacy, in conjunction with other Ministers, is now working to achieve that end. As a result, the people of Queensland will have better access to all Government services, instead of being confronted with people who are standing around in various areas throughout the State. Members of the National Party should complain now about the closure of courthouses and other facilities because, in 12 months' time, when this Government's reforms come to fruition, they will not be able to offer one word of criticism. They will be forced to realise that the reforms laying the foundation of Government administrative efficiency will bear fruit in 12 months' time, and will leave no room for justifiable complaint.

I turn now to discuss the contribution made to this debate by the member for Moggill who referred to the so-called statistical reports of the economic consultants from Canberra, Access Economics. He referred specifically to the decline in investment in Queensland compared to other States. He said that the investment patterns have to be right, and members of the Labor Party might very well ask the member for Moggill exactly what the right investment patterns, about which he seems to know so much, are. He provided no details or solutions. He was long on criticism and rhetoric, but very short on solutions. The fact of the matter is that the determination of investment patterns is not merely a question of Government initiatives; rather, it is the structural deficiencies of this State's economy that underlie Queensland's present weak investment performance. The structural weakness to which I have referred previously is the result of this State being uniquely dependent on primary production, that is, upon the farm and the quarry. For that reason, during good seasons, there will be increased investment in those industries. I am sure that honourable members will recall Malcolm Fraser's prediction in the 1980s that Australia would have an investment-led recovery through the mining industry. To some extent, increased investment did occur in mining and primary production. Because commodity prices have fallen and because the terms of trade have turned for the worse, we do not have that investment now. It is not a question of Government policy; it is a question of the market determining where investment would flow. Investment will not flow into industries where there are no returns in the short term.

In a moment, I will say something more about the short-term and long-term debate. I endorse the remarks that the Premier made this week when he encouraged business to adopt a more long-term outlook when making investment decisions. The Premier's so-called program of new intervention was the source of much criticism, both in the media and in this Parliament, by the member for Moggill. The honourable member is playing a cynical political game. He knows that, in its Treasury policies, this Government is determined to pick winners. As the Premier himself said, the Government is not intervening to determine or dictate where private-sector investment is to be placed. On the contrary, the Premier is simply pointing out a simple and indisputable fact: the long-term economic security of our State and our country can be assured only if private-sector investment looks to long-term yield, as Japanese investment currently does. That

yield is the one which will best serve the interests of Queenslanders--not only employees, but also those who are in business.

The argument involving criticism of other States--that somehow the policies of Queensland are something like those of Victoria or Western Australia--is utterly fatuous. The Western Australian experiment was just that--an experiment. Sure, it went wrong. But let that not be the final test of when a Government should intervene. There have been errors in other States, but, if the experiment in Western Australia had been pulled off, then the members of the Western Australian Labor Government would today be heroes. The fact that they are not heroes is not due to the failure of Government intervention in economic policy or the economic future of a regional economy; it occurred simply because those who negotiated on behalf of the Government in Western Australia were not up to the task. That task was to make sure that the figures added up in the shonky books of those with whom they dealt. They were very careless in dealing with Bond and the other entrepreneurs who were in Western Australia for a quick buck. If ever there was an example of short-sighted investment practices, it was the Bond Corporation when it went around the country chewing up our foreign debt by investing in take-overs and taking over existing businesses rather than investing in new, productive capacity for this country.

That was the weakness of other States. It had nothing to do with the failure of Government's role in determining or encouraging proper investment in the economy. In the last few days, the Premier has not intervened in any way other than by encouraging and endorsing a new way of thinking in business, a way of thinking which places priority on long-term planning. The reason for Queensland being in this so-called investment hole is not Labor policy or the policies of our Government but the structural weaknesses which are inherent in the Queensland economy and which, in the long term, have to be turned around. Whether we like it or not, the long-term security of this State can never be sustained by our total dependence upon minerals and farm products. Whether people like it or not, we can leave the market to itself for the time being. But, sooner or later, Governments--either Federal or State--will have to intervene because the existing dependency of the Queensland economy on the farm and the quarry cannot be sustained. It cannot be sustained in many ways. It is not economically sustainable and it is not ecologically sustainable.

We have seen the program of reform that the conservatives have for us in this country. The member for Brisbane Central outlined one of the planks of Liberal Party proposals at the Federal level--the introduction of a consumption tax. A consumption tax, combined with a deregulated wages system, is designed to strip assets from the working families of this country and strip the wages of working people in this country. The conservatives will take assets from working people through taxes, and more taxes, on every item they have to buy to sustain their families' standard of living. Then the conservatives will cut the wages from under people's feet by deregulating the wages system, as has happened in New Zealand, and will strip Australian workers of any semblance of decent working conditions.

That is the conservative agenda in this country. If we go down that road, we can be guaranteed a fast-track to economic decline. If the member for Moggill, our professorial expert in this Parliament, wants to see Queensland fall into an investment hole, he will certainly see it if Hewson and his cronies ever get the reins of the Treasury bench in Canberra and deliver to the Queensland and Australian public the recipe for suffering that they have planned for this country.

I wish to turn to what I regard as a new ethic for economics. It is a new ethic that is based on a new formula, a new way of thinking--a new, broader philosophy of economic outlook to enhance our standard of living as a community. In years gone by, we were raised with a view that our future would be made secure and successful if in our education we concentrated on the three Rs. All honourable members would be well aware of the principle of the three Rs. We were taught to understand that, by concentrating on the three Rs in our education, we would be assured of a successful future. To a large

extent, that is true today. It is manifested in the policies of this Government, which places a very high priority on the educational standards of Queenslanders.

But there is another formula which Governments and industry must focus on if we are to establish long-term sustainable development. I refer to what I call the three Es. Unless we get the right mix of the three Es, no development will be sustainable. Development will not be sustainable economically or ecologically. The three Es to which I refer are energy, environment and economics. Energy policy, economic policy and the mix of those two policies in an ecologically sustainable context provide the formula which Government and industry must focus on if economic development is to be in any sense sustainable in the long term.

One of the arguments against long-term thinking is that there is scientific uncertainty. For example, the uncertainty about the greenhouse effect is one excuse for Governments never doing anything about it--an alibi for Government inaction. If climatic changes do occur, as the majority of scientists now believe will happen, then the longer Governments do nothing about it, the greater the changes will be and the greater the difficulties that will be experienced turning our economies around to face the cold realities of our ecological predicament. I refer to a cartoon in the *Sydney Morning Herald* some months ago which depicted a politician saying, "We cannot afford to save the world. However, we can afford to destroy it." That is really what it is all about. Long-term thinking and long-term planning in industry and in Government is about what we are prepared to spend and how much we are prepared to invest now to ensure that in the long term that investment can be sustained and the product of that investment can be sustained. We have a choice to make economic growth. We have a choice to establish a sustainable growth. However, no growth or development can be sustainable if it is not ecologically sustainable.

Recently, I visited Victoria and spoke with officers of the Renewable Energy Authority in that State. Studies conducted by that authority have shown that, notwithstanding reductions in the CO₂ emissions which affect the greenhouse gases, we can establish economic growth, added-value growth, without necessarily having a corresponding growth in our consumption and waste of resources. We can increase employment opportunities and manufacturing opportunities in this country while at the same time using our energy more efficiently and effectively. Four issues summarise the focus that I am advocating. Firstly, the longer the rhetoric continues without action, the more opportunities will be lost in the long term for industrial growth, employment and exports. Secondly, even if the increase in greenhouses gases does not greatly affect the climate, there are certain actions in energy conservation and renewable energy use that should be taken now to benefit society, the economy and our general environment. Thirdly, the cost of all energy options should be analysed on a common basis. They should be compared with the cost of providing additional supply from conventional sources. And, fourthly, regulation and/or financial incentives will probably be required to maximise the potential for energy conservation and renewable energy technologies. This last point is the point with which the free marketeers opposite would disagree, because their view is that the market will always resolve which are the best choices to make, that the market will sort out which is the correct technology to use. However, that is not necessarily so. For example, in making decisions to invest in future power-generation facilities, the utility generally looks to the long-term investment and return on a power station, but when companies make capital investments, they look to the short-term return on that investment in energy equipment. Government needs to provide incentive, encouragement and regulation to ensure that business makes the right decisions--decisions which result in efficient energy use and not just the least-cost method of establishing energy production. This is medicine for a future healthy planet. It is medicine which must be used in a right mixture of energy, economics and environment if the development of our State's economy, our regional economy and our national economy is to be sustainable in the long term. I repeat that there can be no economic development, no economic growth and no long-term sustainable development unless it is also ecologically sustainable.

Time expired.

Mr PERRETT (Barambah) (8.12 p.m.): It does not give me a lot of joy to take part in this debate tonight because what I want to talk about are some of the things that are of major concern to the country-dwellers of Queensland and particularly the rural producers. As this opportunity has arisen, I feel that I have to make this House aware of just what is taking place out in the bush. The Department of Primary Industries is largely responsible for one of the powerhouses of this State's economy. Historically, primary production has been the backbone of our domestic and export economies. In recent years, of course, the money figures have shaded in favour of tourism and mining as export earners. They are great and valuable industries and must be fostered at every opportunity. However, primary production provides more deep-seated benefits to this State and this nation. Prosperous primary industries provide export earnings in huge measure. They also provide employment, not just on the farm but also in processing, transport and many other sectors. Most of our towns and cities would disappear if primary production went under.

In short, our great rural industries should be nurtured and encouraged by the State Government. Under Labor, the exact opposite is true. What about Labor's rural and northern task force? What has it achieved for people out in the bush? Over the last three or four months, I have spoken to many groups in the bush, and I have been told that that task force is just a cruel hoax and has produced nothing, that it is just a Labor con job. Where have the courthouses been returned? Where have the services been restored as a result of visits by that task force? It is just not happening. Encouragement for rural industries, hope for rural communities, are just not part of Labor's plan. Instead, there is a new philosophy which can be summed up very simply. This Government of old union heavies, yuppie suburban lawyers and failed businessmen has only one aim, and that is to soap the squatters and make the bush pay for deserting Labor so long ago, to save some money in the bush to spend it in the city, to let the north and the west die, and who cares. This Government believes that if it can save plenty, it can spend it between Noosa and the Tweed, between Brisbane and the range. It believes that it can buy enough seats to stay in power.

Everyone knew that regional Queensland would do it hard under Labor, and hard "Labor" it certainly has been. The cut-backs in rural spending started as soon as Labor assumed office. Every Minister had his chop. The Minister for Environment and Heritage started grabbing good productive land for national parks. The Minister for Land Management increased the rents on lands used for rural production. The Treasurer made sure that the QIDC interest rates became a bigger problem. The Transport Minister wiped out rail services. As I say, all the Ministers got in for their chop. I suppose the Minister for Primary Industries did not want to be left behind, so he has tried hardest of them all. He has made sure nobody could accuse him of lying down on the job.

Mr Littleproud: Now there is a failed businessman.

Mr PERRETT: The honourable member can say that again. If there were cuts to be made and damage to be done, he would be in there with the best of them. Forget the frantic efforts of media managers to convince us we are all better off; forget the Labor media army telling us how there is something for everyone; forget the expensive efforts to sell regionalisation to us; and forget the pleas to believe what the Government says and not take notice of what it does. The producers of Queensland and the people in rural towns dependent upon primary industry are not taking notice of the press releases any more; they are looking at the evidence in front of them. It is hard to miss. Who can miss the suddenly empty seed laboratories? Who can miss the empty Government house where the stock-inspector used to live before he was made redundant? Who can miss the plant-breeding program closed down to save a few dollars, or the empty DPI office? All these rural services have gone. The Minister must think producers are thick. He could not believe that producers think they are better off without the horticultural adviser in an area that the Government has said is ideal for small crops, or without the soil scientist they used to have.

The Minister for Primary Industries has presided over the dismantling of the department which has the most effect on the future survival of extremely valuable industries. He has forced reductions in important research and extension services provided by the agricultural branch of the department. If he thinks that is not a problem, he has failed to come to grips with the realities of agriculture in the modern world. If that is the case, he is too incompetent to hold down the job.

Australian producers have a well-deserved reputation as being the most efficient in the world. They have to be, just to survive. They are competing in world markets with one hand tied behind their backs. They have to meet world prices manipulated in the most cynical manner by huge trading nations which subsidise both the production and selling costs of their own farmers. At the same time, producers have to cope with a Federal Labor Government which has the naivety of a small child. It believes that if it abandons all protection and all help for farmers, the rest of the world will follow suit. It thinks the Americans, the European Community and the Japanese will be overwhelmed by this simple faith and start playing fair. It would be laughable if it did not make our producers sitting ducks. In that sort of environment we have to keep improving our productivity, yet the Minister refuses to be diverted from the Labor course. He forges ahead with cuts in the research and extension programs that have been helping our producers maintain the edge, taking away the very services our producers need if they are to keep lifting their efficiency.

The agricultural branch is being dismantled, but other services are disappearing just as fast. Stock-inspectors are being offered redundancy packages, and vacancies in their ranks are not being filled. Our livestock industries are being placed in great danger of exotic diseases. The people whose job it is to detect problems and to contain them before they get out of hand are simply not around any more. Honourable members from the urban south-east might not be concerned, but let me assure them that they will be concerned if something like foot-and-mouth disease gets into our northern cattle industry. If that happens, there will not be a lot of meat on the tables in Brisbane, there will not be a lot of jobs in the meatworks and there will not be a lot of export income from the beef industry--because there will not be a beef industry. There will not be a dairy industry or a sheep industry, either. It would virtually annihilate our livestock industries overnight.

We all hope that that will not happen, but we have to be realistic. It is only a matter of time before some disease comes in over our northern coastline. Every day, small boats cross from Papua New Guinea to the Torres Strait islands. It seems that every week foreign fishing boats are found in our northern waters, and most are carrying pigs, fowls, dogs and cats, as well as meat products. All of them carry stock diseases. There is the potential every day for foot-and-mouth disease, Newcastle disease or, of course, screw-worm fly, to come ashore. By stripping the north of a sufficient number of stock-inspectors, the Minister is gambling with the future of some of our most important industries.

The tally of staff cuts in primary industries--and that means program cuts as well--is already high. In a Government as secret as this it is hard to get accurate figures, but worried staff in the department say as many as 145 could already have gone. As if that is not bad enough, there are obviously plenty more cuts on the way. The Minister told the House yesterday that Cabinet had endorsed still secret recommendations for the Public Sector Management Commission. That commission's report on the Department of Primary Industries has only just been submitted, and not many staff know much of the detail. They are all certain of one thing: it is an academic exercise conducted by people who might have a good understanding of efficiency theory but who have no knowledge of the real world of farming and grazing. There is no confidence that the report will do anything to encourage the delivery of professional services--the very services departmental people have proved themselves so capable of delivering.

Producers can take no joy from the words of the Minister in the House yesterday. It was typical Labor doublespeak. He told us that the department must step back and

develop a hands-off relationship, and that there must be an emphasis on self-help. That means only one thing: in plain English, "Turn your back and let them sink or swim." The Minister told us that it is a hard environment out there, with rewards for those who are prepared to commit their capital and their intellect to meeting consumer demands. What does that sort of rubbish mean? I reckon it means throwing producers to the wolves if they cannot match the subsidised prices of their overseas competitors. That is tough; if they go broke, it is their own fault! We read about how industry-leaders were summoned yesterday to be told that some of the more radical changes proposed might be delayed. In another story in the *Courier-Mail* we were told how the Premier and the Treasurer wanted the cuts to be sold better. The media army really was active yesterday. The Government is trying but it cannot hide the fact that services and staff numbers have disappeared.

The Minister is responsible for a lot more than savage cuts in staff and services; he is also responsible for a level of incompetence never before seen in his portfolio. Look at the state of the bread industry. Every day, vendors are going to the wall. Consumers are getting the short-term advantage of a price war but will pay for that when the very few winners emerge and the price goes through the roof. They will have the Minister, and nobody else, to thank for that. His fiddling around the edges of the regulations of bread-pricing has done nothing more than play into the hands of the big bakeries looking for an oligopoly in the bread industry. Along the way, the vendors and the corner stores are paying the price by going broke.

The same level of incompetence is becoming apparent in the retail milk industry, too. The Minister has hopped around wringing his hands while milk-vendors lose their businesses. It is time the Minister sat back and had a good look at what is going on around him. He has to think hard about why he is the Minister. If he cannot bring himself to look after his portfolio competently, he should do the right thing--resign and let somebody else have a go. Primary industry is too important to be a toy of an incompetent administration. Before I conclude, I would like to mention roads. Roads are very important to country people, particularly as people become more dependent on them as more and more railway services are taken away.

Mr Hamill: Kingaroy is a freight centre. What are you talking about?

Mr PERRETT: Kingaroy is a freight centre and we are very happy about that. However, I am concerned about the work that is not taking place on country roads. Recently, I was concerned to read in the *Courier-Mail* an article headed "Roadworks cash crisis".

Mr Hamill: By Denver Beanland.

Mr PERRETT: No, it was by one of the Minister's Main Roads engineers, Mr Tennant of the Sunshine Coast. As he mentioned the region which also included part of my electorate, I was very concerned to read that he forecast there would be huge cuts in funds and that about 900 jobs would be lost. Of course, the Minister was quick to deny that. The article states that the Minister "scoffed at the suggested cuts and said that no decisions had been made because the Budget had not been finalised". The article stated--

" 'Those figures quoted are very wide of the mark and I dispute them,' Mr Hamill said."

Following that, I received a copy of the *Bribie Times* of the week before. It contained an article which stated--

"Transport Minister David Hamill foreshadowed big cuts in road funding in this year's budget despite election promises to spend an extra \$40 million a year on roads.

The Minister told Caboolture Shire council last Tuesday there will be \$60 million less to spend on Queensland roads in 1991/92 than in the current year.

He said 900 retrenchments statewide will have to be made in the next six months to achieve the cuts, mostly from day labour."

I ask the Minister: what are we to believe? One week he says that 900 jobs will be lost and the next week he says they will not be lost. He has certainly confused all the country people who are not seeing any new work being undertaken on their roads. People have lost confidence, and why would they not? All Queenslanders have lost confidence. The unemployment rate has never been so high. Jobs have never been harder to get. Under this Government, many young people face a very bleak future indeed. Those who voted Labor in the 1989 election have realised what a grave mistake they made and they will not make the same mistake next time.

Mr BARBER (Cooroora) (8.27 p.m.): Appropriation Bills are about Governments appropriating moneys for the business of government. The business of government usually then leads to the delivery of services to provincial Queensland. But for 20 years this formula of appropriating moneys for services in the Sunshine Coast area failed to work. For a 20-year period, the Sunshine Coast, with its gerrymandered seats, was overlooked by George Street. As successive Liberal/National Party Governments gazed out over their provinces, their gaze failed to fall on the Sunshine Coast. The coast had doughty National Party chairmen who were yes-men for George Street. There were even doughtier National Party backbenchers in the seat of Cooroora. As a result, the Sunshine Coast became the cinderella area of south-east Queensland. When I attended Nambour State High School, it had 1 300 students at its peak. In 1974, when I arrived at that school from a plush suburban school, its buildings and facilities were reminiscent of a concentration camp. Successive Liberal/National Party Governments starved education Statewide and the Sunshine Coast in particular suffered.

Tourism is the Sunshine Coast's major industry and appropriation decisions of Government are vital to tourism outcomes in my area. Over the next 50 years, the Sunshine Coast can become the Tuscany of south-east Queensland in its attractiveness to visitors. Government machine appropriation should lead to visible results and an improvement in life-style for residents in that zone. Fortunately, the 20 years of neglect is changing as Sunshine Coast residents are starting to see an end of the Dark Ages. Enlightenment has broken out in the Sunshine Coast region of south-east Queensland. A renaissance is flowering in the region. In Europe, heritage and tourism attract visitors year round to places such as Florence. An examination of the historical documents of Florence reveals that those that have survived in volume are the taxation documents of that town. That says to me that the appropriation of moneys from the burghers and its syphoning back into the community is what set that town up to become the gem in world tourism that it is. So, what result do we see from the taxation of the communes in Florence during the Renaissance? We see Florence Cathedral, the Palazzo Vecchio, Santa Maria Novello and other gems that are unparalleled in the rest of the world. In years to come, the Sunshine Coast can pursue that sort of tourism recognition, and Government appropriations will play no small part in directing funds into the correct areas. I will return to that idea later on. The Goss Government, which came to power in 1989, has begun to address the years of neglect in the areas just north of the City of Brisbane. The seat of Cooroora is now on the map.

I want to outline a couple of projects on which the appropriation of Government funds has begun bailing the Sunshine Coast out of its 20 years of neglect. The first one is the sealing of the road to Boreen Point. Minister Hamill will open those improvements in August. The Goss-led ALP, in Opposition, was the only party prepared to promise to seal that road. Every time it rained the locals had to put up with being cut off from the rest of the State. Damage to cars was horrendous. It was a prime tourist town. The Nationals failed to deliver a sealed road for that community. The locals decided to make it a State election issue. Three roadside meetings were held on the Boreen Point road in 1989. Invited to those meetings on different days were Tom Burns; the then Minister, Bill Gunn; and the then Liberal Leader, Angus Innes. Tom Burns was the only politician who was prepared to promise that town, unequivocally on the Boreen Point road, that

the road would be sealed. I want to quote a couple of excerpts from the *Noosa News* of 14 March 1989. The first is--

"Mr Burns said the \$1.7 million needed to finish sealing the road would be allocated in the first ALP Budget in August, 1990."

A local spokesman said--

"If the Labor Party doesn't get in you can kiss this road goodbye for another four years."

That was it. Tom Burns was the only politician who came to those roadside meetings and promised that the road would be sealed. The sealing has been duly delivered. The locals will have a bit of a shindig at the Apollonian Hotel on the day of the opening. I trust that Minister Hamill will come up and show that this Government delivers.

Education is another matter of Government appropriation with which I want to deal. For 20 years, successive Liberal/National Governments failed to cope with the population growth in the Sunshine Coast region. It is true that they were safe National Party seats, and had been for decades. Because the representatives never created a stink about the neglect in that area, the area missed out. Seven hundred children were, and still are, bussed daily from Noosa to the high schools at Cooroy and Coolool because successive conservative Governments refused to build a high school at Noosa Heads.

Mr Foley: It was a reactionary Government.

Mr BARBER: They were reactionary Governments. The position gets worse. When the Cooroy State High School was constructed, on demographic grounds, it was built in the wrong spot. Even in those days demographics suggested that the high school be built at Noosa Heads. Conservative Governments put the school in the wrong spot. The position gets worse. The Coolool State High School should not have preceded a high school at Noosa Heads. So we have the horrendous situation to this day of 700 Noosa Heads students being bussed out on Cooroora's rickety roads to high schools south and west of the town. Only the Goss Government was prepared to dig into its pockets and appropriate funds for a high school at Noosa Heads. Paul Braddy came to the town in the 1989 campaign and was the only politician who would promise a high school for Noosa Heads.

Mr Littleproud: Be honest! The site was chosen before the election.

Mr BARBER: The member for Condamine well knows that he is incorrect. A site for that high school was allocated only this year. That site was agreed to because of unprecedented cooperation between the Noosa Shire Council and the Education Department. I hope the member comes up to see where it is. It is probably in a spot different from where he thought it would be. That high school was not on the books, it was not in the planning, under successive conservative Governments. Paul Braddy came to town and unequivocally promised that the school would be built in the first term of the Goss Government. That school is now under construction. The Goss Government believes that if one wants to fix a society one has to educate a society. If one wants to fix an ailing society one has to spend money on education. I was very pleased that education was the No. 1 priority in Treasurer De Lacy's Budget last September.

Mr Foley: We were the worst in Australia on education spending. It was shameful.

Mr BARBER: Indeed. Our National Party colleagues obviously do not understand the position. If one wants to break the poverty cycle, if one wants to break the unemployment cycle, if one wants to stop consumer rip-offs, if one wants to fix a stressed society, one spends money on education. They never grasped that. They never came to realise that that was the case. It suited them better to have a society kept in the dark so that people kept voting for them. It will be a blot on their names for a long time. It is exciting that education is the No. 1 budgetary priority of the Goss Government. I trust that that will continue. At the end of the day, when it matters, parents and grandparents are very pleased to see that. People who regret the poor education standards

that they had to suffer decades ago are very pleased that their children and grandchildren are now benefiting from the Goss Government's education policies.

Finally, I turn to the environment. The poor old Sunshine Coast suffered again from tunnel vision for a 20-year period because conservative Governments never realised that money was to be made on the Sunshine Coast by recognising its natural wealth. They could not see that natural wealth. They could not see nature's tourism potential there. They set about destroying it and selling it to their mates. Mount Coolum is a prime example. Successive National Party shire councils mined it for road gravel. After that, when one of the council's mates came along with a restaurant and chairlift idea for the mountain, the council fell behind him. That council could not see the economics of leaving those places be. It set about mining them. I am pleased to say that those times have changed. As we sit here this evening, Mount Coolum is a 60-hectare national park, which was declared in November last year. I defy any conservative politician to come up to the town of Coolum and tell the people that it should be otherwise. In fact, I invite them to do so.

The Noosa north shore proposal is another prime example of National Party tunnel vision. The Libs are just as bad. Recently, Mr Beanland criticised the Noosa north shore decision. I hope that he comes to Noosa to tell us why that decision should not have been made, because he will be run out of town. The tourism product of the Sunshine Coast is its natural beauty, and this Government has delivered a series of green belts surrounding the town of Noosa that will set it up as a tourist gem for decades to come. In relation to the Noosa north shore decision--Russell Cooper should not escape criticism. He also thinks that it should be concreted. I trust that he will come up to Noosa to tell the people in that township why that should be so. I invite him to come up there. To his credit, Mr Borbidge has not made such statements about the Noosa north shore decision. All that I can say is that the conservative leaders, Cooper and Beanland, have not asked the people on the ground what they want, and those statements will come home to roost.

With a view to setting up the town of Noosa and the surrounding region as a tourist attraction, in March 1991, the 840-hectare Lake Weyba national park was declared. The northern Sunshine Coast is fast accruing a world-class green belt of national parks behind the bustle of the suburban beach towns. Again, it highlights the fact that Government appropriations are essential in setting up those places for their future prosperity. The Goss Labor Government has saved those pieces of natural heritage from Liberal/National desecration. Government appropriations in education, roads and tourism are vital for the Sunshine Coast. At last, the Sunshine Coast is coming out of the Dark Ages. We are starting to put a drop in the bucket of 20 years of oversight. I look forward to the progress that can be made in that area in years to come.

Mr HOBBS (Warrego) (8.41 p.m.): It is my pleasure tonight to speak in this debate. I was disappointed to listen to the previous speaker whingeing and whining about what has not gone on with regard to the Sunshine Coast. That is one area of this State that has expanded and developed and certainly it will be a very important part of Queensland in the very near future. Under the next conservative Government, it will expand even more again. The member can whinge as much as he likes, but a lot of work was done in that area. As the previous Minister for Education said, the schools in that area were planned well ahead and, for a long time, the development and expansion of those areas was a feature of the administration of the previous Government. As we know, Queensland's population will increase. In the south-east corner, there will be probably 3 million people in the next 50 years, and maybe 5 million or 6 million people in the next 100 years. We will be looking to more expansion, and the Sunshine Coast will be part of that.

Tonight, I want to talk about the unrealistic pressures that have been put on the Department of Lands over the past 18 months and, in particular, the past 12 months. I talk of pressures from a new Government with a different philosophy, which I guess

we can all understand; pressures relating to regionalisation, the amalgamation of departments and job security; pressures from a review by the Public Sector Management Commission; pressures from a review of land policy and administration, and pressures from trying to put in place new legislation to satisfy all of those issues that I have mentioned. One does not have to be very bright to realise that----

A Government member: You're not.

Mr HOBBS: Well, we will wait and see what develops. One does not have to be very bright to see how all of those pressures on a department will curtail its performance. When one considers the hurdles that the department has to overcome, it is a wonder that anything at all has been done for clients of the Department of Lands--the people of Queensland. I congratulate those officers in the department who have worked under such adverse conditions to provide the services that are available. Some very basic services have been denied to the people of Queensland. I refer to freeholding, the annual land valuations and the delays in transferring land titles. They are some of the matters that I will talk about tonight. In Queensland, freehold is the very basic tenure that will give us real security of tenure--the ownership that we all want. We started off with a three-month freeze on freeholding. It is now 16 months, and there is no end in sight.

Mr Foley: How do you justify the wholesale transfer of leasehold into freehold----

Honourable members interjected.

Mr HOBBS: Let the honourable member go. Let the learned gentleman go.

Mr Foley: How do you justify the wholesale transfer of leasehold to freehold on Cape York? How on earth can you justify that?

Mr HOBBS: That is not the case at all. We are talking about freehold land throughout Queensland. If the honourable member knew about land tenure and pastoral leases, he would know that pastoral leases cannot go straight to freehold. They have to go through a system of transfer. The honourable member for Yeronga does not know about the land tenure system and he is supposed to be the learned lawyer and the great civil libertarian.

Government members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Campbell): Order! There are too many interjections. I ask the member for Warrego to continue.

Mr HOBBS: Honourable members are finding out just how much knowledge there is in the legal circles in Brisbane. It is not much at all. The member for Yeronga does not even know the basic steps that are taken to secure freehold ownership of land in Queensland. The proposal for future freeholding--and I am talking about what is proposed by the Department of Lands--will generate funds in the future. There is no incentive for land-holders to either, firstly, convert their lease to freehold and provide capital funding for the State, or, secondly, convert their freehold lease to freehold, which will also provide funding for the State.

Mr Veivers: What about them changing the industrial areas of Southport? They changed the rules about converting those industrial areas to freehold and it is causing hundreds of thousands of dollars worth of problems.

Mr HOBBS: I would not doubt that. That is the way this Government ends up getting into trouble all the time. It has no idea about the system.

Mr Veivers: He has never earned an honest quid in his life.

Mr HOBBS: That is probably true. It is an absolute scandal that freeholding has been delayed. It is the only real tenure people have; they really own their land. If a person leases his land, the Government or the Crown is the owner and he has to comply

with any conditions it lays down. The Government has let Queenslanders down. It is not allowing Queenslanders the basic tenure of freehold land to call their own.

Mr Neal: Are you aware that only 10 per cent of the State's land is actually freehold?

Mr HOBBS: That is quite correct. Obviously, the member for Yeronga is not aware of that fact.

Mr Foley: And your previous Government allowed a massive transfer to the great detriment of our future heritage.

Mr HOBBS: What rot! All the honourable member is talking about is a socialistic attitude, because the Government does not want people to own their own land.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! This is the member for Warrego's speech. He does not need help from his colleagues on that side of the House. Honourable members will allow him to make his speech. If the member for Warrego wishes to take interjections, he may do so, but it is his speech and I ask him to continue.

Mr HOBBS: Thank you for your protection, Mr Deputy Speaker. I turn now to annual valuations, which is another very important subject. This evening, I wish to refer to annual valuations, or the lack of them.

Mr Veivers: We are being provoked.

Mr HOBBS: As the member for Southport says, we are being provoked.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Southport can speak later in the debate.

Mr HOBBS: I wish to refer to one of the biggest insults ever by the Minister for Land Management. I acknowledge that four shires in the Gold Coast and Cairns areas will be given annual valuations. Obviously, the Government is trying to win the Gold Coast area, and of course it will not succeed.

Mr Veivers: They will put up valuations so they will get more land tax.

Mr HOBBS: The member for Southport has summed it up beautifully for me. I could not have said it better myself. The Minister said that there are staff shortages, but that is no excuse. The computerisation of the land titles system is no excuse, either. The Government has placed these hurdles in front of the department and they should be taken into account when basic services, rather than reforms, are carried out. It is great to have all these reforms that will make things so much better for Queensland. We hear about these reforms and the Government's philosophies daily in the press. However, at the end of the day, people cannot be denied their basic services.

Mr Palaszczuk: The best reform is redistribution.

Mr HOBBS: Was it not the member for Archerfield's electorate that recorded the highest donkey vote?

Mr Veivers interjected.

Mr HOBBS: That is true. Archerfield had the highest donkey vote at the last election.

Mr Palaszczuk: Half your voters live down on the Gold Coast. They don't live in the Warrego electorate.

Mr HOBBS: That is not true. I will give honourable members a few examples. The Government is ripping off the people of Queensland, and there are examples of that in the central business district here in Brisbane. The member for Yeronga might shake his head, but I will tell him why.

Mr Foley: Have you ever heard of the Land Court?

Mr HOBBS: The honourable member should sit back, listen and take this.

Mr Foley: Have you ever heard of the provisions for appeal under the Valuation of Land Act?

Mr HOBBS: I ask the honourable member to listen to what I am saying and he can then respond. The Pavilion, which is only two or three blocks down the road from here, was on the market for \$25m, yet it was sold for \$13m.

Mr McGrady: What's the story?

Mr HOBBS: The honourable member should know. I am showing that land values have dropped. That property had a Valuer-General's valuation of \$11.4m. Therefore, the building on that land is worth \$1.6m. Honourable members cannot tell me that a building can be built on that land at a cost of \$1.6m. It cannot be done.

Mr Welford: So what?

Mr HOBBS: The honourable member says, "So what?" Government members do not even know what I am talking about. They are absolutely oblivious to what is going on in the real world. They are ripping off the businesspeople of Queensland. The Valuer-General's valuation on that land is far too high. Valuations in the Brisbane City area are at least 87 per cent higher than they should be, or an average of 60 per cent higher.

Mr Foley: If that were true, why would there not be successful appeals to the Land Court under the Valuation of Land Act?

Mr HOBBS: Because there have been no annual valuations.

Mr Foley: If the valuation is too high, a citizen has the right to appeal.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Enough has been said about annual valuations. I ask the honourable member to confine himself to the principles of the Bill.

Mr HOBBS: I am trying to educate the member for Yeronga. Basically, shire rates and land tax are derived from VG assessments. For the last six years, those VG assessments have been conducted on an annual basis. However, suddenly this Government decided not to carry out annual valuations, and one can only wonder why. I suggest that the reason for it is that the Government wants to maintain high valuations so that more revenue can be collected. Last year, the Government collected \$190m in land tax, but the actual value of the land in respect of which the tax was collected has been reduced by approximately 60 per cent. Because people are paying that tax on the basis of the inflated value of their land, the members of this Labor Government are stealing the best part of 40 per cent of that land tax revenue. Members of the Labor Government are robbers and crooks.

Mr Littleproud: It is a new tax.

Mr HOBBS: It is a new tax.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The point has been well made, and I ask the member to move on to a new topic.

Mr HOBBS: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. I am pleased that you recognise the point I am making. I will now turn my attention to land on the Gold Coast. Recently, Mr Mike Gore was in trouble. He put the Saddleback Country Resort up for sale.

Mr Nunn interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! There are too many interjections.

Mr HOBBS: The property was worth \$25m and a reserve of \$12m was placed on it at auction. An offer of \$9.5m has been made.

Mr Palaszczuk interjected.

Mr HOBBS: I am telling the honourable member that land values have gone down, but the Government is not assessing its land tax on the current value of the land.

Mr Nunn: How much did he sell it for?

Mr HOBBS: It has not been sold. He cannot sell it.

Mr Nunn: He will not take the \$9.5m? He reckons it's worth more?

Mr Veivers: But the valuation was \$15m, you goose.

Mr HOBBS: Yes, and the price that was offered was not high enough.

Mr Veivers interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Isis and the member for Southport will cease interjecting. I am trying to allow the member for Warrego to make his speech.

Mr HOBBS: Thank you for your protection, Mr Deputy Speaker. I also point out that the Japanese company, EIE--of which all Labor members would be aware--has made it quite clear that the property it purchased some years ago would not reach 60 per cent of the original purchase price if it were sold now. The company purchased the property when the market was buoyant, but the market is now depressed. The Government is not allowing annual valuations, which would reflect current land values, to be carried out, and that is an absolute scandal.

A similar situation exists in rural areas. In the Longreach area, a property that 12 months was worth \$3m ago will now attract offers as low as \$950,000, which gives honourable members some idea of the extent to which land values have declined. In spite of that, this Government will not allow annual valuations to take place. A choice, open downs block in the central western country that was previously sold for approximately \$70 an acre can now be sold for only \$35 an acre, whereas the VG assessment is as high as 50 per cent of the total value. This represents a complete rip-off on the part of this Government that affects everybody, not just people who pay land tax. The Government's policies also affect people who pay shire rates. While I appreciate that councils in various local authority areas will adjust the formula for the valuations, the simple fact of the matter is that the relativities will change in highly valued areas. The annual assessments have not been done, which means that the property owned by some people will be assessed at a higher value, leading to the payment of higher rates. I am not confining my remarks to urban areas only, because this situation applies also in rural areas. Different assessments apply to sheep country as compared to cattle country.

Mr McGrady: What is the point?

Mr HOBBS: I am talking about shire rates.

Mr Hayward: Are these people paying land tax?

Mr HOBBS: No, I am talking about shire rates.

Mr Hayward: Hang on. You said "land tax". You have misled the Parliament.

Mr HOBBS: No, I have not. I changed the topic. The former Mayor of Mount Isa is aware of what I am saying because he was listening. I am now talking about shire rates and I am pointing out that just as relativities apply in the city, they apply also in rural areas, and I cited the example of sheep country that is worth a lot less than cattle country is worth. The categories can be broken down further by having different rates for good sheep country as compared to the rates applying to bad sheep country, etc. People are paying high rates and taxes because the land values are being assessed at a rate that is higher than the current value and higher than it should be. That has occurred because the annual valuations have not been carried out.

Mr Foley: Harry Coyne would turn in his grave if he heard this.

Mr HOBBS: I would think that anyone would turn in his grave if he knew that any Government refused to honour a system of annual valuations that had been in place for six years. When the values reached their highest peak, this Government suddenly decided to freeze them, and that is when the problem started.

Mr Palaszczuk: What about the floor price for wool? Explain that! It is the same principle.

Mr Littleproud interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Condamine will interject only from his usual place.

Mr HOBBS: I thank the honourable member for his interjection. Although I would love to go into the floor price for wool, only two minutes remain for my speech and there are other issues with which I wish to deal. I mention the matter of staff cuts in the Department of Lands because I believe that they are unjustified. I believe that this Government is preoccupied with support for unproductive departments and sectors instead of productive sectors.

Mr Welford: Like what?

Mr HOBBS: The Department of Lands is a productive sector. Nearly all development carried out across the length and breadth of Queensland must be controlled by the department, irrespective of whether it is an easement or title to a property. One would be reducing the number of people in that department and boosting, say, the Department of Environment or the Fraser Island environmental study. It is costing money. The Government is changing its priorities. That is affecting the productive sector not just in the departments but throughout the whole of Queensland. We are also talking about reductions in the rural centres. Lands Department centres that may be closed down or phased down include Goondiwindi, Cunnamulla, Blackall, Hughenden and Mount Isa.

Mr McGrady: Hold on! Explain that statement about Mount Isa.

Mr HOBBS: That's right, I am.

Mr McGrady: That's totally untrue.

Mr HOBBS: It is not entirely untrue. The member knows as well as I do that those changes are proposed. The Government is sneaking in the back door. This morning, on ABC radio, De Lacy came out----

Time expired.

Mr T. B. SULLIVAN (Nundah) (9.01 p.m.): I rise to support the Treasurer's Appropriation Bill (No. 1). In these financially difficult times, this Labor Treasurer has done a magnificent job in forming and delivering the 1990-91 Budget. This was achieved despite the additional expenditure for extra teachers, nurses and police or for unexpected natural disasters. As well, this Government did not resort to massive overseas borrowings to fund recurrent expenditures, as some previous Governments have done. Prudent financial management has enabled the Government to maintain services within tight monetary restraints. As the Treasurer outlined this morning, this State is held in high regard in the marketplace. Those opposite talk about the marketplace judging us. Let us look at that. We have a AAA rating, the highest rating of any State, which means that Queensland will be able to borrow at the cheapest rates, as we heard the Treasurer tell us this morning. Considering the results in other States--examples are New South Wales and Victoria--the 1990-91 Budget outcome is even more remarkable. I remind the House of the Treasurer's comments this morning about the commitment that there will be no reduction in overall public service numbers in Queensland in the coming financial year.

Mr Littleproud: Clearly there is growth--just a growth factor.

Mr T. B. SULLIVAN: If there is fat that has to be trimmed, let it be trimmed. The proportion of public servants living outside the south-east corner will increase. Let us make it clear, as the Treasurer said, that that does not mean, as some members opposite have said, that every public servant in his or her own little town will be in the same job, doing the same thing, next year. As the Treasurer pointed out, there is a difference between the service provided and the allocation of personnel to provide the service.

Mr Littleproud: What about equity of service?

Mr T. B. SULLIVAN: I will give an example. I will take my own electorate. For years, the number of teachers in my electorate dropped. That had to happen because the population changed. As the number of children in the school dropped from the remarkable height of 1 200 to 300 or 400, we would expect the number of teachers and the allocation of personnel to change. As things change, so will the allocation of personnel change. We cannot have it both ways, as the member opposite would like. In one breath those opposite cry that we have to get rid of big Government and big spending; on the other hand, they say they want their own personnel in their own town, even though that might not be efficient.

Mr Littleproud: But you're a socialist. Do you believe in equity of service? What about the cost?

Mr T. B. SULLIVAN: Equity of service is important. We are saying that redeployment of personnel can achieve that in a better fiscal way and still deliver the service. The honourable member opposite needs an open mind for this. My brother-in-law tells me he is a nice bloke, and, as my brother-in-law is an honest bloke, I will believe him. The honourable member must be more open-minded. If he was less open-mouthed and more open-minded, we might get somewhere tonight. With reallocation of Government personnel, we can do a more efficient job. For years--and here is the problem--the Opposition overstuffed and overcapitalised services in its own electorates and ignored the Labor areas. Let us take some schools as an example. National Party areas, especially if they were represented by a Minister, had unopened reading laboratories, maths kits that were not even touched and extra personnel.

Mr Hobbs: Whereabouts? Name them!

Mr T. B. SULLIVAN: I will tell the honourable member why.

Mr Hobbs: Name them! Whereabouts?

Mr T. B. SULLIVAN: I cannot name an individual school; I will let my colleagues do so.

Mr Davies: They were producing more hair-dressers at Peak Downs TAFE college than in the whole of Queensland.

Mr T. B. SULLIVAN: Well, that is a problem. Those areas had more resources than one could throw a blackboard duster at, whereas the overcrowded and understaffed schools in the Labor electorates were starved of the basics. There was no photocopying paper, art materials or basic texts. The handkerchiefs and tears can come later. Standards were below those of many rural areas. It reminds me a bit of a spoilt child who has been asked to share his toys and is spitting the dummy a bit. I admit that there are, and there will be, certain difficulties with services in rural areas. I do not resile from that. But, before I am quoted out of context, I will also say that the city folk experience similar problems.

Mr Veivers: Weren't you a teacher at one of those good GPS schools?

Mr T. B. SULLIVAN: If it was a school that Mr Veivers went to, we must have done a good job somewhere. We must have done an excellent job. The honourable member held the scrum together on more than one occasion--he was the scrum on

more than one occasion! It is a matter of the fair and equitable sharing of the available resources. Some members opposite have complained about the police services in their areas. For years, there has been entrenched corruption at high levels in our police force. The service was allowed to run down. The numbers fell; morale disintegrated; and public confidence evaporated. Now members opposite come into this Chamber and try to lay the blame on this Government, saying "Get your act together." They remind me of a group of people who rent a house for 30 years, carry out no maintenance, foul the house, break the walls, move out and then when the new people come in they say, "Why aren't you living in spotless conditions?" Give us a go. Similarly with roads, health care and family services--thank goodness Labor is in power in Queensland. At last a Labor Government has the opportunity to improve the quality of life for the majority of Queenslanders, and that is great.

The member for Toowong criticised the Labor Party in regard to industrial relations----

Mr Schwarten: The nong from Toowong.

Mr T. B. SULLIVAN: No, I respect the gentleman. He says, "Leave it to private-enterprise bargaining. Let us have private agreements." What a narrow, inept understanding of this complex issue! I reject his view and the view of my colleague the union-bashing member for Merthyr. Even the member for Cunningham had a couple of words to say about it. Those honourable members are painting themselves as having the answer to industrial relations, but they and their colleagues come from a culture that appears----

Mr Veivers interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Campbell): Order! The member for Nundah is trying to make a point. I ask the member for Southport to let him make that point.

Mr T. B. SULLIVAN: Those honourable members come from a culture that opposes even minor gains for the workers. There have been calls for wage restraint for the last eight years. I invite honourable members to look up the business journals. Where have the greatest percentages of wage increases been? The answer is in upper and middle management.

Mr Veivers interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I have allowed a lot of latitude tonight, but from now on the member who is making a speech will speak and I will start stopping all interjections. That applies to members on both sides of the House. I now call the member for Nundah.

Mr T. B. SULLIVAN: Some members opposite come from a culture that I call the Nobby Clark culture. I remember when the workers were to receive a \$7 wage increase. Nobby Clark and the Confederation of Industry said, "We can't afford it." Nobby voted himself a rise of more than \$100,000 but, no, the workers could not get an extra \$7 a week in their pockets. That is the sort of mentality of some members opposite. Was Nobby worth it? He said that he was worth it but, of course, the workers would not be, would they? They only help to produce the profits. Members opposite say that they have got the answer to industrial relations. The member for Carnarvon has worked with his hands and he knows what it is like to knock around with labourers. \$7 a week in their pockets makes sense, not \$100,000 in the pocket of someone such as Nobby Clark.

This afternoon, the Leader of the Liberal Party said, "Leave business investment to private enterprise." Of course, we have to leave it to those heroes who borrow too much, fail badly, have a few pennies in their pockets to pay off \$100m in debt, then go to Spain to keep up their suntans. Such people are the heroes of some members opposite, especially the Liberals. Let there be no misunderstanding: I am not knocking free enterprise. I grew up in a family that ran a small business. I worked in that small business. I knew what it was like when business was not good. One did not have a

holiday; one did not get a new pair of shoes. If Mr Veivers did not drink at the sideshow bar and our profits were down, we had to tighten our belts. I knew what it was like.

Most small-businessmen and most big-businessmen are honest, hard-working people who need the support of our banks, our Government and our people. I believe that in many ways our banks are letting business down. Fortunately, this Government is releasing a lot of red tape to help business to be more efficient. I believe that we have to find the balance. There is a balance between Government and private enterprise, and I believe--and I am sorry that he is not in the Chamber so that I can say it to his face--that the Liberal Leader has tunnel vision. Today, I heard his colleague the member for Moggill--who I believe is a very fine gentleman--speaking on the radio. He said, "Don't trust the super funds to Governments, especially Labor Governments. You can't have Labor people investing superannuation funds." Let us look at the epitome of the private-enterprise groups that should handle superannuation funds--our banks and AMP, which is the biggest and the greatest. During the 1980s, they lent millions of dollars to the reckless and the greedy. Now that we are left with the bad debts, who is going to pay for it? It will be the small investor, the person who does not have \$10,000 or \$20,000 in a bank account, the person who has the lowest amount. That is the inequity; that is the injustice. There are good managers and there are bad managers. Some are in the private sector and some are in the public sector, and some are in small business and some are in big business. We need to recognise them both. We also heard one member opposite saying how we should go easy on Mr Greiner because he had to follow a decade of Labor. Why did he not take the next step and apply the same philosophy to Queensland? Our Treasurer has had to follow 30 years of the previous Government's management of the economy. What a dreadful shambles it was. Thank goodness we have a capable and strong-willed Treasurer who can guide us through these difficult times. Queensland is lucky, and we are lucky.

Mr LINGARD (Fassifern) (9.16 p.m.): The State Government has tried to put forward education as the greatest example of its new corporate management policy, developed under the Public Sector Management Commission. To do this, it has dishonestly referred to supposed increases in Education Department funding of up to 14 per cent. I say "dishonestly", because whilst there have been increases in the education budget, we continually see employed the strategy of providing schools with extra funds through school grants but then they are given increased responsibilities such as having to pay for teacher aides, teacher relief and administrative absences. Therefore, while the Government continues to talk about increasing funding it neglects to mention the increasing responsibilities. This is deceitful, and the education system is reacting to that deceit. The Government is losing the support of the teachers and the families and it knows that very well.

One of the most blatant examples of the Government's abuse of the system is the politicisation of and the cronyism developing in the Education Department. There are three things that the Government will have to live with. First, legislation introduced into this House requires that a commissioner applying for a position has to nominate both his present and past political affiliations. Secondly, after award-restructuring, once a public servant's job designation is changed his position can be spilled. The Government can get rid of any person now belonging to the public service. Thirdly, I refer to the blatant example of politicisation of positions in local government. Any person who retires in the third year of a term now has to be replaced by a person of the same political affiliation. Having politicised the Education Department, the Government has now brought politics into local government and left it open to cronyism.

I have warned this House before that this leads back to the time of Dr Peter Wilenski, and back to the Delaney days, the Whitlam days and the Dawkins days. They said that if a Government is to control society and the bureaucracy, it has to control the public servants. That is what this Government has set out to do, and it is what it is doing with the Education Department. I refer honourable members to a research document written by Bob Lingard--no relation to me--and Colin Collins, previously at

the Darling Downs Institute of Advanced Education and a Rugby League player who is now at the University of Queensland. In a document headed "Education under the Goss Labor Government", they suggest that that is happening. They refer to Peter Wilenski, and anyone who knows Dr Wilenski and who can remember the Delaney days, and the Ros Kelly and Dawkins days, knows what those people and Whitlam set out to do. They set out to politicise the public sector--to institute cronyism. That is what has been done in the education sector. Lingard and Collins refer to the October 1989 Budget commitments of the National Party. They say that when those initiatives were suggested----

Mrs Edmond interjected.

Mr LINGARD: The honourable member--she does not like to be called a lady, so I will not call her a lady--knows as well as I do that those October 1989 initiatives were not National Party initiatives; they were set out by the Education Department and therefore, as Collins and Lingard say, that is relevant because it was not a Government document but a departmental document. It set out to show that \$1,400m over the next three years would be added to education funding. That did not compare with what Labor has done; it was much more. The Government has set out in this Appropriation Bill to promote education as a major area of funding. But what we set out in our 1989 Budget initiatives was not rhetoric; it was fair dinkum.

Mr Welford: It was a fraud.

Mr LINGARD: Look at what the Government has done to fraudulently deceive the public of Queensland. The Education Minister has said that the Government will provide an additional \$300 to Year 11 and Year 12 students. As I have said, he cannot say that that is an additional \$300. Previously, Year 11 students received \$120 and Year 12 students \$50, and now it is a total of \$300, not an additional \$300. He has written to the p. and c. associations that the Government is providing students with that additional amount, although he knows that is deceitful. Similarly, it is deceitful for him to say he is providing an extra 14 per cent in grants to schools because they have now been told they must pay out of the extra amount teacher relief, teacher aides, support centre management, and other items as well. So those schools and the teachers do not have an additional 14 per cent available to them. They have extra money, but they have more responsibilities.

Government members must surely be ashamed of what the Education Minister said in the House this morning. The Education Minister was shaking as he tried to explain that money in consolidated revenue was Government money to be handled by Government members. Surely they must be ashamed of that, yet they have allowed the Minister to send them personal letters asking whether they will have prepared at Education Department expense floppy discs and material which will give them the opportunity to hand out school grant cheques. That is absolutely disgraceful. I table two letters of two pages each. I have asked the Deputy Speaker if they can be incorporated in *Hansard*. One of the letters is from the Minister for Education to all back-bench members of the ALP, the other is from the Executive Director of the Education Department, Peter Macdonald, to his executive directors. I seek leave to have those letters incorporated in *Hansard*.

Leave granted.

MINISTER FOR EDUCATION

The Honourable Paul Braddy LLB MLA

Floor 22 Education House 30 Mary Street Brisbane Queensland Australia PO Box 33 Brisbane North Quay Q 4002. Telephone: (07) 237 1000 Facsimile: (07) 229 6562

Mr P Beattie MLA

Member for Brisbane Central

Shop 4

21 Enoggera Terrace

RED Hill Q 4059

Dear Peter

As advised previously, I have requested the Department of Education to introduce new procedures for the delivery of school grant payments.

I would like to stress the importance of prompt delivery of cheques to schools in your electorate. In order to facilitate this process I invite you to participate in a trial of the process to be used so that the actual delivery of cheques for the second semester progresses smoothly. The information attached to this letter is part of this trial.

The trial is designed to familiarise you with the new procedure for distributing School Grant cheques to schools. This trial will also highlight any problems with the proposed delivery process before the actual cheque payment is made in early July.

Enclosed is:

- (i) a floppy diskette of WordPerfect 5.1 files containing:
 - (a) a draft of a letter to be sent to the principal of each school in your electorate; and
 - (b) briefing notes regarding the School Grant.
- (ii) hard copies of these files.
- (iii) a Cheque Delivery Option Sheet showing each host school in your electorate with provision for you to indicate your preferred option for cheque delivery.
- (iv) an example of a Resource Allocation Information sheet for a school in your electorate.

The letter will be presented to the principal with the School Grant cheque, the briefing notes are for your information and the Cheque Delivery Option Sheet is for use by my staff.

To participate in the trial:

- (a) Check the diskette for viruses.
- (b) Print the letter on your own letterhead. You are invited to mark suggested changes on the letter. Please do not alter the file. Any suggested changes will be negotiated with you by my staff.
- (c) Mark on the Cheque Delivery Option Sheet how you intend to deliver the cheques to schools in your electorate.
- (d) Please return:
 - (i) the floppy diskette;
 - (ii) one letter to principal with any suggested changes on your electorate letterhead; and
 - (iii) completed Cheque Delivery Option Sheet to this office by 1 June 1991.

Please do not send this letter to any school as this is a trial only!

In the week commencing 8 July, 1991, you will receive a kit of information containing instructions for distributing the School Grant cheques to schools in your electorate.

All cheques must be available to schools no later than 12 July, 1991, whether they are delivered by post or by you personally.

If you or your office staff have any problems with this process please do not hesitate to contact Romey Stubbs in my office on (07) 237 1000.

Yours sincerely
Paul Braddy
PAUL BRADDY
Minister for Education
10 May 1991
Department
of Education

P Macdonald
237 1084

15 May 1991
Executive Director
Dear

The Honourable the Minister has proposed that Government members of Parliament transmit the Semester II School Grant cheques to schools in their electorates.

The Minister has been concerned for some time that, despite a considerable increase in school grants, many school communities are unaware of the extent and detail of the changes that have been made.

To this end, it is therefore proposed to seek alternative methods of delivery which heighten such awareness.

All Government members are currently participating in a trial of a system which could be used to implement this proposal. Each member has received a package of materials together with a diskette of sample data. The intention is to test the capacity of electoral office staff and equipment to undertake the necessary processes in July. A set of the materials forwarded to Government members is enclosed for your information.

Schools that are not in government electorates will receive their Semester II payments directly from Central Office, as has been standard practice in the past. The cheques to these schools will be accompanied by a letter signed by the Minister.

I am aware that schools have an expectation that School Grant cheques will be received in the first week of Semester II. As this coincides with the first week of the financial year, earlier processing of the payments is not possible as the accounts for the current financial year will not be finalised until the first few days of week one in Semester II. The appropriation for the 1991-92 financial year can not be accessed until after finalisation of the previous year's accounts.

I am also aware that this arrangement may cause some delay in the receipt of cheques by schools. The Minister is also aware of this and has taken steps to ensure that all cheques are delivered by the end of the second week of Semester II.

I am sure you will appreciate that the proposed change in procedure should be regarded as strictly confidential until the outcomes of the trial are known, and a final decision to implement the changed procedures has been taken. At that time you will be advised of the intentions of each Government member in relation to the intended form of transmission of the cheques to schools, i.e. by post or personal visit. This will assist your staff to respond to questions from schools.

The Director-General has advised the Minister that it is possible that the intended course of action might attract comment from some school communities. I am sure you will take the necessary action to respond appropriately to any comments that may arise.

Yours sincerely

Peter
Peter Macdonald
Executive Director, Regional Operations

Mr Beattie: What are they?

Mr LINGARD: The member for Brisbane Central says he has not seen those letters. I have his letter here. It is addressed to "Mr P Beattie MLA, Member for Brisbane Central, Shop 4, 21 Enoggera Terrace".

Mr BEATTIE: I rise to a point of order.

Mr FitzGerald: Under what Standing Order?

Mr BEATTIE: Do you mind! Mr Deputy Speaker, if the material is to be distributed, I think members----

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Hollis): Order! I cannot even hear the honourable member's point of order. I ask honourable members to desist from talking.

Mr BEATTIE: Mr Deputy Speaker, honourable members are entitled to know what material is being distributed. With respect to that process, I point out that we have not seen it, and I ask, through you, that we have that material provided to us.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! There is no point of order. The honourable member is debating a point of order.

Mr LINGARD: The member for Brisbane Central says that he has not seen this letter. It commences "Dear Peter" and concludes "Paul Braddy, Minister for Education". I have been given leave to have those letters incorporated in *Hansard*. The honourable member can read in *Hansard* exactly what they state.

Mr Beattie interjected.

Mr LINGARD: Funnily, it fell off the back of a truck. No wonder the honourable member is whingeing; no wonder he is grumbling. This letter is addressed to Peter Beattie "Shop 4, 21 Enoggera Terrace, Red Hill". It commences "Dear Peter". Yet the honourable member is silly enough to whinge and grumble. Let me refer to what Peter Macdonald wrote to the executive directors about the action of the director-general in allowing Labor members to hand out cheques. Peter Macdonald wrote--

"The Director-General"--

that is, Professor Scott--

"has advised the Minister that it is possible that the intended course of action might attract comment from some school communities. I am sure you will take the necessary action to respond appropriately to any comments that may arise."

In other words, jump on them. But Professor Scott was not prepared to send out that letter. Why? Because he was about to resign. He was about to throw his name in. He was not going to have any more of this, and members opposite know it. Professor Scott has now decided not to resign, but he told Peter Macdonald to send out that letter to his executive directors. They were ashamed and embarrassed that Government members would demand that they, and they alone, must hand out cheques to schools in their electorates. How ridiculous!

I will tell the House what the next agenda is. Next year, when the textbook allowance cheques are to be given out to all students and all parents, Government members will demand that those cheques be posted to each student and parent personally over the name of the Government member as the local member. But that will not happen to any other members.

Mr Veivers interjected.

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

Mr Borbidge: Is this consistent with Fitzgerald?

Mr LINGARD: The Deputy Leader of the Opposition asks: is this consistent with Fitzgerald? This morning, the Minister said that the money in consolidated revenue is Government members' money and that they are allowed to do with it what they like. How ridiculous! Yet today, the Minister stood there shaking--we could not even see the letter--as he tried to say, "This is our money, not the money of Opposition members. You can't have anything to do with it. We are allowed to hand it out personally. We are allowed to turn up a quarter of an hour late to a parade and have all the kids waiting." Unfortunately, the wife of the fellow who turned up late was one of the teachers at the school concerned and, as a result, he was given a nice old serve. The teachers at

that school said, "How dare we wait here for a quarter of an hour!" One member opposite, who has just been talking, has not even had time to hand out his cheques. Do honourable members know what the Minister's private secretary now wants to do? He has said, "Maybe we can give all the Government members the cheques early so that we can ensure that they get them out on time." As a result, Government members will be given their cheques about a week early and they will hand them out to schools only in Labor electorates.

The ranting of the Minister for Education this morning has shown how completely lost and incompetent he feels as his department falls down around his ears. How pitiful it was this morning to see a man holding up a document and shaking so violently that we could not see what it was. How pitiful it was today to see a Minister claim that all the money in consolidated revenue is Government money and should be handed out only by Government members. Consolidated revenue money is taxpayers' money, it is not the money of Government members, and as such it belongs to all Queenslanders. It is not the right of the Education Department, the Minister or members of the Government to demand that they alone should hand out this money. All Queenslanders should be made aware of the agenda in relation to the textbook allowance cheques.

Another incredible system is starting in the Education Department. We called it devolution of responsibility. It is another system which the Treasurer will say is an increase in the funding in the Education Department. Towards the end of last year, honourable members who have small schools in their electorate would have discovered that State Works Department men were going around and checking those schools. They would have determined what sort of money was needed for the maintenance of those schools in the future. I will tell honourable members what will happen with money from the Administrative Services Department. It will be transferred to the Education Department so that principals themselves can look after the repairs to their schools. That money will obviously be claimed as an increase, supposedly, in the money that is allocated to schools. All principals will be responsible for paying for the maintenance to their schools. Honourable members know how much controversy that will cause. If the principals are given enough money, that is a good system. But if they do not have enough money, obviously they will face ridicule. Yet the Government will say, "We have increased the money to schools." The Government will not have increased the money allocated to schools, it will have transferred from the Administrative Services Department to the Education Department that money to be spent on repairs to schools. That system will be known as the user-pays system. It is not an increase in the money allocated to the Education Department, but the Government will say that it is. It will say that education is the big thing--"This is what we have done for education; this is the increase in percentage." We have seen it from the QTU; we have seen it from the Minister all the time.

Publicly, the most blatant example of politicisation is the number of resignations from the Education Department. On 2 July 1991, the Minister spoke on Rod Henshaw's radio program. Rod Henshaw said to him that he had heard that of 130 senior members 80 were resigning. The Education Minister said--

" . . . there won't be anything like 80."

That is completely untrue. I am quoting from a document from the ABC. I say to the Minister and to Government backbenchers that, of the 130 people in inspectorial or equal positions, 93 have now gone; 93 people from one classification, inspectors, have thrown in the towel. Yet the Minister will tell the electorate that it does not matter, that the money for these people is coming out of their superannuation funds. The Minister makes no obvious statement about the severance pay which will go to these people. He makes no statement about the fact that 93 people from the upper echelon, people who are much higher than principals, out of 120 to 130 have thrown in the towel. That figure does not include previous people such as the Director-General of Education and those who went in 1990. This figure is for 1991; 93 out of 120 to 130.

The Minister says that he has control of the Education Department, but these people are giving him the wiper. Yet the Minister said to Rod Henshaw, "Nowhere near that. That is completely untrue." The Minister knows as well as I do that 93 have gone.

Mr Coomber: It is true, but it is more.

Mr LINGARD: I would not be surprised if the figure were higher. There have certainly been six go in the last week. I ask Government members to look at the number of children who cannot get tertiary positions. Last year, 10 600 students who passed Year 12 tried to get into our universities and missed out. Last year, the unmet demand was 17 500. This year, the figure will be close to 25 000. They are children who have qualified to go to university, they have passed Year 12, but cannot go to a tertiary institution in Queensland. The Minister is embarrassed by what is happening in the southern States. The Federal Government does not want to take places off South Australia, Victoria or New South Wales. It should, because of the decrease in population there. It has never been game to take places off those States and give them to Queensland. Next year, close to 25 000 children who have passed Year 12 and are qualified to go to university will not get a place.

I read in the *Sun* today an article about Ms McClelland. She spoke about QTAC last year receiving 55 000 applications and having places for only 22 000. The difference is obviously made up of people seeking second degrees, housewives or men who want to go back to study. I do not include those people in my numbers. I am saying that 25 000 people in Year 12 this year will pass and will want to go to university but will not get a place in a university. Mr Braddy and Mr Goss have tried to talk to Mr Dawkins but have been unsuccessful. This year, because of the Consolidated Revenue Fund allocation for tertiary institutions, the number of places available has decreased from 1 500 to 800. I do not disagree. I do not think that money from State consolidated revenue should go to that, because it is Federal funding. I am not criticising the Minister because the number has been cut from 1 500 to 800, which he has done. But 25 000 Year 12 students will not be able to get places in universities and will be unemployed or will have to seek a job.

There is no doubt that there is a need for funding for school support centres. As a party, we support the priority country area program. We support education through technology in country areas. We support any move to increase the teacher-student ratio. We support non-contact time as long as during that non-contact time specialist people are there. We have always supported remote area incentives. I do not know why the present Government dropped those incentives. We always supported them. We support life education classes and believe they should be reintroduced. We support the capital works program. Look at the advanced capital works program. Members opposite will tell us next year that three new high schools will be built. Each year, two new high schools are built. Three will be built next year, but none the year after. The net result is a loss of one. Next year, an election year, members opposite will talk about three new high schools being built.

Mr SCHWARTEN (Rockhampton North) (9.36 p.m.): As luck would have it, I am following the member for Fassifern tonight, and I am in a position to put paid to some of the mendacious nonsense that he brought before the House tonight. The last comment that stuck in my mind was his pious claim about the remote area scheme. Let me give him the facts about the remote area scheme. There are not too many people on this side of the House who were here when Sir Alan Fletcher first brought up this matter. He could see the wisdom of it. Val Bird supported it. It went to Cabinet in 1983 and lasted for two minutes. Joh Bjelke-Petersen and the Nationals knocked it on the head, and the research that was done on it, in a collective way, by the Queensland Teachers Union and the Department of Education went down the drain accordingly. I say to the member for Fassifern: he should not be a hypocrite in this House and tell me how he supported the remote area scheme for teachers in this State. That is absolute nonsense. It did not occur. It is a figment of his imagination.

I want to deal with a few more comments which exposed his hypocrisy in the House tonight. The greatest hypocrisy is that members opposite are saying to us tonight that somehow it is wrong for Government members to hand out Government cheques. What selective memories they have. I live in an electorate which has always voted Labor, and I cannot recall one cheque being handed over by my predecessors; it did not ever happen. In my electorate, National Party members would visit and announce projects which the local member did not know anything about. That does not happen any more. At official openings, I saw Les Yewdale, my predecessor, sitting in the crowd while the honourable member's tory mates sat up and talked about Government money and how the National Party looked after the people. The honourable member should not whinge and whine and piously say to me that it is all crook and all wrong, because members opposite are a mob of hypocrites. In their case, what is good for the goose is not good for the gander. They should sit there and cop it and shut their mouths.

Mr Littleproud interjected.

Mr SCHWARTEN: I will come to some honourable members opposite. Mr Littleproud will not want to open his trap too much, because I know a lot about his little pork-barrelling efforts in this place.

Mr Santoro interjected.

Mr SCHWARTEN: Sit down, you idiot.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I ask the member for Rockhampton North to withdraw that comment. It is unparliamentary.

Mr SCHWARTEN: With due deference to you, Mr Speaker, I did not know that he was a member of this Parliament. He was standing up and yelling out things to me. For a moment, I thought that it was a scarecrow with a voice.

Mr SANTORO: I rise to a point of order. I respectfully wish to inform the honourable member for Rockhampton North that I did not refer my remarks to him. I was concerned about the welfare of the honourable member for Brisbane Central. If he sits in his seat for much longer, he will get pneumonia from the wetness.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I suggest that the honourable member does not take frivolous points of order.

Mr SCHWARTEN: Sit down, you ratbag!

Mr FitzGerald: Mr Speaker was on his feet and you said, "Sit down, you ratbag!" This is dreadful.

Mr SCHWARTEN: I was talking about the honourable member for Merthyr.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I do not require the protection of the honourable member for Lockyer. I know that it is getting late--what do we do about it?

Mr Beattie: Tell us about the member for Fassifern--the man who deals in stolen property. You talk about him.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I ask the member for Brisbane Central to withdraw those comments.

Mr BEATTIE: I am happy with withdraw them. They refer to matters that were dealt with when Mr Speaker was not in the Chamber. Under those circumstances, I am happy to withdraw.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Let us get back to the debate.

Mr SCHWARTEN: Thank you, Mr Speaker. For a moment, I thought that four or five people wanted to enter my section of this debate. The point to which I wish to return is that members opposite would have us believe that the problems that befall the

education system in this State are the fault of the Labor Party. Members opposite were in Government for 32 years and they oversaw the worst-paid teachers in Australia--and probably in the world--and the worst-resourced schools in Australia. Those figures can be backed up time and time again, but those statistics were ignored.

Much was made by the honourable member for Fassifern about that blue document that was released, coincidentally, before the State election and around the time when the Budget was brought down. He stated that the former Government had made a guarantee on teachers' wages. What a shame that it did not understand that it had to go to the Industrial Relations Commission in this State; that it could not make backdoor deals in terms of wages and conditions. In order to make that deal stick, the former Government had to go through the Industrial Relations Commission in Queensland and abide by certain criteria. It was not used to dealing in that manner. The former Government released a blue document that cost a fortune and referred to a rural incentive scheme. However, it was not worth the paper that it was written on. It had a hollow ring to it. The former Government had 32 years to do something about the lousy wages that it paid teachers and the Third World conditions under which teachers in this State worked. For that very reason, teachers all over this State rebelled against the Government of the day. The piece of blue paper that the former Government issued at that time was not worth a tinker's cuss.

Mr Santoro: Did they march on Parliament House as they did under your Government?

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

Mr SCHWARTEN: The fact is undeniable that wage justice has been delivered to teachers in this State only under a Labor Government. There is no question about that. Under a Labor Government in this State, we now have the best-paid teachers in Australia. End of story. It did not take 32 years of pontification to deliver that into the payrolls of teachers in this State, and we have delivered that.

A couple of weeks ago, \$461,000 came into the electorate of Rockhampton North by way of school grants. That is more than double what was previously the case. I have been through all of the grants. When I was an official for the Teachers Union, I saw how the parents and citizens groups had to raise money in those schools. I saw the kids having to raise that money themselves. It was disgraceful. They do not have to do that for basic necessities any more. I will highlight one instance. The other day, I visited Parkhurst State School, which is a very small school on the outskirts of Rockhampton North. Vic Keith is the principal of that school.

Mr FitzGerald interjected.

Mr SCHWARTEN: He is a mate of the honourable member's. He is an honourable man and a damned good principal. He pointed out to me something that he had purchased out of the school grants. It is called CD TV and is an exceptionally good program in schools. It costs \$1,800 and the software for it costs \$60 a throw. It is an enormous enhancement to that school, and it came out of the school grants that were provided by a Labor Government in this State. Let there be no mistake about it: if members opposite were in Government, that facility would not have been in that school. There is no case to argue otherwise. Honourable members opposite can argue and bicker as much as they like about the figures, but there is no way around the fact that we have given a bigger share of the Budget to education than the former Government ever did. When I was in the Teachers Union, we pushed and pushed and pushed the former Government for a bigger slice of the cake. It never, ever occurred. I say quite honestly that some of the National Party Ministers were pushing for it, and Brian Littleproud was one of them.

Mr Littleproud: Fourteen per cent increase two years in a row.

Mr SCHWARTEN: No. When the honourable member for Condamine took on the portfolio he tried and tried to get his Government to increase funding to education, but it fell on deaf ears.

Mr Littleproud: Fourteen per cent increase two years in a row.

Mr SCHWARTEN: What the member got for education in this State is not worth a pakapoo ticket. What the member got for education in this State did not improve conditions for teachers, or the lot of the kids. It did not reduce the class sizes to any great extent or improve the conditions of education in Queensland. The honourable member should not try to bung that one on. I was trying to do the member a favour by saying that he was not weak-kneed about it, but perhaps he is.

I now turn to a couple of other important initiatives of this Government. As I said in my maiden speech, education is the linchpin of all development. I hold very firmly to that view. In the last few months I have noticed that various members opposite want to deride the efforts of members in Government in terms of our responsibility towards Queensland Railways. If there ever was greater hypocrisy than that, I have yet to see it, because this Government has inherited a system that loses \$1.5m daily. The National Party continues to say that somehow or other that is our fault. The National Party let the system run down to that extent, but they say it is our fault. I would like to refer to some of the comments made by members opposite. On a number of occasions I have visited the railways in Rockhampton. On my last visit, I talked to a couple of railway electricians. They told me that recently they were working on a train between Rockhampton and Brisbane when Vince Lester told them that their jobs were on the line. I will not repeat what my reply was, nor will I repeat what they said about the honourable member. Suffice it to say that they did not believe what he said because they knew that man's track record. The fact is that for the first time ever we had uncovered a plot in the railways in Rockhampton that the Tories on the other side of the House presided over when they tried to hold the seat of Maryborough by unduly interfering politically in the roster system. Our blokes up there are awake up to it. It has taken a Labor Government to properly access that problem and address it.

Mr Springborg interjected.

Mr SCHWARTEN: No, we will not interfere. You are obsessed with interference. You want us to interfere in everything. You will have us peeping through people's louvres shortly. I remember what you said during the homosexual debate.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I suggest to the member for Rockhampton North that he address his comments through the Chair.

Mr SCHWARTEN: I think the honourable member will be peeping through people's louvres shortly. The fact is that the situation was politically manipulated and, as a result, there is a disparity in the way in which rosters between the centres of Maryborough, Gladstone, Bundaberg and Rockhampton have been drawn up. It means that there has been less efficiency. The blokes on the job will tell honourable members that that is so and, if this problem is not addressed, then the rail system cannot be appropriately efficient. Political tinkering with the system could not continue. I do not endorse that and neither does the Minister. As the new Act reveals, the Government does not want any part of that sort of system.

The fact remains that if it is allowed to run properly, the rail system in Queensland is very efficient. It was not allowed to run under the National Party Government. It was politically tinkered with at every single turn. The Queensland rail system was interfered with at every turn, whether it be through contracts or apprenticeships. The Labor Government has put more apprentices on at Queensland Railways in one year than the National Party Government put on in five years.

Mr Randell: What are you talking about?

Mr SCHWARTEN: The honourable member would not know what I am talking about because he is too lazy to get on a train.

Mr Randell: Webber first, I know Jimmy Webber.

Mr SCHWARTEN: The facts are undeniable and the honourable member can check them for himself.

Mr Randell: Webber first, the member second.

Mr SCHWARTEN: If the honourable member is able to read, he can check the facts for himself. Recently, as a result of negotiations, this Government has been able to guarantee jobs in the traffic control area in Rockhampton. This has not been achieved through political interference, but by people sitting down and discussing the best possible way to solve the problem in order to achieve the most efficient and economic outcome for Queensland Railways and the taxpayers of this State. This problem has been resolved. Recently, it was announced that the supercoal wagons will be built by very expert tradesmen at the excellent facilities in Rockhampton. There will have to be some enhancement of facilities, but the good news is that those jobs are secure. I challenge members on the other side of the House to come down and debate me in front of those railway workers in Rockhampton and see how they get on.

Mr Randell interjected.

Mr SCHWARTEN: Any time the member wants to come down, he can do so, if he likes the smell of rotten fruit. He will be as popular as bacon at a Jewish breakfast. In the five minutes I have remaining to me I wish to talk about the employment program, because that is one of the cornerstones of the economy of this State. I have heard members in this place deride this Government's record on employment. I have heard them talk incessant platitudes about how this Government does not create jobs, but within the next three years 250 000 hours of employment per week will be created under the accelerated capital works program.

Mr T. B. Sullivan: They are all leaving for a drink.

Mr SCHWARTEN: That is all they are good for.

Mr T. B. Sullivan: They can't cop it.

Mr SCHWARTEN: No. I wish to refer to the \$20m Government building that is now being constructed in Rockhampton but which should have been constructed in 1983. This project was hampered by political interference from people in Rockhampton who were very closely connected with the National Party and who oversaw the National Party's collection of rent for Education House at \$119,000 a year, which was paid by the taxpayers. The rent for that building went straight into the National Party's coffers and, at the same time, the National Party Government stopped the construction of a Government building. Why do honourable members think that the National Party did that? I can assure this House that that type of arrangement will never happen again.

Mr Littleproud: Value for money.

Mr SCHWARTEN: Value for money, my fat aunt! That was not the case at all. The fact is that when the National Party bought Education House, it was vacant and it was not commercially viable, but it proved to be a good milking cow for the National Party at that particular time. This Government will not be deflected from its purpose by that type of political tinkering because, at the end of the day, it is the taxpayer who loses out. The Government building that is being constructed in Rockhampton will not only generate employment but also greatly stimulate the economy of Rockhampton. Recently, an independent study revealed that \$40m will flow to the local economy, and I applaud that. Rockhampton's economy is performing very strongly, and this project can only assist that position. The building will also provide facilities for use by the general public.

The project has attracted its fair share of knockers. One of them is Alderman Bruce Simpson, who wrote a letter of protest. Members of the Opposition may remember him because he stood against Les Yewdale, and on one occasion nominated for a Federal electorate. He was beaten in both instances. The National Party was able to rot him into obtaining a local government area by drawing the boundaries itself, but because he could not obtain endorsement to oppose me, he ratted on the National Party and became an Independent. His letters, which denigrate the project, have been published in the local newspaper. It is only to be expected that he would, because he is anti-progress and all he can do is knock the project. The National Party does not want to know him, and I do not blame it for that. I do not regard him as an albatross around the neck of the National Party.

I conclude my remarks by saying that because this Government is not hampered by the political tinkering and political irresponsibility that was characteristic of the previous Government, the three areas to which I have referred have met with unparalleled success.

Time expired.

Mr LITTLEPROUD (Condamine) (9.56 p.m.): It is obvious to members on the Opposition side of the House that in recent weeks there has been a change of mood in the Labor Government, which suddenly seems to have become sensitive. Apart from the speech I have just heard, it seems to me that reality has replaced hype. For 18 months, I have repeatedly heard members of the Labor Government talk up their position in this Parliament. It now seems that, at last--if the reports appearing in the newspapers and the speeches made in this Parliament are any guide--the reality of government has suddenly been brought home, and members of the Labor Party have realised that they are being judged on their performance. I can remember the maiden speeches of Labor members who represent metropolitan electorates. They reflected the high expectations of those members, and they could all be placed in the category of speeches on social justice. The members who held such high expectations are now a little disillusioned because the Treasurer has now told them the reality of the state of the economy at both State and Federal levels. Those members are not able to obtain the facilities and resources they wanted. They had promised improvements for their electorates, and they are now being pressed to provide all the facilities that they thought the Government could afford. A perfect example of the disillusionment to which I have referred is the case of the former member for Nundah, Mr Heath.

The people who live in the bush are now recognising that services are being cut. As I understand it, there is total hostility in those areas towards the Government. The honourable members for Archerfield, Mansfield and Barron River are three Labor members who visited my electorate in south-west Queensland, and they listened to what the local people had to say. I compliment the honourable member for Archerfield on listening carefully to the people of my electorate. I know for a fact that he came back to Brisbane and spoke to his Cabinet colleagues. He told them about the genuine case that had been put by the people of my electorate. In spite of the fact that members of the Opposition have been explaining the position for 12 months, it took a visit to the electorate to make members of the Labor Party realise that what members of the Opposition were on about was in fact correct. At last, it seems that this Government has got the message from the bush.

The result of the Nundah by-election has made the metropolitan Labor Party representatives begin to worry about the message that is being sent by the Brisbane electorates. A recent survey shows that support for the ALP Government among public servants has dropped by half. Metropolitan Labor members also know that the people of Queensland are concerned about this State's economy and about jobs. A publication that was circulated recently among members shows that when people begin to worry more about the availability of employment, they start to think less about social justice and welfare issues because they know that the economy cannot afford them. A change in attitude has taken place in the wider electorate, and at last the majority of Labor

members are sensitive to the real issues. The change in attitude of this Government is borne out also by the press releases that have been issued by Cabinet Ministers. An article in today's *Courier-Mail* carries the headline, "Govt backdown on major DPI reforms", and reports the fact that the Minister for Primary Industries called together 50 farm leaders to a meeting. At last, this Government is sensitive to what is going on and is taking notice of what has been said by the members who comprised the rural task force. The Minister for Primary Industries is now trying to reassure primary producers that the public service cuts that are occurring, the introduction of user-pays services for the DPI, closure of research stations and corporatisation of some DPI functions will not now occur. The *Courier-Mail* also carries the headline "De Lacy pledge on rural services", and the article quotes Mr De Lacy as saying--

"There will be no reduction in services: in fact there will be improved services."

Members of the Labor Government defend the current policies by saying that this is all part of the regionalisation program. As the honourable member for Cunningham pointed out earlier, regionalisation does not necessarily mean an improvement in services. It may well be the case that there will be the same number of public servants or even a few more because of the growth of the public sector, but those factors do not guarantee that more services are being provided for the community. Some members heard me interject earlier, when the new member for Nundah was talking, about equity of service and equity of access to service. There is no equity when an old person, a pensioner, in Jandowae without a car has to beg a ride to Dalby to get basic Government services. If members opposite are true to their ideology, they will do something about it.

Mr Livingstone: What happened with schools?

Mr LITTLEPROUD: They had basic facilities. It is interesting that those opposite bring up education. Recently, the Minister for Education made a comment. I said, "You know, Mr Minister, you will be lucky because, as the Queensland Education budget has gone up in the last three years, the budgets for Education in the other States have come down because they have had systems they could not afford." I predicted it would happen; in fact, I brought it up last year in the Budget debate. We have always delivered a service we could afford, and members opposite have never argued about quality. Research shows that the quality coming out of Queensland's schools is equal to any in Australia. If those opposite argue, they will hoist themselves on their own petards.

Government members interjected.

Mr LITTLEPROUD: Mr Speaker, I would like some protection, because I have some good things to say.

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Mr LITTLEPROUD: As I look across the Chamber, I see, with few exceptions, that most new members of the House, and many Ministers, are children of the affluent days of the 1960s to the 1980s. I have heard in this place arguments about "What happened in the last 32 years?" I will not ask those opposite what was here before 1957. I would like to say, "Bugger all", but I will not say that. Earlier, my colleague the honourable member for Mirani pointed out that in those days the people who worked for the railways----

Mr Santoro: Mr Littleproud----

Mr LITTLEPROUD: I am sorry, I cannot take the interjection. In those days, the men who worked on the line for the railways lived in canvas tents. We had pathetic development of natural resources. We had State-owned butcher shops that were a big rort. Labor had been in power for something like 40 years. I will give a quick cameo of the achievements of 1957 to 1989. We opened up the vast coal fields of central Queensland. We cleared millions of acres of brigalow scrub and then sold them off to people to create the enormous potential of central Queensland. We put in place the State electricity grid. We bituminised the major road network throughout Queensland. We

developed the electric train system in and around Brisbane. We extended it to Gladstone. We would have extended it to Cairns; we had plans to extend it to Townsville. All those things happened in the last 30 years. We also provided the electric system from Mackay back to Emerald and then to Gladstone--the triangular link to service the coal fields. The aluminium industry was developed. We developed a scheme of fibreglass optics for transmission of voice which was the biggest in the world. That was put in place by Don Lane. In 1957, when we came into Government, there was one university in Queensland. We have seven now. That is not too bad. We have had comments about the number of high schools. The Education spokesman, the member for Fassifern, said that the Government had not built a new high school for 30 years in Queensland. I can tell him that, two years ago, there were something like 150 high schools. The number of schools is gradually increasing by one or two, but people will always claim that schools are not being built as quickly as they should be. That is not a bad achievement.

In the years since 1957, Brisbane changed from a place with red galvanised rooves to a modern city. We were a good enough Government to put in place the Commonwealth Games and Expo and we were good enough to create the best economy in Australia. That is not too bad for 30 years!

What happened before 1957? Nothing new was done. I was a young fellow in those days. I was born in 1941. I knew what it was like to live out in the country with poor roads and no educational facilities. Of about 30 children in my age group, one would expect about three to pass scholarship. Few families could afford to send their children away to boarding school. Those children were the only ones who were able to take advantage of their opportunities. All of a sudden, after 1957, the provision of secondary education as a right spread across Queensland. The challenge is now for honourable members opposite. They have to provide tertiary education, be it TAFE or university education, for all the people of Queensland as a right. They are not doing too well. Let us judge them in a few years' time.

Mr Livingstone: Take the interjection. Where did the money come from for those universities? Not from the Queensland Government--from Canberra, from Gough Whitlam!

Mr LITTLEPROUD: We all pay our taxes. We had a terrific growth rate.

Mr Livingstone interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member should let the matter rest; he has made his point.

Mr LITTLEPROUD: The next matter I wish to raise concerns the old notion of no new taxes. I will run a few things past honourable members. First, I mention land rentals. Land rentals are up by about 1 000 per cent, and will be even worse when the Wolfe report comes down. The honourable member for Warrego talked about land taxes. Valuations, be they commercial or rural, are kept up even in falling land markets. The Government is robbing people when it should not. It should be adjusting. The Government has purposely delayed the revaluation of land. That is another way of avoiding the claim of no new taxes. The Government has cut the delivery of Government services. It calls it regionalisation. I talked about it earlier. All the Government has done is cut the number of points of delivery of services; it has transferred the cost of that service from the Government to the public--the people who have to use the service. The Government has dodged the issue; it has put the onus back on the people who live out there, and they are suffering. Then, of course, we can go back to TAFE fees.

Honourable members opposite said we had not done too well in Queensland. I agree that there was a lot more to be done. In fact, the member for Peak Downs was doing a tremendous job in TAFE. The TAFE area has gone backwards. The Government may have allocated more money, but it is in a bit of a mess. But what has happened? The Government promised no new taxes, yet the fees went up about 300 per cent. That was only a charge; it was not a tax.

We can also remember that people in the country were told that there would be no new taxes. The concessions were abolished and farm vehicle registrations went up by something like 1 000 per cent. There we have it--the claim of no new taxes. I wish members opposite would stop the hype and understand the reality. The reality is that people out there do not accept the claim any more. They know they are being charged more for living and their quality of life has declined. They no longer believe the claim.

My colleague the member for Fassifern spoke at length about education. It was an excellent address. He really brought home some of the points about funding for schools. I have always retained a strong interest in education, and I always will. It was my profession for 25 years. I have been watching what is happening. It is marvellous how many people I know in the Education Department still come to me and talk about the sorts of things that are happening at present. I bleed inside when I think about the careers of hundreds of people who have given them away, disillusioned. They have retired prematurely and have been criticised for not re-signing contracts. They want to be true to themselves.

One thing that really worries me--and the people of Queensland should know about it--is that the system of inspection is being dropped. For years one of the strengths of the Queensland education system has been the fact that its inspectors have helped teachers to develop their skills and have appraised teachers. The inspectors are also appraised. What is happening? They are being replaced by auditors. The name is similar, but I was told as recently as Tuesday night that, in reality, the auditors will consist of a couple of people in each regional office who will be office-bound. They will be sent profiles of various aspects of the schools' performance--student performance, teacher performance, financial performance. We will lose the personalised service where the inspector looks around the class room and looks into the faces of the kids to see whether they are alive and bright.

Other parts of the world have gone down that track. Of course, John Cain made one hell of a mess in Victoria. The parents of Queensland should demand that that inspectorate be reinstated. The inspectors were not ogres. They were there to develop the skills of the teachers and to make a careful assessment of them. They were there to observe the teacher performing in front of the children. The previous Government instituted a Statewide sampling of the performance of students. I pressed the present Minister for Education to carry on a sampling of the performance of children in various subjects across the State. He said, "Yes, I will carry on with that." I have to say that I am disappointed that he has not, because when it was trialled by the previous Government I promised that such sampling would be carried out every six months. I promised that the results would be published every six months so that the parents of Queensland could see how their children were performing as compared with other children in Queensland and with children in other parts of Australia. I even invited the non-Government schools to participate. They welcomed the idea. They said, "Yes, we will be in that." As late as last Saturday, I received a report that in the last 18 months only one piece of sampling has been conducted. The school concerned is a private school. The person to whom I spoke has not received any feedback regarding the performance of the students of that school compared with the performance of other students around the State, and there has not been any publication of that sampling. I believe that that is sad.

Members of the Government who have an interest in education should press the Minister to get on with conducting the sampling. An inspectorate was a chance for an assessment of students school to school, region to region, Statewide and nationwide and a way of keeping up the standards. I am also disappointed that the Minister does not give me credit for being the person who invited parents into the schools to help set the agenda, be it in regard to budgeting or setting academic goals. Those three measures together were designed to answer the call by parents to discover just how good our schools are. It was a way of letting them set the agenda. It was a way of giving them facts on which to base their judgment and giving them some sort of confidence in the system. Members of the Government should press the Minister to bring back that system.

Another matter that concerns me and people in the department is gender equity. It is a fact that some officers of the Education Department--they are female officers--recognise that they have been appointed to more senior positions when other people have better qualifications than they do, and they are embarrassed about it. They know that they have obtained those positions only because of the Government's program of gender equity. That is sad, especially when the people concerned realise the true situation and are embarrassed about it. I cite the example of a very senior female officer who came back to the central office in Brisbane and said, "I can't do it. I can't cope." She was told, "Go back and cope." She was very concerned and said that she could not cope----

Mr Foley: Aren't you ashamed of your Government's failure to allow women a fair go in education?

Mr LITTLEPROUD: Women were never denied a fair go in the Education Department under my administration. I would rather see people promoted on their qualifications than on their gender. Some of the policies of this Government are pie-eyed.

I must follow up what my colleague the member for Fassifern said about this terrible sham of public money being taken out of the Education Vote and used to set up Government backbench members with a hard disc containing all the necessary information so that they can go out to schools and present cheques. In the eight years that I have been a member of this Parliament I have never before seen something like that done. When members of the Government were in Opposition, they were very pious. They stood up in this Chamber, thumped the benches, talked away and looked very good. I might add that there are a couple of civil libertarians on the Government side who came in with a halo around their heads. It has slipped a fair bit. Yet the Government has stooped to this. Someone said to me, "Yes, Brian, but your members used to hand out the sporting grants." They did, but they were----

Mr Prest: Who?

Mr LITTLEPROUD: National Party members, but all those letters carried the letterhead of the Division of Sport.

Mr Prest: No!

Mr LITTLEPROUD: Yes, they did. It was just a matter of going to the sorts of functions where these people meet, in clubs and so on, and they were passed out. But this is different. This is going into the hearts and homes of all those little kids out there. The other half of Queensland is saying, "What's wrong with us? We just happen to live on the other side of the fence." Members of the Government ought to search their hearts about this. There was probably a bit of butt-kicking today after question-time. There has been a change. The Government has gone from hype to reality. It knows that it is in a bit of trouble and that it has to improve its game. The member for Archerfield and the member for Barron River have been good enough to say, "We have to get things right." The Government cannot be bull-headed about this. Labor got a rush of blood when it got into Government, but it is doing a great disservice to the people of Queensland.

Mr PREST (Port Curtis) (10.13 p.m.): I did not intend to speak in this debate. However, having listened to some of the lies that have been told by members of the Opposition, particularly the member for Fassifern, Mr Lingard, and the member for Condamine, Mr Littleproud, I want to----

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member to use a more parliamentary word in future.

Mr PREST: I substitute the word "untruths". I believe that this Government has been elected by the people of Queensland to govern. Without a doubt, over the past 20 months Queensland has been governed very capably. I would like to congratulate the Treasurer on the Budget that he brought down for 1990-91 and the way in which he

has carried it through. I am certain that the Budget that he is contemplating bringing down within the next month or so will again ensure that Queensland will be very well served.

Just after the leadership debacle within the National Party I was listening to Dr Paul Reynolds, a university lecturer. Dr Reynolds said that the Opposition is just a team of rabble. He said that the Opposition has not learned from its massive defeat in 1989 and that it has not learned how to be an Opposition. That is something that has been demonstrated strongly again today by the tactics that these people have reverted to in order to try to damn the Treasurer and to damn the Australian Labor Party Government in this State. Mr Littleproud claimed that the previous Government developed grain-growing in the Central Highlands. For the benefit of Mr Littleproud, I point out that the QBFC started growing sorghum in the Capella, Springsure and Clermont regions way back in about 1947 or 1948. It was that experience and the clearing of vast areas of land at that time that made the Central Highlands a major grain-growing area and such a great economic proposition for this State.

Mr LINGARD: Mr Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

Quorum formed.

Mr PREST: As I said, it was in the 1947-48 period when British Foods experimented with the growing of sorghum in that region. The Opposition Whip, Mr Neal, has said to me that that was a failure. However, it showed the agricultural industry of Queensland that grain could be grown profitably in the region. As I said, at that time Labor was in power in this State, so I would just like to draw to the attention of Mr Littleproud the fact that it was not his Government that experimented with growing grain in the Central Highlands. The big holdings in that area were eventually cut up into smaller settlements, and we now see people earning a living off the land by growing grain and producing seed of many varieties.

As a result of the foresight of J Martin Hanson, who was the Gladstone Harbour Board chairman back in the 1950s, a conveyor system was installed at the port of Gladstone. That system was able to be utilised for the economical export of coal and grain. Gladstone had a great start on any other port in Queensland, and that was brought about only as a result of the foresight of the Labor Government and that wonderful man, Mr Martin Hanson. That is why Gladstone took off, and it is now handling some 28 million tonnes of produce each year.

Mr Lingard and others have referred today to the handing out of cheques. How hypocritical can they be? Throughout the years I have been a member of this Parliament, I have never taken the opportunity to hand out cheques to sporting clubs or organisations within the Port Curtis electorate. In fact, under the National Party Government we were never given the opportunity to do so. But I remember quite well National Party members from adjoining electorates coming into my area and handing out cheques to sporting and other community organisations just so they could have their photo taken and get a little publicity for themselves. I do not believe in that. I remember in January 1989 that a Meals on Wheels service in an adjoining electorate had been experiencing some problems because its subsidy cheque had not arrived. Upon investigation, I found that the cheque had been forwarded to the member for the adjoining electorate. She had received the cheque some six weeks previously, but due to her going on holidays and not being able to visit the area she did not bother to forward the cheque but held it until such time as it would be convenient for her to arrange for the media and a photographer to be present.

I made inquiries of her office--I'm not saying who she was, but it was in Biloela--and I was told that she did have the cheque and would do her utmost to get it to the organisation as quickly as possible. Being a knowledgeable person who visited the area regularly, she picked out the secretary's name but unfortunately she forwarded the cheque to a past secretary. Of course, that past secretary had left the area, having moved to Calliope to live. Because her mail was being redirected, the cheque did not go to Meals

on Wheels in the right town. However, eventually this former secretary gave the cheque to her daughter to take to the high school to give to another student whose mother was then secretary of the Meals on Wheels service that was meant to receive the cheque some eight weeks earlier.

In this case, the attempt to present the cheque and gain some publicity and kudos went awry, and that has happened on many occasions. I have never been one to seek fame or fortune by trying to benefit from those people who can least afford any delay in the receipt of funding. That is why I say it is hypocritical for National Party members to talk about the Australian Labor Party Government in Queensland taking credit for handing out money to schools or other organisations. I would like them to think back over the years they were in power. I cannot go back any more than fifteen and a half years, but I can assure honourable members that cheques were given to National Party members to hand out so that they could gain some publicity at the expense of those organisations which were seeking help.

Mr SANTORO (Merthyr) (10.23 p.m.): In common with the honourable member for Port Curtis and the honourable member for Rockhampton North, I did not intend to speak in this debate. However, after listening to some of the contributions from members opposite, I felt that I should perhaps say a few words. For the duration of this debate, the mob on the other side have been talking about ethics, honesty, propriety and their eminent suitability to govern. I am very pleased to follow on from the honourable member for Fassifern and the honourable member for Port Curtis. I wish to develop the theme upon which they touched and developed somewhat themselves. I suggest to members opposite that it is a theme that inflicts only shame and disgrace not only on Government members as individuals but also on their Government.

On prior occasions in this place, I have spoken about cronyism. Tonight, I wish to add to my previous contributions. In the wider community, including within the broader economic community, the whole subject of cronyism is beginning to cause a crisis of confidence. This Government used as a major election platform the concept and the issue of cronyism and ethics in Government and the waste of taxpayers' funds. It promised that, upon the election of a Goss Labor Government, all of this would stop--cronyism would stop, political appointments would stop and the waste of public money associated with Government decisions and Government actions would in fact cease. The question is: has it in fact stopped? Has it in fact come to the screeching halt that was promised to the people of Queensland by the Honourable the Premier and by other members opposite? I suggest to the House that the public record certainly does not show that the waste of public money, the misuse of public funds and the appointment of cronies and the effect on the whole function of Government has in fact stopped. It is continuing. I suggest to the House that the Labor Party's most effective job-creation scheme--cronyism, it is called--is in fact alive and well.

Mr Dunworth: Flourishing.

Mr SANTORO: It is in fact flourishing. Members opposite become terribly upset when I name people, but I try to do my research and I try to find out the background of the people who have been appointed. Are they qualified to be appointed? Are they qualified to carry out the functions for which they are being paid? Are taxpayers' moneys being properly allocated through the appointments about which I will speak?

I refer firstly to Mr David Butt, the Executive Director of Support Services in the Health Department. Most people would not realise it, but he is the former press secretary to Ken McElligott, the Minister for Health. Let people deny that that appointment does not have quite a degree of political flavour to it. Mr Brian Dobinson, about whom I have spoken----

Mr Schwarten interjected.

Mr SANTORO: I will accept the interjection from the honourable member for Rockhampton North. I indicate that I will mention Mr Dobinson only in passing.

Eventually, I will have some other things to say about him. I give the honourable member fair warning of that, and he can warn Mr Dobinson also. People may be interested to know that Mr Dobinson was appointed after failing in his bid for the Redcliffe mayoralty. He ran third. Three candidates ran and he ran an incredibly bad last.

Mr Welford: You weren't his campaign manager?

Mr SANTORO: I was a campaign manager of sorts but, in my modest way, I was happy to contribute to that result. Recently, he was appointed as a member of the Sunshine Coast Regional Health Authority. I query the wisdom of that appointment. Apart from the experience that that man has had on the Redcliffe Hospitals Board, he had no relevant experience. Yet he was appointed to a position for which he had no experience.

I refer now to Ms Helene Jane Abraham--these days, Alderman Jane Abraham. At the time of her appointment, she was the ALP candidate for the Brisbane City Council ward of Paddington. She is now a member of the Building Industry Workplace Health and Safety Committee. Perhaps one day somebody will tell me what experience she has in that area. I refer now to Mr Alan Doodney.

Mrs EDMOND: I rise to a point of order. Dr Helene Abraham is a medical doctor who does have experience in that area and has for many years worked in occupational health.

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

Mr SANTORO: Thank you for your protection, Mr Speaker, from that vicious assault by the member for Mount Coot-tha. I refer now to Mr Patrick Douglas Purcell, the secretary of the Builders Labourers Federation. He was also appointed to that committee. Mr John Murray Thompson, a TLC advocate, was also appointed to that committee. Mr Don Brown was appointed as a member of the Queensland Licensing Commission. He was the president of the Miscellaneous Workers Union. Members opposite should keep on listening because what I will be saying----

Mr Schwarten: What's wrong with union members?

Mr SANTORO: I will take the interjection from the honourable member for Rockhampton North. As I go through the list--and it is not a very extensive list; he should not be too worried--I want him to try to correlate in his mind the suitability of those people, to be paid by taxpayers' funds, to perform the duties for which they have been appointed. Some of them do have some experience. I suggest that the vast majority of them are political appointments. Let me refer now to Mr Paul Casey, a member of the Chemical and Chemical Products Industry Workplace Health and Safety Committee. He also was a member of the Miscellaneous Workers Union. Let me refer to Mr Geoffrey Slowgrove, who was appointed as a member of the Queensland Harness Racing Board. He was a very good friend of Minister Gibbs and previously research officer for the Miscellaneous Workers Union. Do honourable members opposite get the impression that members of the Miscellaneous Workers Union are getting a pretty good guernsey in those appointments? They are doing very well--very well indeed.

What about Mr Walter Harvey Entrich, a member of the Auctioneers and Agents Committee, the ALP candidate for Albert in the 1983 State election? I have gone a long way back to dig out this material. Mr Walter Henry Tutt, a member of the Queensland Harness Racing Board, the ALP candidate--and this will be of interest to you, Mr Speaker--for the seat of Ashgrove in 1972 is another. I have gone quite a way back. Mr Peter Ball was appointed an industrial inspector and was one of many such appointments. I will be saying a bit more about a few others. He was a former FEDFA official. Miss Jane McDonelt was appointed executive director of the Office of State Revenue. She was a member of the Labor Lawyers Association. Another was Mr Maurice

Charles Swan, a commissioner of the Legal Aid Commission, and husband of the Industrial Relations Commissioner, Deirdre Swan.

Another very notable crony appointment is Mr John Joseph Hogg, a member of the Queensland Small Business Corporation and secretary of the shop assistants union. Mr Alan David McPaul, a member of the Bread Industry Authority, was secretary of the Transport Workers Union.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I assume that at some stage the member will show the relationship between the Appropriation Bill and all these names.

Mr SANTORO: Thank you for your guidance, Mr Speaker. I am almost through this aspect of my speech. I am asking you and members opposite to correlate the suitability of these people to hold office for which public funds are being expended. I refer to the appointment of Mr Bill Ludwig as a member of the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation. He was AWU President and Secretary. He has the unusual pastime of bludgeoning members of the Federal Parliament into voting the way that he wishes them to vote. Mr William Wallace Trohear was appointed a member of the Building Industry Workplace Health Safety Committee. He was Secretary of the Building Workers Industrial Union.

Mr Bredhauer: You have the pronunciation wrong.

Mr SANTORO: I will accept the interjection. I am very pleased to have my pronunciation corrected. At this point, I refer to a very unusual aspect of the whole cronyism story, and that is the particular favouritism that is being displayed to friends of the Premier, particularly friends who are associated with his former legal firm. Mr Peter Carne was appointed a member of the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation. He was a senior partner in Goss Downey Carne. Mr Brian Herd was appointed a member of the Building Societies Contingency Fund Committee. He was a partner in Goss Downey Carne.

I will not mention others, but plenty of other people either related to the Premier or to his circle of so-called Goss legal mafia are receiving very special treatment. I refer the House to the publication *Musica Viva*. It says that Queensland presents the Philharmonica Chamber soloists. The particular activity was held on Friday, 7 June 1991 at 8.00 p.m. in the Legislative Council Chamber, Parliament House, Brisbane. What did I note? It was proudly sponsored by Goss Downey Carne, Solicitors and Attorneys.

Mr SCHWARTEN: I rise to a point of order. I cannot find any relevance to the appropriation in this diatribe.

Mr Borbidge: It is as relevant as your speech.

Mr SCHWARTEN: Pull your bloody head in!

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The member for Rockhampton North will withdraw that comment. There is no point of order. I suggest to the member for Merthyr that it would make things easier for the Speaker if he mentioned money some time.

Mr SANTORO: I have heard members opposite accusing me of seeking to smear. I am seeking to establish the benchmark that members opposite, particularly the Premier, establish in terms of ethics in Government. The question I ask the Premier is: how many other law firms were invited to proudly sponsor the program?

Government members: Oh, come on!

Mr SANTORO: Members opposite cannot say, "Come on!" Let us look at a seminar called "Child-care: Legal Issues", sponsored by a Government department. Who were the legal people, sponsored by the Government department, who appeared to give advice on child-care legal issues? It was Goss Downey Carne. I have a long list, but I will not go through it. I will let out the names one by one. I will acclimatise members opposite. They are stunned. They are stunned by that practice, by that blatant favouritism and

by that constant attempt to politicise the public service. When the honourable member for Fassifern, Mr Lingard, rose----

Mr SPEAKER: Order! It appears that the member for Merthyr is inflaming people on my right. I suggest that the member be heard in silence. I call members to order.

Mr SANTORO: Mr Speaker, all I can say in response to your very astute observation that I am inflaming members opposite is: how the truth hurts. I could go on reading from the list of cronies, but I seek your permission to have it incorporated in *Hansard*.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Is leave granted?

A Government member: No.

Mr SANTORO: As leave is not granted, I seek permission to table the list.

Leave granted.

Mr SANTORO: In conclusion, I refer to a matter I sought to raise in the House yesterday. I give credit to the honourable member for Sherwood for giving me the slide. I refer to the great Kooralbyn caper.

Mr Welford interjected.

Mr SANTORO: The member for Stafford can rest assured that my speech will last for at least another six minutes. Yesterday, before time ran out during question-time, I sought to raise the issue of the great Kooralbyn caper. That seems to be a new game with the expenditure of public moneys. I suggest that it should be sponsored by the brewery and by the Premier and his department and that there should be nothing planned for the next day. In fact, when those seminars are being held, the Premier should make it a habit to declare a half-day, if not a full-day, holiday.

Mr Borbidge: Goss Downey Carne might sponsor it.

Mr SANTORO: That is another very astute interjection, unlike some that I have accepted from the other side of the House. The honourable member is right. That is a place where that firm would feel particularly well at home. A few weekends ago, at Kooralbyn, a seminar was held at public expense for the Premier's Department. I challenge the Premier to deny that and, if he does not deny it, I challenge him to present the personal cheque butts which show the payment for that seminar, which was held for some alleged reason, which was, I think, to acquaint senior staffers and press secretaries with the plight of rural people--farmers and people on the land.

Mr McGrady: What have you done about it?

Mr SANTORO: I take the interjection from the member for Mount Isa. When the Liberal Party gets the opportunity, we will certainly do a lot more than the Federal Labor Party Government has done for primary producers. The honourable member should be ashamed to seek to compare the performance of the Liberal Party with the dismal performance by that pack of incompetents who are constantly marched upon by thousands of rural producers and who are the subject of no-confidence votes at rural crisis meetings. In fact, they are declared to be incompetents by the very people to whom I was referring when the honourable member asked me, "What have you done?" The honourable member for Mount Isa should be ashamed to ask that question. He has no idea of the true plight of rural people. I suggest to the honourable member that after those people participated in that seminar they knew nothing more than they did when they started. I am told that there was a real, fair dinkum party on Friday night, which involved, amongst many others, members of the Premier's staff and other attendees running around in all sorts of unfit states. Another person was so overcome by the effects of that party that he slept all day on Saturday and was unable to make his contribution to the seminar.

Mr Speaker asked me how some of the content of my speech related to the issues of appropriation. This evening, I have detailed a series of appointments and a series of

actions which seem to favour certain friends of the Premier--I repeat "certain friends of the Premier"--certain friends of the Government and certain friends of Ministers.

Mr Foley interjected.

Mr SANTORO: I take the interjection from the honourable member for Yeronga, when he asked me----

Mr Foley: Where is the evidence for saying that?

Mr SANTORO: The honourable member should let me take his first interjection. He should give me the time, because it is running out. He asked, "What is wrong with appointing people who have political affiliations?" I go on record in this place as saying that there is nothing wrong with appointing people who have party membership or political affiliations. However, I object to some of the incompetents who have been appointed by the Government, a list of names of whom I have tabled and read into *Hansard*.

Mr Foley: Where is the evidence? Produce the evidence.

Mr SANTORO: The evidence is self-evident. It is blind, ideologically blinkered fools such as the honourable member for Yeronga who cannot see the eminent good sense of what I am saying.

Mr FOLEY: I rise to a point of order. I find those remarks objectionable. I ask that they be withdrawn.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I was just about to ask the member to withdraw them.

Mr SANTORO: Of course, I withdraw them. However, I respectfully suggest to the member for Yeronga that it is only the blinkered vision of Government members that prohibits them from clearly recognising the merit of what I have been saying about political appointments. This is what I have been talking about: favouritism and the waste of and the inefficient use of public moneys through the blatant practice of cronyism, a practice that those members opposite--and particularly the Premier--said that they would abolish upon entering Government.

Mr VEIVERS (Southport) (10.44 p.m.): This evening, I want to say a few words about racing. They need to be said. A few things need to be said also about previous speakers in this debate this evening. The new member for Nundah spoke about unions and all of the things that go with them, and he said that we were union-bashers. I inform the honourable member for Nundah that the Liquor Trades Union held a meeting at the Miami State High School hall. For the benefit of the member, I point out that the meeting was about the tourism industry and all of the people who serve the tourism industry on the coast. Many notices were given out about the meeting.

Mr Borbidge: It holds 1 200.

Mr VEIVERS: Yes, the hall can take 1 200 people. I am happy to relate that three people turned up. Two of them were officials of the Liquor Trades Union. Only one member turned up. He is a casual worker--a teacher, as the honourable member for Nundah used to be. He turned up because he thought that he was doing the right thing. That shows how much interest in unions there is on the coast.

Mr T. B. Sullivan: That is because you invited them.

Mr VEIVERS: No, I did not invite them. The Liquor Trades Union invited them along to talk about deregulation, but no-one was interested. People want to get on with things down there. It is a pity that the Government does not get on with doing more rather than shooting rhetoric at us every time. We hear a lot of words from members opposite--plenty of rhetoric--but no action. I listened to the interjections made by the honourable member for Yeronga, and if ever there has been anyone in this place who has disappointed me, he has. Where was he when Russ Hinze, who was never found

guilty and was one of the great Ministers, needed support? The member's guts knotted and his back turned to jelly. He is supposed to be a civil libertarian, but he did not stand up once and say that Russ Hinze should have had a State funeral. Where was the member's civil libertarianism then? It had gone. It had shot out the back door.

Mr Foley: Did you call for a State funeral?

Mr VEIVERS: My word, I did, and I called for it in the *Courier-Mail* and the *Sunday Mail*. However, because I am a member of the National Party, it was not printed the way I said it. You need not talk to me about your righteousness. You dogged it when you had the chance to go. You did not go with it. You were spouting this stuff before you came into Parliament. You shot it at everyone, but when you had a chance to do something specific, get off your tail and prove your worth, you did not have the guts. You are shot to pieces. I am a little upset, Mr Speaker.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I suggest that, if the honourable member makes his comments through the Chair, we may have a more pleasant environment in the House tonight.

Mr VEIVERS: Usually you are not here when I am on my feet, Mr Speaker. The Minister for Racing has a very worrying attitude towards money. It must worry even the Treasurer. It is an attitude he shares with his leader, the Premier, and he shares it a little bit with the Treasurer. These people operate on the assumption that the racing industry is nothing more than a money-making machine--a machine to be used to get the Government out of any financial hole that it digs for itself. These blokes have missed an absolutely vital point. The money they are talking about is not theirs. This money belongs to the racing industry. It is a bit like this afternoon when the Government said that the money belonged to it. I cannot believe it! This money has been generated by the racing industry through its own efforts. It has been generated without any help from the Government and has been for 150 years. In fact, the Government is a great source of hindrance for the racing industry. This Labor Government has made the milking of the racing industry an art form.

All honourable members know about the savage attacks made by the Minister and his Government on the revenue base of the racing industry. We know about the turn-over tax rip-off which was carried out in direct contradiction of the Minister's written pre-election promise. We also know about the extra half a per cent grab from exotic or multiples betting on the TAB. We know that those moves resulted in the racing industry losing several millions of dollars. These are losses that must be made up by reductions in prize money paid to industry participants. The Minister is ripping it off the participants that he says he is trying to help. We know about these things because they have received wide publicity as the effect of the Government's duplicity begins to show. The whole of the racing industry has condemned the Minister loud and long.

However, there are other dimensions to the misuse of racing industry money. Virtually from the day he was sworn in, the Minister has sustained an unrelenting attack on the industry. It has been a full-scale campaign involving the full resources of the Minister's Racing Division. It has also been very expensive. I do not think the Minister will ever let us know how much it cost, but it was certainly millions of dollars. However, here is the sting! That expensive campaign, that large-scale offensive conducted against the racing industry, that outrageous attempt to take over racing, was all paid for by the racing industry and it is still being paid for by the racing industry. Racing is not only forced to make a huge contribution to consolidated revenue but also expected to pay every cent of the cost of running the Racing Division to help kill itself off and help the Minister to kill it off. Talk about user pays! I reckon this is taking it too far.

Whilst the Minister has been pursuing his personal vendetta against racing, and using the Racing Division to do it, he has hardly been the model Minister. Some of the policy decisions that have come out of his office defy logic absolutely. The decision to shift greyhound-racing from the Gabba and Lawnton to Albion Park had plenty of people wondering about ministerial logic. They could be excused from concluding that it was just another case of the Minister running off on his own personal tangent. Nobody has

been able to come up with any good reasons for the move. The people in both the greyhound-racing and harness-racing industries are still waiting to see any kind of financial feasibility study on the move. There is no feasibility study. It does not matter what it costs, because greyhound-racing will be moved to Albion Park. It has already been moved from the Gabba. Mick Cox has gone to Albion Park and I believe that the catering manager has gone as well. There was a contract at the Gabba with another company that still had five years to run. Who will pay that company off? The answer is that it will be the poor old racing industry. It is a disgrace. It is now pretty obvious that there never was a financial feasibility study into the move and that there will never be one. That sort of thing leads to the wildest rumours, and the only way to put them to rest would be to publish a proper study.

However, finances aside, there are some important questions for the Minister to answer. One day, for instance, he will have to explain where the coursing track will be put at Albion Park. There are suggestions that it will have to go where the training track for the trotters is presently located. That will not be much good for harness-racing or for the spectators and punters at the dog-racing. They will be about 90 metres away from the action, which is bad enough with an animal the size of a horse, let alone one the size of a greyhound. Everyone will have to buy binoculars or go and see an optometrist. In addition, there is the question of room for the harness-racing facilities that were planned and promised for Albion Park's next stage of development. People in the harness-racing industry know that training stables will soon have to be built at Albion Park. They will be needed to accommodate horses in work with trainers who presently have their facilities on the outskirts of Brisbane. Land-use pressures will soon force them to move, and Albion Park is a logical place to go.

Experience at Deagon and some of the larger provincial tracks shows whether that has been a good move for galloping. If the Minister was taking a proper interest in this portfolio, he would know all about this matter. The very real fear exists in racing circles that the redevelopment of Albion Park to accommodate greyhound-racing will mean that extensive stabling facilities cannot be built. Instead of harness horses being trained where they race--and that is a fair thing, because everyone involved in the racing industry expects it, irrespective of whether they are involved in galloping, greyhound-racing or trotting--they will be forced further and further away. Where is the sense in that? There may be a logical explanation for the Minister's determination to move these two racing codes into shared facilities, but if there is, he is not telling anybody; therefore, nobody knows what the reason is. The people involved do not know, because the Minister has chosen to keep everyone in the dark.

Mr Palaszczuk: What is your suggestion?

Mr VEIVERS: The honourable member is part of the Labor Government and so is the Minister. They are supposed to make the decisions. Labor members claim to have the mandate to govern, so they should get on with the job. Instead, they are as useless as an ashtray on a motor bike. They cannot make any decisions. The member for Archerfield is hopeless. If he had any worth, he would be in the Ministry, but he is still Deputy Government Whip and he will remain in that position until he has a beard half a metre long.

The Minister cannot blame people involved in racing for thinking that something sinister is going on. On behalf of the people involved in both codes, I strongly urge the Minister to do the right thing. I ask him to take people involved in the racing industry into his confidence for a change, instead of battering them with the seven foot length of 3 x 2 he carries around with him in case anyone asks him a sensible question about racing. Mr Speaker, I am trying to encourage him to allay the fears held by people in the racing industry, and those people have plenty of concerns. Mr Speaker, you are a bit of a punter, and you will have trouble putting your money on. The Minister should give the people in the racing industry the figures they need and tell them why he believes they will be better off as a result of the move he is forcing on them.

I mention a group that is definitely not better off these days--the Queensland Sprint Racing Association. This group has been trying for a very long time to establish quarter horse racing in Toowoomba. I know that sprint racing is not everybody's cup of tea. Many people who are involved in the thoroughbred-racing industry turn up their noses at horses that are bred to race in a straight line over a short distance, which is up to 800 metres in length. They are not real rapt in sprint racing, and I must admit that I am a thoroughbred-racing man myself. Nevertheless, because it enjoys a very large following, the industry should make room for this sport. This fact was recognised some years ago by the greatest Queensland Racing Minister, Russ Hinze, who could see the benefit of encouraging the sport when representatives of sprint racing approached him.

By way of background information, I should explain that the sport is centred on the Darling Downs. The association has 92 sires, 600 mares and approximately 300 people involved. However, this industry is on its knees and is just about broke. The Toowoomba Turf Club will not allow sprint racing at the next series of race meetings, and I do not know the reason for that. I wish to relate to the House what was done by the former Racing Minister, Russ Hinze. At that time, the Toowoomba Turf Club was looking for investment capital from the Racing Development Fund. Earlier in the debate, a Government member said that the fund had accumulated debts and was in a dreadful state. I point out that, last year, the \$75m investment turned over \$1 billion, and even the geese and ganders on the Government side would agree that that is a reasonable business expense and a good investment.

Mr Davies: You are misleading the House.

Mr VEIVERS: No way. It is a fact of life.

Mr Davies: It was not just \$75m.

Mr VEIVERS: The honourable member should read my lips and listen. As I was saying, at the time, the Toowoomba Turf Club was seeking investment capital from the Racing Development Fund, so Russ Hinze took the opportunity to kill two birds with one stone. The old fellow was a bit cunning. He arranged for the provision of \$3.2m to the Toowoomba Turf Club on the condition that it agreed to foster sprint racing at Clifford Park and make room for the sport. That condition is stated in the contract document, and the present Minister--together with everybody else involved--has to abide by that agreement, irrespective of what the turf club's chairman has to say. The club accepted the funds, but has never been terribly enthusiastic about promoting sprint racing. When the member for Mirani was Racing Minister, he was forced to intervene. He came to grips with the problem and straightened it out. However, the arrangement has gone off the rails again.

Many obstacles have been put in the way of the sprint racing fraternity. As I said earlier, the stage has now been reached at which the sport is now in danger of folding up, which would be a catastrophe, bearing in mind that the economy is in recession and that these are difficult times. I suggest that it is time the Racing Minister intervened--and intervened quickly. The current Racing Minister must ensure that sprint racing is looked after in terms of the original agreement that was arranged by Russ Hinze. The present Minister must take time out from lambasting the racing industry and spend a bit of time attending to some of the real problems. He has created some lulus and doozeys, and he should try to resolve them.

People in the racing industry are wondering why the Racing Minister is so selective in his interference. By refusing to act against a provincial club president who has supported him in the past, could he be touting for support for his continuing attack on the QTC? We will just have to wait and see. I believe it was the member for Stafford, Mr Welford, who mentioned the Racing Development Fund. Obviously, if he cannot understand the operation of the fund, the poor man does not understand the generalities of business. Mr Speaker, it has been my pleasure to participate in this debate.

Mr COOMBER (Currumbin) (10.59 p.m.): In rising to speak to this Bill, I wish to address a few issues that affect my electorate and people who live on the Gold Coast. The expression "land tax" is on everybody's lips on the Gold Coast, and what an insidious tax it is. It affects almost every person who either visits the Gold Coast or lives there. Land tax is destroying incentive and small business. It should be remembered that the brunt of land tax is borne by small business and that the buck stops with small business, which is the largest employer in Australia. The poor excuse offered by the Office of State Revenue for the freeze on valuations was that an amalgamation of four Government departments, including the Land Tax Office and Stamp Duties Office, meant that the issuing of annual valuations was impossible. I and most land-owners I have met say that that is a farce. The only reason for not proceeding with yearly valuations in all but four local authorities is to keep land tax receipts at an artificially inflated figure. Land tax receipts for this year will reach Budget Estimates, and that is about a 50 per cent increase on land tax paid in 1989-90.

Even though the Gold Coast was one of the four local authorities to have an annual valuation, the Gold Coast is still in a catch-up phase under the existing land tax legislation. Land tax hurts and the application of land tax needs to be reassessed. A ceiling needs to be placed on land tax, because small business just cannot afford to keep on paying this exorbitant tax.

Consumer confidence on the Gold Coast is not exactly bubbling over. The Indy race was not a great business success for the Gold Coast. I ask the Government to make more use of the local product. People should buy Gold Coast and not look to Brisbane or interstate. People should get their catering done on the Gold Coast. The dispute over the date for the Indy race this year is quite ridiculous. The television dilemma as to whether the Indy should be screened on the same day as a one-day cricket match is to be played is a joke. Surely the acceptance of Channel 9 as the sponsor means that it can schedule sporting events so that something can be negotiated to stop that from happening.

I support the Indy race. It is good for the Gold Coast. Any international exposure for the Gold Coast is good. It is now up to the people of Queensland to decide whether a loss of some \$27m is an appropriate way in which to spend public funds. I have great faith in Bob Minnikin. I know that the race next year will be marketed differently and I think that the financial result will also be markedly different.

The main topic I would like to talk about tonight concerns what is probably the greatest environmental disaster that this State will see for at least the next decade--effluent disposal for the two treatment plants on the Gold Coast. I want to talk about the Minister, Mr Comben. I want to refer to statements made by Mr Comben in an interview with Cathie Job on ABC radio on 21 May. At that stage, he outlined the reasons for refusing to commit the installation of advanced tertiary treatment at the two plants of Elanora and Merrimac. A letter to the Minister states--

"As set out the responses given by you are a cause of concern because they don't appear to accord with the factual situation. and as the A.B.C. has provided a taped transcript of the interview it can only be assumed that your advisers had provided inaccurate briefing details.

You should be aware that despite the technical submission made by the Council and the offers made to expand on those submissions there was no contact whatsoever made by your officers with Gold Coast City Council staff."

When I was on the Gold Coast City Council, a seminar involving world-renowned experts on tertiary treatment was convened. The letter continued--

". . . during the time this matter was under consideration and whilst two of your Officers attended, at Council's invitation, they announced that they were not available to discuss the issue, they were merely attending as observers. This was a most disappointing response in view of the very important environmental and financial issues attaching to Council's proposal."

It is disturbing to see what issues the Minister for the Environment considers important in making his decision. A letter that the Minister sent to the council states--

"I refer to your letters of 15 February 1990 and 5 April 1990 concerning your Council's request for approval to depart from the sewage disposal strategy agreed between the Council, Albert Shire Council and the previous Government in respect of the Elanora Water quality Control Centre.

The reports submitted with your letter have been reviewed by my officers, and the matters you raised have been carefully considered in the context of desirable long term environmental management for the Coast region and in the light of the uses and values of Tallebudgera creek. I see no justification for departing from the previous-agreed strategy under which effluent from the Elanora and Merrimac plants would be diverted to the Seaway and hence regretfully must reject Council's request.

In doing so, I have been mindful of several important considerations which impinge on the strategic aspects of effluent disposal for the region, in particular:

- the potential implications for other waterways in developing areas to the north of the Gold Coast . . .
- the interests of the National Parks and Wildlife Service in the environmental and fauna reserves contiguous with Tallebudgera Creek . . .
- the counterplay of opposing community attitudes towards estuarine as against ocean disposal of effluent; and
- the economic, environmental and social implications for Albert Shire in respect of its Merrimac plant . . . "

To sum up what the council thinks of those comments, I cite the chief engineer. He said--

"From a technical and environmental viewpoint this is a most puzzling response to Council's offer which was to install the most advanced system of sewage treatment currently available in the world.

It must be pointed out that whilst Council based its case upon input from one of the world's foremost engineers, in the area of sewage treatment in general and tertiary treatment, in particular, coupled with expert input from a University of Queensland group as to Estuarine management, the Departmental Officers chose to make their recommendation to the Minister without any discussion or even contact with either those experts of this Council's very experienced staff."

That is what is happening in the discussion about the Gold Coast. The Minister's decision has been based on very inaccurate information. The Minister is being pig-headed about the matter. He knows that he cannot win on this matter, but he is making the council conform to a 1976 decision which was taken when a sewage discharge program was put into place. A letter stated--

"What has been achieved by the Minister's decision is to ensure that advanced tertiary sewage treatment doesn't occur on the Gold Coast for the foreseeable future, or if it does, then the cost of constructing the pipeline must be seen at that time as a gross waste of public funds.

On the other hand, for the same overall expenditure of public funds at this time, the opportunity to upgrade all sewage treatment for the City and southern Albert Shire, became a feasible objective within the next decade. For the Tourist Capital of Australia this would have been a most significant attainment."

A project which in this case involves some \$20m of public moneys would appear to warrant something better than the apparently cursory consideration which led to the Minister's decision. I say "cursory" because the Minister's letter is the only communication received and the reasons outlined would not pass the test of technical adequacy in any way.

The Gold Coast City Council's chief engineer, Mr Barry McGinnity, would be one of the most technically proficient engineers in local government in Queensland. It is a matter for concern when he says things such as--

" . . . I am bound to provide advice based upon the best technical comment I can reasonably obtain. In this case I cannot support acceptance of the Ministers decision, as without disclosure of the full technical and environmental aspects taken into consideration, it appears to be a wrong decision which I consider will be recognised within a short time as having resulted in not only a gross waste of public money but a loss of an opportunity to put our City"--

being the City of the Gold Coast--

"clearly ahead of any other World Tourist destinations in terms of the treatment and disposal of liquid wastes."

One hears the Minister for Environment and Heritage saying that he is going to clean up the Brisbane River, that he is going to change it from what it looks like now to something that is more environmentally acceptable. What he is doing on the Gold Coast is not allowing a city to do exactly that. That is what I am talking about. A man who has been with the Gold Coast City Council for about nine years made the following statement--

"The Minister's decision to refuse Council's application is the worst decision, in terms of both economics and the environment, that I have seen made in my 30 years plus in Local Government."

That makes one sit back and wonder what is really going on, what this Minister knows about his department and what his departmental officers know about the recommendations that they are making.

In summary on this matter, the Minister's decision has committed the ratepayers of the Gold Coast and the Albert Shire to a totally unnecessary expenditure of some \$8m. The Treasurer should be very concerned about that because he has been emptying out hollow logs like the one last night from the Auctioneers and Agents Fidelity Guarantee Fund of \$85m. Here is another \$8m that he can put towards that. Whilst this financial result can be seen as something that is totally unacceptable, the environmental situation is even worse. Unless advanced tertiary treatment is ultimately introduced at Elanora and Coombabah, the nutrient build-up in the ocean off the Nerang River will run out of control. When Elanora is converted to tertiary treatment in the future--and this appears to be inevitable--the \$23m pipeline immediately becomes redundant. One then has to add to the \$8m another \$23m, which makes a total of \$31m plus interest that the ratepayers will lose.

The other matter that I want to touch on briefly is the beach and coastal system. To me, that is of immense importance to all Gold Coast businesses. The northern beaches are in good condition at present but there are some problems associated with their stability because they are relying on a littoral drift of some 5 000 cubic metres of sand per annum along the beach. The southern Gold Coast beaches are not so fortunate.

Mr Hayward: Can you tell me how this relates to the Appropriation Bill?

Mr COOMBER: It relates to it quite significantly. During the Budget discussions, this Government is going to need to provide moneys to ensure that works that need to be done on the southern Gold Coast beaches are in fact done. About \$8m needs to be spent on those beaches so that the \$16m spent in the past couple of years is not wasted, because that is exactly what we are being told will happen by a very incompetent Minister for Environment and Heritage.

The beaches around Kirra and North Kirra are starting to recede quite quickly following the beach restoration in 1989-90. That program was an immense success. The technology to restore beaches has changed dramatically. I must say that the Beach Protection Authority of Queensland is one of the finest academic and technical advisory bodies in the world. However, the approval process for the decision-making procedure

is long and tedious. The technology to restore beaches makes beach restoration a financial possibility. The \$16m spent in 1989-90 will service beach systems to the north of Kirra for many years, but this Government must continue the work started by the previous Government. Stage 2 of the works now needs to be scheduled to stabilise Gold Coast beaches. The time and the cost is considerably less. The exercise basically resolves to place two million cubic metres of sand off shore of Kirra, Coolangatta and Snapper Rocks.

Mr Davies: There is more to Queensland than the Gold Coast.

Mr COOMBER: There may be more to Queensland than just the Gold Coast, but members of this Parliament are elected to represent their constituents and raise matters of concern in their area. I would hope that the honourable member would have the chance to do exactly the same as I am doing now.

Mr Davies interjected.

Mr COOMBER: I realise that Currumbin is a Liberal electorate, not a Labor electorate, so it can expect to be disadvantaged financially---

Mr Davies interjected.

Mr COOMBER: Apparently the honourable member cannot get funding for projects in his electorate, either. Perhaps he also has some erosion problems. The beaches are very important to the economy of the southern Gold Coast. For years, when the beaches were eroded, visitor numbers decreased dramatically and, of course, businesses folded and moved away. This Government has got to grasp the nettle, fund Stage 2 and resolve the longstanding dispute between New South Wales and the State of Queensland. The problem is not so immense. Under the Greiner Government, New South Wales is happy to help a land-locked fishing industry in that State and also to help ease flooding in Murwillumbah. The answer lies with the stabilising of the Tweed River mouth. The training walls at the Tweed have stored millions of metres of sand south of the river and cost Queensland millions of dollars in income, investment and beach restoration. I really do not know whether the Minister, Mr Comben, is capable of understanding the technical details of beach erosion, but the people of the Gold Coast are waiting for him to take some action concerning the beach as he said he would when the public meetings were held in Kirra prior to the last election. A sand by-pass system funded equally by the two States makes common sense. If the technical details can be resolved, let us look at using the sand by-pass to fund itself through the extraction of shellgrit, for which there is a significant market. Mr Goss stated recently that he would announce a resolution of the saga, which has been going on since 1970. Everybody who lives on the Gold Coast is waiting to hear whether the Premier can come up with the goods and solve this ongoing problem. The Gold Coast Indy race is apparently worth pursuing, so surely preserving our good beaches is a prerequisite for the promotion of the Gold Coast.

Mr CONNOR (Nerang) (11.16 p.m.): Tonight, I would like to speak on the cost of the Criminal Justice Commission report into prisons. The Government has had a good day today on this subject; the report was almost too good to be true. The honourable member for Archerfield had a nice time talking about how much the commission's report cost. It is not often that a report of an inquiry finds nothing. It found nothing on favoured treatment, nothing on Kingsnorth's, nothing on the purchase of vehicles for prison officers and nothing on the purchase of a block of land by Mr Kingsnorth. It found nothing about the funding of a prize fight, nothing about allegations of meat being stolen, nothing about allegations of trees being stolen and nothing about double payments. Nor has it found anything about prisoners not being charged for drug offences, about drug plants being planted or about prison officers supplying prisoners with drugs. It found nothing about drug-trafficking or drugs going missing and nothing about prostitution.

As I have said, it is unusual for an inquiry to find nothing, so the Government has a right to feel happy. I wish to relate to the House an incident that happened in early January, before most of the investigation and the public hearings took place.

Mr Coomber: When did all this happen?

Mr CONNOR: Just prior to the public hearings and just prior to all these investigations. I have here an extensive document setting out all the allegations that the CJC was about to investigate, which was left at Boggo Road prison. That was very strange. I might add that I now have a letter from Sir Max Bingham himself, and I would like to go through it very quickly. It states--

"I write to you pursuant to section 2.24(4) of the Criminal Justice Act 1989-1990 in respect of the above matter.

As you will recall, during the second week of January, 1991 this Commission became aware of allegations that one of its officers had left a Criminal Justice Commission document at the Brisbane Correctional Centre and that Correctional Services officers had read the document or a copy of it.

The Commission immediately instituted a full investigation including an investigative hearing which commenced on 17 January 1991.

The information produced from the investigation indicated that a Commission document had in fact been left at the Brisbane Correctional Centre in the second week of January 1991. The issue for determination in the investigative hearing was whether copies of the document had been made. Three of the Correctional Services Officers then stationed at the Brisbane Correctional Centre gave evidence at this hearing.

Because the evidence which was likely to be disclosed in the course of the hearing might have been prejudicial to then current Commission inquiries into allegations against staff and inmates of the Queensland Correctional Services system the hearing was held in private and orders made by the Chairman that there be no publication of the evidence adduced during the hearing. The cumulative effect of this investigation and hearing is that the Commission is reasonably satisfied that:

1. A Commission officer who attended the Brisbane Correctional Centre to interview a person on the 9th of January, 1991"--

before all the investigations and the public hearings--

"inadvertently left a Criminal Justice Commission document on a cluttered desk at the Centre.

2. The subject document, which was of a sensitive nature, was recovered by the same Commission officer the following day but no disclosure of his loss of possession of the subject document was immediately made.

3. Whilst the subject document was out of the possession of the Commission two copies were made which copies were destroyed at some time prior to 17th of January, 1991."

So it says that no disclosure of his loss of possession of the subject document was immediately made. Was there a cover-up? It says that it was lost on 9 January, but it was 17 January before the copies were destroyed. They were floating around for eight days. The letter continues--

- "4. Three of the Correctional Service Officers then stationed at the Brisbane Correctional Centre perused either the subject document (prior to its recovery by the Commission) or one of the two copies of the same (prior to their destruction)."

So it was determined that three correctional officers had read this document. Paragraph 5 states--

"Two of the three Correctional Service Officers who gave evidence at the hearing before the Commission were dishonest in certain aspects of their evidence."

The question is: how far did their dishonesty go? The letter continues--

"Due to the legal and evidential difficulties it was not recommended that criminal proceedings should be commenced against"----

Mr Dollin interjected.

Mr CONNOR: I am reading from a letter written by Sir Max Bingham. That letter stated--

"Due to the legal and evidential difficulties it was not recommended that criminal proceedings should be commenced against any of the Correctional Services Officers stationed at the Brisbane Correctional Centre involved in this matter.

The Commission has written to each of the Correctional Service Officers who gave evidence before it. In relation to the two officers that the Commission was reasonably satisfied were dishonest in some aspects of their evidence, the Commission's correspondence intimated that it was satisfied that each had been untruthful but that for technical reasons it was not envisaged that any criminal charge would be preferred against either of them. The Commission has reported this to the Queensland Correctional Services Commission.

The officer whose inadvertence led to the Commission document being left at the Brisbane Correctional Centre has been disciplined. He remains a member of the Commission staff.

In light of the action already taken by the Commission in relation to this matter it is considered appropriate to provide you with this information."

The letter concludes, "Yours sincerely, Sir Max Bingham QC".

Certain questions need to be asked. It has been acknowledged by Sir Max Bingham that that document, which was distributed freely throughout the prison, covered all the allegations by the informants and the investigation that was to follow. Before they conducted the investigation, they had the exam paper and the answers. The document from Sir Max Bingham acknowledges that that was the case. I have just read what Sir Max Bingham said.

Mr Schwarten interjected.

Mr CONNOR: The questions that need to be asked----

Mr Schwarten interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Campbell): Order! The member for Rockhampton North has been able to make his own contribution to the debate. I feel we should allow the member for Nerang to make his. I now call the member for Nerang.

Mr CONNOR: The questions that need to be asked are: does this compromise the whole inquiry? Why was this letter not mentioned in the report? Was this letter left by accident? How many other people read the allegations and knew of them? How many people tried to cover up corruption? It has already been acknowledged in the letter that there was an attempted cover-up. How many people tried to cover up the corruption as a result of having prior knowledge of the investigation? How many copies of those copies were made? I ask again: was this inquiry compromised? If so, by how much? I ask the CJC parliamentary committee to fully investigate the circumstances surrounding the events that allowed this crucial document to fall into the hands of commission officers. Did the Corrective Services Commission know everything about the proposed investigation? That is the question.

Hon. K. E. De LACY (Cairns--Treasurer) (11.28 p.m.), in reply: I thank all honourable members for their contributions to the debate. I am pleased that many members at least recognised the soundness of the Queensland Government's budgetary position, as well they ought. In fact, I find it very difficult to believe that members of the Opposition cannot see that and seem to be looking for all kinds of ways to say that

Queensland is not performing well. In my opinion, that is an anti-Queensland view. They are being seen as knockers. They are looking for things to knock. They cannot find anything to knock, so they make it up. In my view, the Opposition is sounding more like an Opposition all the time--a permanent Opposition.

Mr Hayward: What does Mr Connor sound like?

Mr De LACY: I will come to Mr Connor. The Opposition has no direction, no strategy, no ability and no hope. As the hour is late, I will not comment on individual contributions except for one. Today, this House witnessed the second disgraceful performance in as many days by the member for Surfers Paradise. It follows on the devastating findings by the CJC on the actions of Mr Borbidge's neighbour, the Liberal member for Nerang. There must be something in the air down at the Gold Coast, or else they are smoking dope. I do not propose to let Mr Borbidge's allegations go unchallenged. Under the cloak of parliamentary privilege, he has slandered honest, hard-working public servants.

In short, Mr Borbidge's allegations are wrong in every respect. Mr Borbidge said we had acquired a tacky, second-rate system. All Mr Borbidge had to back that up with was his usual offering--just another tacky speech from a second-rate politician. He spoke about a system lacking integrity. His diatribe had as much integrity as his continued promise to resign as Deputy Leader of the National Party. He and his accusations are worthy of nothing but contempt and deserve to be consigned to the rubbish bin but, out of respect for the public servants concerned, I propose to demolish, brick by brick, his brick outhouse of lies. Just as the member for Nerang was, to use the words of the CJC, used as the patsy for disaffected prison officers, so Mr Borbidge has been duped by an unhappy, unsuccessful tenderer. In short, the computer system selected to monitor the poker machines in Queensland is state of the art, was properly evaluated by independent experts under stringent State Government tendering procedures, has the respect of the industry in Australia and in the USA, has none of the security problems described by the member for Surfers Paradise, was rated by the evaluation committee as being streets ahead of the next best and, to top it off, cost more than \$20m less to buy and install and \$3m to \$4m less in annual costs than Mr Borbidge's favoured system.

As I said, many points were raised by the member for Surfers Paradise. All of them were wrong. Contrary to what he said, the standard Government tendering procedures were followed. Contrary to what he said, the tender documents were available for purchase at \$100 a set. Again, this is standard procedure. Contrary to what he said, no Machine Gaming Division officers visited the USA in October and November 1990, that is, before tenders were called. Officers did visit the USA in May 1991 as part of the evaluation process, and I will come to that shortly. Contrary to what the member said, no Australian tenderers were disadvantaged. All tenderers--from the USA or Australia--had the same five weeks to get their tenders in. Contrary to what he said, representatives from all tenderers were present at the opening of tenders. State Stores Board explained that a calling of prices would be too complicated, and no objection was raised. Contrary to what the member for Surfers Paradise said, the successful tenderer does comply with Australian Banking Association EFT standards as set out in the tender document. Contrary to what he said, there is no requirement to have an encryption system approved for use in Australia. Contrary to what he said, the successful tenderer offers state of the art technology, but I am advised that no supplier would provide indemnities against obsolescence.

Contrary to what the member said, the only winner from the computer hacking techniques described would be Telecom. It would pick up the price of the phone call. The facts are that the computer chips in the poker machines cannot be accessed by a telephone line. Data on the machines cannot be manipulated. There would be no benefit to a potential machine player to go to all of that trouble and expense. In short, Mr Borbidge got his wires crossed. And contrary to what he said, physical tampering with

the machines, the computer chips or the communications cords would result in an automatic shut-down of the machine.

Contrary to what the member for Surfers Paradise said, the selected system can take readings at any time of the day or night. Indeed, if the Machine Gaming Division wants to, it can keep the system's links open continuously. Contrary to what he said, it is impossible to dial into the Machine Gaming Division's central system. Contrary to what he said, the only reason that the system is not approved elsewhere is that Queensland is leading the way, again, and other States are likely to follow. I point out that the system is based on a similar type that is up and running successfully in the USA. Contrary to what he said, it was the special purpose Cabinet committee on gaming machines that recommended to Cabinet last year that a dial-up system be used because it balanced security and price. Contrary to what he said, four tenderers, not two, were short listed. While I am reluctant to say where each rated, I will say that the unsuccessful tenderer named by Mr Borbidge did not come second and, for that matter, did not come third.

After that litany of untruths, Mr Borbidge then asked some questions. He asked: has the Government been indemnified against major system break-down? The answer is "Yes". The system is a fault-tolerant system. As with aircraft computer systems, the IGT system is duplicated and, therefore, if one component fails it is automatically replaced by its twin. Let us move on. He asked: was a risk assessment carried out by independent experts? Yes, all tenders were assessed by a panel of six experts. The member asked: was a 20 per cent preference applied? Quite simply, a 20 per cent preference would not have helped Mr Borbidge's informant. That system cost more than \$20m extra.

The honourable member asked about Federal Police inquiries. I am unaware of any current inquiry. Even if there were such an inquiry, it would only be advised to us on a confidential basis. What I can say is that the Queensland authorities undertook their own police investigation as a normal part of their selection process. Mr Borbidge asked about a visit by Machine Gaming Division and CITEC officials to the USA. This visit occurred between 4 and 16 May, not 2 and 15 April as he stated. Does Mr Borbidge really expect us to make a multimillion-dollar purchase without an on-site inspection and demonstrations? There were on-site inspections of the two American tenderers and all of the Australian tenderers. All airfares and accommodation were paid for by the Treasury Department, as were most meals. The officials did benefit from one free dinner from each of the US tenderers and a trip to Yellowstone national park courtesy of the unsuccessful US tenderer. Mr Borbidge has got all of his facts wrong.

The IGT system involved a cost of \$3.5m to buy and install, not \$2.258m as claimed. Neither I nor anyone connected with the Machine Gaming Division is aware of stocks of machines held by IGT in Sydney, but I would point out that it supplies 25 per cent of the New South Wales and ACT markets. Frankly, I could not care less how many machines it had in stock. That is not relevant. Tenders for the supply of machines in Queensland will not be called until the end of this month. They will be evaluated on many more criteria than just the immediate availability of machines. The successful tenderer for the supply of machines will be recommended by the Machine Gaming Division.

Mr Borbidge is attempting to claw his way to the leadership of his irrelevant party over the bodies of honest, dedicated public servants. He declared that we had bought a bicycle instead of a Rolls Royce. I would suggest that the member for Surfers Paradise is simply pedalling for his rich mates.

I will make one final comment about the tendering process for poker machines and about the process that will be followed with casinos. The poker machine tender will involve something like \$100m. Many people will want that contract, but not everybody will win. I assure members that the process the Government will follow will be proper, it will be by the book and we will select the tender which is best for Queensland. However, the unsuccessful tenderers will, inevitably, go to Opposition members and

anybody at all to try to prosecute their case. I expect that, from time to time in this House both this year and next year, Opposition members will stand up and quote a biased account of events from some aggrieved tenderer. I am only saying that because I know that it will happen, and it will happen with casinos. I am advised that potential casino-operators who tender for casinos in Brisbane will spend upwards of \$1m on their tender application. They are very serious about getting the tenders.

We will put in process a proper, objective tendering system. We will select the system free from political interference, properly evaluated and done by the book. However, I will tell members now that unsuccessful tenderers--aggrieved tenderers--will seek the ears of gullible Opposition members of Parliament. They will stand up here and carry on as the member for Surfers Paradise did today, or as the member for Nerang carried on yesterday because some disenchanted prison officer got hold of his ear. That is the way it will be. I simply give members an assurance that we will do it right. Members can take what those people say on those issues for what it is worth--absolutely nothing.

Motion agreed to.

Committee

Hon. K. E. De Lacy (Cairns--Treasurer) in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1--

Mr BORBIDGE (11.42 p.m.): I wish to refer partly to comments made by the Treasurer. I have with me a document written by Queensland Purchasing and Sales, which contradicts some of the remarks that were just made by the Treasurer concerning tender No. C118 for the supply, delivery, installation and commissioning of a dial-up computerised monitoring system for the operation of gaming machines. The letter states--

"Further to a facsimile received at our office on 1 July 1991, from"--

a certain person. The letter continues--

"The successful Tenderer for the above was International Game Technology (IGT) at a first year Capital Cost estimated of \$2,258,968.00 nett.

The recommended supplier was the lowest priced, most conforming Tender received."

That document confirms that comments that I made in the debate this afternoon were accurate and that comments made by the Treasurer in his reply were inaccurate.

Mr De LACY: I am not sure that we ought to debate this matter during the debate on the Appropriation Bill. However, the member said in his speech that the total cost of the machine was \$2.258m. Tonight, he said that that was the capital cost for the first year. The IGT system involved a cost of \$3.5m to buy and install.

Clause 1, as read, agreed to.

Clause 2, as read, agreed to.

Bill reported, without amendment.

Third Reading

Bill, on motion of Mr De Lacy, read a third time.

SPECIAL ADJOURNMENT

Hon. T. M. MACKENROTH (Chatsworth--Leader of the House) (11.45 p.m.): I move--

"That the House, at its rising, do adjourn until Tuesday, 20 August 1991."

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 11.45 p.m.