

**THURSDAY, 12 MARCH 1992**

---

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

**DISTINGUISHED VISITOR**

**Hon. D. Tonkin**

**Mr SPEAKER:** I extend a welcome to the Honourable David Tonkin, Secretary-General of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association, Headquarters Secretariat, London, who is in the public gallery.

**SELECT COMMITTEE FOR MEMBERS' INTERESTS**

**Appointment of Members**

**Mr SPEAKER:** I have to inform the House that the membership of the Select Committee for Members' Interests shall be as follows—

Mr Gary Bernard Fenlon, MLA; Mr Raymond Keith Hollis, MLA; Mr Brian George Littleproud, MLA; Ms Laurel Jean Power, MLA; Mr James Henry Randell, MLA; Mrs Joan Mary Sheldon, MLA; and Mr Kenneth William Smyth, MLA.

**PETITIONS**

The Clerk announced the receipt of the following petitions—

**Prostitution**

From **Mr Borbidge** (41 signatories) praying that prostitution be not legalised.

**Tully-Millstream Hydroelectric Scheme**

From **Mr Pitt** (17 signatories) praying that action be taken for the Queensland Electricity Commission to withdraw the proposed Tully-Millstream hydroelectric scheme and that a moratorium be declared on major developments in the area.

**Flying of Union Jack at Parliament House**

From **Mr Lingard** (20 signatories) praying that the Parliament will take action to resume flying the Union Jack.

**Vegetation Protection Ordinances**

From **Mr Comben** (26 signatories) praying that a resolution be passed to discontinue the force of the vegetation protection ordinances.

**Abortion Law**

From **Mr Borbidge** (141 signatories) praying that the Queensland Parliament will oppose any attempt to decriminalise or legalise abortion.

#### **Pornographic Material**

From **Mr Pitt** (7 129 signatories) praying that the Parliament enact laws which set standards for the presentation, exhibition, promotion and sale of "soft" pornographic magazines in newsagencies and other retail outlets.

Petitions received.

#### **PAPERS**

The following papers were laid on the table—

Orders in Council under—

Harbours Act 1955

Harbours Act 1955 and the Statutory Bodies Financial Arrangements Act 1982

Regulations under—

Queensland Marine Act 1958

State Transport Act 1960

Notifications under the Transport Infrastructure (Roads) Act 1991

Proclamations under—

Dental Amendment Act 1991

Health Rights Commission Act 1991

By-laws under—

Harbours Act 1955

Chiropractors and Osteopaths Act 1979

Medical Act 1939

Occupational Therapists Act 1979

Pharmacy Act 1976.

#### **MINISTERIAL STATEMENT**

##### **Absence of Ministers during Question-time**

**Hon. P. J. BRADDY** (Rockhampton—Leader of the House) (10.03 a.m.): I have to inform the House that the Honourable the Deputy Premier is still ill and, therefore, will be absent from the House during question-time today.

#### **MINISTERIAL STATEMENT**

##### **Daylight-saving Referendum**

**Hon. W. K. GOSS** (Logan—Premier, Minister for Economic and Trade Development and Minister for the Arts) (10.04 a.m.), by leave: I wish to make a statement on the daylight-saving referendum held on Saturday, 22 February 1992. On Tuesday, 26 November 1991, this House resolved that the question "Are you in favour of daylight-

saving?" be submitted to the people of Queensland in a referendum. Subsequently, His Excellency the Governor issued his writ to the Electoral Commissioner setting Saturday, 22 February 1992, as the date on which the referendum should be held. The writ is not due to be returned until Monday, 6 April 1992. As members well know, the subject of daylight-saving has consistently engendered much debate in the community and, in particular, has seen people from all walks of life and from all sides of the political fence join forces in support of either the "Yes" or "No" case. Nowhere was this more evident than in the House, where each member voted according to his or her conscience on the motion that caused the referendum to take place.

I feel that this is an opportune time to place on record my appreciation to the members of the Committee of Advice on Summer Time who were able to prepare within a very short time-frame the draft of the "Yes" and "No" cases that were subsequently lodged with the Electoral Commissioner for publication. I would also like to acknowledge the work undertaken by Queensland's new Electoral Commissioner, Mr O'Shea, the staff of the Electoral Office and all other persons who assisted in the conduct of the poll on 22 February. Faced with new electoral boundaries, a new electoral roll and inclement weather on polling day, these people managed to conduct the referendum as efficiently as possible and their efforts in this regard should be applauded. However, as with any such large-scale operation, the conduct of the referendum was not incident-free. This was the first occasion on which the Commonwealth electoral roll was utilised for a poll under the Commonwealth/State joint roll arrangement. Due to a coding error made by the Australian Electoral Commission, the rolls that were produced for the referendum assigned a number of electors to the wrong electorates. The most significant error occurred in relation to over 1 000 residents in the Logan City area who were incorrectly assigned to the electorate of Albert rather than that of Beaudesert.

The Australian Electoral Commission has been contacted about the problems that arose from the errors on the electoral rolls that it produced and I am assured that the AEC is now taking corrective action to remedy those faults. As members will also recall, the weather presented some problems for electors on referendum day. Due to heavy rainfall and flooding, the voting at some 31 polling booths in the area from Caboolture to Maryborough had to be adjourned. The Electoral Commissioner has subsequently determined that the overall result of the referendum would not have been altered if those polling booths had remained open. Accordingly, he does not propose to appoint another day for the taking of the poll at those polling booths.

I am advised that the count of the vote is proceeding expeditiously and that a final result may be available a short time prior to the prescribed date for the return of the writ. The Electoral Commissioner has indicated that at the close of counting on Friday, 6 March, 87.1 per cent of the vote had been counted with the result standing at—

Yes	725 932 votes
No	865 544 votes.

Although the very high proportion of "No" votes from northern and western Queensland was expected, what was not predicted was the size of the "No" vote in the south-east corner of the State. Whether some residents in the south-east corner voted in sympathy with rural Queensland or there is a general indifference in this part of the State in respect of daylight-saving is an issue that could be debated for a long time. It is suffice to say that, at the end of the day, most pundits overestimated the level of support for daylight-saving in the south-east corner of the State. I have publicly committed the Government to abiding by the wishes of the electorate on this matter and, as I have said on many occasions, the referendum result will determine the future of daylight-saving in Queensland once and for all. Accordingly, I hereby undertake to introduce later this year a Bill which will repeal the current daylight-saving legislation.

As an aside, I feel that brief mention should be made of recent events at the Commonwealth level in respect of the Federal Government assuming control over the setting of daylight-saving times. Over the last 12 months, there has been considerable debate about the fact that, if the National Measurement (Standard Time) Amendment Bill was approved by the Senate, the States would be forced to surrender virtually all control over the commencement and conclusion times of daylight-saving, regardless of the outcome of the Queensland referendum. However, I have always maintained that in the Senate the Bill would not receive sufficient support, and last week my claims were substantiated at a meeting of the Federal Labor caucus at which a motion by Queensland Senator Mal Colston to have the Bill removed from the Senate notice paper was supported by a majority of caucus members. On Wednesday, 4 March 1992, the Bill was officially discharged from the Senate notice paper.

I feel that, before concluding this statement, it is worth mentioning that there were three matters associated with this referendum which should be acknowledged as being of historical significance for Queensland. Firstly, because opinions on daylight-saving are not polarised along political lines, we saw members from different parties joining forces in support of either the "Yes" or the "No" cases. Secondly, the referendum was the first poll conducted on Queensland's new fair and equitable electoral boundaries. Thirdly, and by no means the least important occurrence but one which seems to have escaped public attention, is the fact that for the first time in the history of Queensland female returning officers were appointed.

In the last two years we have seen the processes of Government in Queensland change dramatically. Queensland has gone from having a Government which imposed quality-of-life decisions on the electorate to having a Government which is committed to upholding democratic processes and views the essence of leadership and achievement as being firmly based on consultation, dialogue and, where necessary, referral back to the electorate to determine the views of the majority. That is the very minimum that the public expects of a truly representative Government. In this case, the majority of the people have decided overwhelmingly that they do not want daylight-saving in Queensland. It is now our responsibility and the duty of all Queenslanders to accede to the will of the majority on this matter.

## PRIVILEGE

### Commissioner of Police; Leave to Move Motion Without Notice

**Mr BORBIDGE** (Surfers Paradise—Leader of the Opposition) (10.13 a.m.): I rise on a matter of privilege. Earlier this week, Mr Speaker, you shared my concern in relation to the timing of the presentation of the CJC report into allegations made by the former Police Minister in regard to the commissioner. I understand that that report will be tabled this afternoon after question-time. Members will not have the opportunity until next Tuesday to raise matters of concern relative to that report. I therefore seek leave to move—

"That so much of Standing and Sessional Orders be suspended so as to defer question-time until 3 p.m. today."

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

AYES, 32

Beanland	Turner
Booth	Veivers
Borbridge	Watson
Connor	
Coomber	
Dunworth	
Elliott	
FitzGerald	
Gilmore	
Goss J. N.	
Hobbs	
Horan	
Johnson	
Katter	
Lester	
Lingard	
Littleproud	
McCauley	
Perrett	
Randell	
Rowell	
Santoro	
Sheldon	
Slack	
Springborg	<i>Tellers:</i>
Stephan	Neal
Stoneman	Quinn

NOES, 51

Ardill	Mackenroth
Barber	McElligott
Beattie	McGrady
Bird	McLean
Braddy	Milliner
Bredhauer	Nunn
Briskey	Palaszczyk
Campbell	Pearce
Casey	Robson
Clark	Schwarten
Comben	Smith
D'Arcy	Smyth
Davies	Spence
De Lacy	Sullivan J. H.
Dollin	Sullivan T. B.
Eaton	Szczerbanik
Edmond	Vaughan
Elder	Warburton
Fenlon	Warner
Flynn	Welford
Foley	Wells
Gibbs	Woodgate
Goss W. K.	
Hamill	
Hayward	<i>Tellers:</i>
Hollis	Pitt
Livingstone	P r e s t

Resolved in the negative.

#### LEAVE TO MOVE MOTION WITHOUT NOTICE

**Mrs SHELDON** (Landsborough—Leader of the Liberal Party) (10.22 a.m.): I seek leave to move a motion without notice to condemn the failure of the Premier to tackle the growing tentacles of organised crime into prostitution in this State.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Landsborough should understand that, under Standing Orders, she may only seek leave to move a motion without notice.

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

AYES, 32		NOES, 51
Beanland	Turner	Ardill
Booth	Veivers	Barber
Borbridge	Watson	Beattie
Connor		Bird
Coomber		Braddy
Dunworth		Bredhauer
Elliott		Briskey
FitzGerald		Campbell
Gilmore		Casey
Goss J. N.		Clark
Hobbs		Comben
Horan		D'Arcy
Johnson		Davies
Katter		De Lacy
Lester		Dollin
Lingard		Eaton
Littleproud		Edmond
McCauley		Elder
Perrett		Fenlon
Randell		Flynn
Rowell		Foley
Santoro		Gibbs
Sheldon		Goss W. K.
Slack		Hamill
Springborg	<i>Tellers:</i>	Hayward
Stephan	Neal	Hollis
Stoneman	Quinn	Livingstone
		Mackenroth
		McElligott
		McGrady
		McLean
		Milliner
		Nunn
		Palaszczyk
		Pearce
		Robson
		Schwarten
		Smith
		Smyth
		Spence
		Sullivan J. H.
		Sullivan T. B.
		Szczerbanik
		Vaughan
		Warburton
		Warner
		Welford
		Wells
		Woodgate
		<i>Tellers:</i>
		Prest
		P i t t

Resolved in the negative.

Mr CONNOR having given notice of a motion—

**Mr CONNOR:** I table for incorporation in the business paper a list containing the addresses and phone numbers of 21 brothels and their current advertising.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

**Hon. V. P. LESTER** (Peak Downs) (10.29 a.m.), by leave: I have to point out to the House that I am deeply distressed over an event that occurred yesterday afternoon in this Chamber. The Minister for Environment and Heritage made the comment that I should be crossbred with a hairy-nosed wombat. In a spirit of goodwill, I believe that the Minister really should apologise to me.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! The House notes that the member was personally misrepresented.

#### QUESTIONS UPON NOTICE

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! Before calling on members to ask questions upon notice, I advise Ministers that, although it is their prerogative, I am happy to allow them to incorporate their answers in *Hansard* without reading them to the House. However, it is up to the Ministers themselves.

#### 1. Department of Justice

Mr FITZGERALD asked the Minister for Justice and Corrective Services—

“With reference to the letter dated 20 December 1991 written by the Manager of Human Resources Management Branch asking an unsuccessful applicant for the position of registrar who fell into the category ‘not sufficient management skills’ to

supply details of his skills and career aims to the Co-ordinator, Recruitment, Selection and Deployment no later than 15 December 1991—

(1) Is the letter sent out by his department systematic of the state of confusion in the Department of Justice?

(2) What is he doing to end the confusion created?"

**Mr MILLINER:** I table my answer and seek leave to have it incorporated in *Hansard*.

Leave granted.

(1 and 2) In response to the Honourable Member for Lockyer's question on notice regarding the letter dispatched by my Department seeking career data, I am advised as follows:

Consistent with Government policy on the management of redundancy, the Department in pursuing the preferred redeployment option, sent letters to those people who were determined to be unattached as at 2 December 1991. To allow appropriate follow up action to be taken, a return date of 15 December was set.

As a result of the filling of further positions after 2 December 1991, other officers who were unsuccessful in their applications for positions were also identified for redeployment action.

Subsequent letters were prepared for these officers. Regrettably, the letter format used was taken from the pro-forma sent on 2 December, 1991 and an elementary error was made in not modifying the original return date of 15 December, 1991.

The letter clearly identified an officer from the Human Resource Management Branch to whom any queries could be referred. Any confusion could have been easily resolved by the officer referring to the nominated contact officer.

Indeed, at least one recipient contacted the nominated officer to advise of the anomaly and secured an appropriate new return date.

This error is not considered significant and an appropriate remedy via a telephone conversation with the nominated contact officer would have speedily resolved the date inconsistency.

Subsequent communication with the displaced staff has clarified the situation regarding their redeployment options and it is my belief that there is now no confusion in the minds of the unattached officers.

## 2. Registrars, Magistrates Courts

Mr FITZGERALD asked the Minister for Justice and Corrective Services—

"What action has he taken to clear up the bungle of the selection process for the position of Registrars, Magistrates Court, where there are over 650 appeals to 56 appointments in light of the Appeal Tribunal's finding on the four test cases that I quote in part—

We therefore uphold the appeals on the ground of substantial deficiency in the selection process?"

**Mr MILLINER:** I wish to table the answer to question No. 2 and have it incorporated in *Hansard*.

Leave granted.

The Honourable Member for Lockyer has quoted but a small and selective part of a considered finding in which the Appeals Tribunal found the Justice Department process to be appropriate for eight out of nine issues raised by the Queensland State Services Union as its test case, the exception being concerns raised with respect to reference checking.

The Tribunal's very positive finding induced the following statements:

"It does not necessarily follow from our decision on reference checking that the entire selection process was substantially deficient as defined by the regulation."

and

"...the selection techniques used included review of the application, work sample test and interview. We have already confirmed that these techniques were appropriately used."

Consequently the original selection process was not a "bungle", and in fact, the Appeal Tribunal also stated:

"Much that the Department did was commendable."

In fact, any reasonable reading of the Tribunal's findings could only lead to a determination that the selection process was very thorough, fair and professional, particularly as 8 of the 9 issues were supported strongly by the tribunal.

Despite the fact that a reference check did occur, the tribunal found however that the reference checking was inadequate, and has directed my Department to continue with the process for reference checking only. There is no requirement to readvertise the positions, nor for applicants to resubmit applications, nor to be reinterviewed, nor to be reassessed in any shape or form.

As this part of the process is now proceeding, little if anything should be said about the reference checking as the Selection Committee, who did receive accolades from the Tribunal for the manner in which it dealt with the applications, should be left to make its final determinations without any actual or perceived interference by any person.

However, I can report that written references have now been sought from all the applicants. A reading of these references has commenced, and once completed, the panel will make a fresh decision on the order of merit as required by the Tribunal. I should also point out to the honourable member that the PSMC guidelines for recruitment and selections states that—

"Reference checks are to occur with respect to the selection criteria and may only be used to supplement the final selection decision."

Additionally, and for clarification, there were 66 appointments, and not 56, as was stated. The large number of appeals were lodged by a proportionately small number of persons within the Magistrates Courts services.

### 3.

#### Q-Fleet

Mr PERRETT asked the Minister for Administrative Services—

"With reference to the operations of the Goss Labor Government initiative known as Q-Fleet and his promises of cost saving and efficient operation when he boasted to the House about his plans for Q-Fleet—

(1) What amount was owed by Q-Fleet to General Motors-Holdens Automotive and/or its dealers as of 31 December 1991 and 29 February this year?

(2) What amount was owed to Ford and/or its dealers on the same dates?

(3) What amount was owed to Mitsubishi and/or its dealers on the same dates?

(4) What amount was owed to Toyota and/or its dealers on the same dates?

(5) What action was taken with respect to a move to repossess Toyota vehicles based in the Warwick area and used by the Transport Department?

(6) What reservations have been expressed by Ford and Toyota and/or their dealers about supplying vehicles against Q-Fleet orders?

(7) What is the average delay between a departmental order and the delivery of a vehicle to the department?

(8) What was the average odometer reading on vehicles disposed of in December 1991 and February this year?

(9) What was the amount owing to the Government Garage at the end of December 1991 and the end of February this year?"

**Mr McLEAN:** As the answer is lengthy, I ask that it be incorporated in *Hansard*.

Leave granted.

(1-4) under Q-Fleet's contract for the purchase of motor vehicles accounts are payable within 30 days of the supplier submitting a correct invoice and evidence of delivery of the vehicle.

Q-Fleet's creditors records show the following amounts owing for vehicle purchases:

General Motors-Holden—31 December 1991, \$69,745; 29 February 1992, \$367,784.

Ford—31 December 1991, \$911,936; 29 February 1992, \$971,911.

Toyota—31 December 1991, \$250,910; 29 February 1992, \$250,873.

Mitsubishi—31 December 1991, \$90,548; 29 February 1992 \$74,651.

(5) No Q-Fleet vehicle has been repossessed and the management of Q-Fleet has no knowledge of any attempt or intention by Toyota, or any other supplier, to repossess vehicles.

(6) The General Manager of Q-Fleet is in regular contact with the management of each of the motor vehicle manufacturers. I am advised that none have expressed any reservations about supplying vehicles against Q-Fleet orders. Only this week the General Manager has spoken to three of the major manufacturers and no such concerns were expressed.

(7) A range of factors can influence the time taken to deliver vehicles to departments.

These factors include availability of vehicles from suppliers; production cycles; the need to import four wheel drive and light commercial vehicles; the need for vehicles to be built to meet the specific requirements of departments for options and accessories. Recent trends in the industry are that manufacturers and their agents do not appear to be holding significant numbers of vehicles.

Average delivery times for the major suppliers are:

Ford—passenger vehicles 5 weeks.

General Motors-Holdens—passenger vehicles 13 weeks.

Mitsubishi—10 weeks for passenger vehicles and 16 weeks for light commercial and four wheel drive.

Toyota—8 weeks for passenger vehicles and 18 weeks for light commercial and four wheel drive vehicles.

(8) Q-Fleet did not sell any of its vehicles in the two months in question. All vehicles disposed of belonged to other agencies and therefore Q-Fleet does not have the information sought.

(9) Outstanding debtors for the Government Motor Garage at 31 December 1991 was \$288,071 and \$297,551 at 29 February 1992. The Government Motor Garage operates on a commercial basis and actively pursues payment of its outstanding accounts.

#### 4. Technological Infrastructure and Development Opportunities, North Queensland

Mr DAVIES asked the Minister for Business, Industry and Regional Development—

“With reference to this Government’s commitment to the economic development of regional Queensland and, in particular, the opportunities for development in North Queensland—

Will he provide details of this Government’s achievements in strengthening the technology infrastructure and opportunities in North Queensland?”

**Mr SMITH:** Queensland has a viable manufacturing sector which is capable of competing on the national and international scene. This Government has focused on creating the climate to provide the infrastructure necessary for Queensland industry to reach its full potential. Just as the Federal Government’s plan for Australia’s ports, roads and rail will transform Australia’s ability to do business, so too will this Government’s creation of technological infrastructure throughout Queensland enable business opportunities. In this age, the existence of a strong technological infrastructure is just as important as roads, rail and ports. North Queensland’s proximity to the lucrative markets of Asia and the Pacific places it in an important position for the future development of this State. North Queensland already has excellent port facilities, a pool of labour, expertise and a world-class university. This Government has been working hard to further develop the potential to secure the necessary technological infrastructures for north Queensland that I have already mentioned. In the interests of saving time, I seek leave to incorporate in *Hansard* the detailed lists of those achievements.

Leave granted.

Special Research Centre in Seabed Mapping

(Jan 1990) A grant of \$20,000 was made to the marine geophysical laboratory at James Cook University for the creation of a major centre with seabed mapping expertise for Australia and the southern hemisphere, with consequent research, technological and commercial opportunities, particularly for export.

Queensland Grants for Research and Development

(May 1991 ) Head of JCU Zoology Department, Professor Rhondda Jones, appointed to the State Government's new QGRAD advisory panel.

(July 1991) Under the Queensland Grants for Research and Development, James Cook University Tropical Biotechnology Pty Ltd received a grant of \$113,821 for the development of a range of diagnostic kits for the detection of a range of animal diseases.

#### QUESTnet

(July 1991) James Cook University was one of three universities to benefit for a State Government decision to upgrade the Queensland Education Science and Technology network (QUESTnet).

The Government committed more than \$900,000 over two years to bring QUESTnet's high-speed information technology transfer link to James Cook University. The extension of QUESTnet is a vital step in the development of advanced infrastructure in this state.

QUESTnet enables researchers at different Campuses to access advanced computing facilities and extensive databses from educational institutions around Australia and overseas.

#### Stereolithography

(August 1991) A \$650,000 grant for the establishment of an advanced three dimensional computer design and modelling network.

Stereolithography is a revolutionary form of technology which uses a laser to generate 3D models from computer data.

James Cook University is one of six networked tertiary institutions throughout the State with access to the Stereolithography Apparatus which means that it will be able to offer an advanced design and analysis service for local industry.

#### Marine Research

(Dec 1991) \$200,000 for marine research and oil spill containment work at JCU.

\$50,000 of the funding will allow the commercialisation of an oil spill containment system developed at the University.

The remainder will go towards the purchase of a nutrient auto-analyser needed for the analysis of marine, freshwater and terrestrial samples.

The project has been developed as a joint venture with Townsville-based company Oil Spill Containment Systems Pty Ltd.

#### Centre for Applied Economic Research and Analysis

Early this year, 2 grants of \$35,000 were made available for the establishment of new Economic Research Units based at the JCU Cairns and Townsville campuses. These grants, made on a dollar for dollar basis with the Commonwealth, will provide professional advice on economic activity and investment in North Queensland.

## 5. Government Aircraft

Mr COOMBER asked the Minister for Police and Emergency Services—

“Will he table details of all flights on the Westwind II jet and King Air turbo-prop aircraft by Government Ministers since 2 December 1989 including (a) the destination of the flights, (b) the passengers on these flights and (c) the cost to the taxpayer of these flights?”

**Mr WARBURTON:** I can, and I will, provide the information for the honourable member regarding use of the Government air wing. However, it was impossible to have that information available for today's question-time. I will provide the information to the honourable member next Tuesday.

## 6. Police Staffing, Yeppoon and Emu Park

Mr LESTER asked the Minister for Police and Emergency Services—

“With reference to the recent Mall bashings in Rockhampton, the bashing of a motel proprietor in Yeppoon and the recent spate of seven robberies in Emu Park, Yeppoon and other parts of the Capricorn Coast—

Will he provide a 24 hour police coverage at Yeppoon and an additional police officer at Emu Park?"

**Mr WARBURTON:** Police services need to be constantly reviewed and increased in a number of areas throughout the State as funding becomes available. The honourable member, who was Minister for Police in the previous National Party Government, would be well aware that this Government is energetically attending to the needs of the Queensland Police Service, which is changing and reforming after years of neglect, mismanagement and stagnation under his National Party Government. It is appropriate to remind the honourable member that, when he was in control, Fitzgerald described the situation by stating—

"The Queensland Police Service is debilitated by misconduct, inefficiency, incompetence and deficient leadership. The situation is compounded by poor organisation, administration and insufficiently developed techniques and skills for the task of law enforcement in a modern, complex society."

Whether the debilitating leadership description by Fitzgerald applies to the honourable member who asked the question is, of course, something which honourable members here can consider and decide upon. Inherent in the honourable member's question is criticism of this Government's reform program. I cannot imagine how any member of the National Party who was a Police Minister during that period of decadence which was investigated by Fitzgerald could have the temerity to suggest that this Government is not addressing the policing problems caused by previous National/Liberal Party Governments in this State. The Police Service, through the Regional Assistant Commissioner based in Rockhampton, will continue to monitor police needs in that particular region, which I visited only a few weeks ago.

#### **7. Instrumental Music Teachers, Peak Downs Electorate**

Mr LESTER asked the Minister for Education—

"(1) Is he aware that there is only one instrumental music teacher servicing schools in Blackwater and Emerald?"

(2) Could he provide additional instrumental music teachers so that instrumental music teaching can be provided at Anakie, Lochington, Gindie, Comet, Capella, Tieri and Clermont?"

**Mr BRADDY:** (1 and 2) There is a distinct irony in the member for Peak Downs asking this question. Mr Lester states that there is one instrumental music teacher serving Blackwater and Emerald. What he fails to remember is that, under the previous National Party Government of which he was a member, there were no instrumental music teachers provided to those schools. It was only in 1990 that the Goss Government achieved what Mr Lester and his colleagues have failed to do in 32 years—provide an instrumental music teacher for the school. The honourable member, however, should be aware of the significant difference between instrumental music instruction and music instruction per se. The provision of instrumental music teachers is costly and relies on large student numbers to be maintained. In these circumstances, it is difficult for small schools to access this service. However, many schools are ably served by conventional music teachers. Until the election of the Goss Government, no music teacher was provided by the Government for the small schools referred to in Mr Lester's question.

**An Opposition member** interjected.

**Mr BRADDY:** The honourable member should just listen. In 1992, a music teacher was provided for schools in Clermont, Capella, Kilcummin and Mistake Creek. These schools now have access to these services on a regular basis. The decision to provide this service was a deliberate policy on the part of the Goss Government. When a music

teacher was placed in the area this year, it was decided that the teacher would be located at Clermont, given the fact that Blackwater already had access to instrumental music services. This teacher would then be able to provide a service to schools in smaller centres—a service which these schools had not previously enjoyed. The honourable member may rest assured that the interests of smaller schools will continue to be a high priority for the Goss Government and further consideration has already been given to the trialing of an innovative new program that will allow students in smaller schools in the region to use computers as part of their music studies.

### **8. Amalgamation of Queensco Foods Co-operative Ltd and Darling Downs Co-operative**

Mr J. H. SULLIVAN asked the Minister for Primary Industries—

“With reference to the vote taken recently by members of the dairy co-operatives, Queensco Foods Co-operative Ltd and the Darling Downs Co-operative, to amalgamate those co-operatives—

What are the benefits that will accrue from this amalgamation?”

**Mr CASEY:** I thank the honourable member for Glass House for his question. I know that he is acutely aware of the strategic significance for the Queensland dairy industry of the amalgamation of Queensco Foods Co-operative Association and the Darling Downs United Co-operative Association, better known as Unity. The new Queensco/Unity Co-operative will service a total of about 940 suppliers who currently produce in excess of 280 million litres of milk annually. This represents almost half of Queensland's total milk production.

Last year, the combined turn-over of the new cooperative exceeded \$170m. Consequently, it has the financial strength to develop new markets and, if necessary, compete with other large players in the marketplace. It will be well positioned both geographically and in the marketplace to compete with any interstate milk incursion which might result from changes in the industry interstate. Through its four factories and diverse product range, there is scope for the new body to increase value-adding opportunities to Queensland's benefit. The members of both cooperatives have recognised the opportunity that an integrated, market-oriented association offers for the future. The Government is proud to have been able to encourage and assist in this process. I am confident that the new cooperative will play a major role in enhancing the viability of its producers and the State's dairy industry generally. I thank both the members for Caboolture and Toowoomba North for their cooperation in this matter.

### **9. Caboolture Hospital**

Mr J. H. SULLIVAN asked the Minister for Health—

“With reference to concerns being expressed in my electorate and indeed his electorate which neighbours mine, regarding services to be available in the new Caboolture Hospital for which he and I recently laid the foundation stone—

Will obstetric services be available at the hospital when it opens in 1993?”

**Mr HAYWARD:** I thank the member for Glass House for the question. As most members would be aware, the member for Glass House and the people of Caboolture have fought long and hard for a hospital in that region. Commencement of this long overdue facility signals a real commitment to the health and welfare of the people of the Caboolture district. However, there has been substantial debate about the provision of obstetric services at the Caboolture Hospital. This is understandable, as there are more than 1 000

births each year in the catchment area. The new hospital will have an obstetric unit. Initially, it will provide a service to women with low-risk pregnancies, but I have no doubt that it will quickly expand to handle more complex cases. Some doctors from Redcliffe have expressed concerns about the staffing of the unit. I can assure them that specific medical and nursing staff will be recruited for the unit and existing obstetricians at Redcliffe will not be forced to work at Caboolture.

The Redcliffe Hospital will continue to serve the peninsula and Deception Bay communities' obstetrics needs. The Caboolture Hospital is an added facility to serve the needs of the rapidly increasing number of families living in the Caboolture district. What disturbs me and the people of Caboolture has been the carping criticism from the Leader of the Liberal Party, who has claimed that this is simply a pork-barrelling exercise for the people of Caboolture. I want to make it very clear that this is a hospital that is very much needed for the people of Caboolture.

**Mrs SHELDON:** I rise to a point of order. The Minister for Health is misrepresenting what I said, and I ask him to retract it.

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

### QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

#### Police Commissioner Newnham

**Mr BORBIDGE:** In directing a question to the Premier, I refer to the future of Police Commissioner Newnham and allegations made by the former Police Minister that the commissioner had misused public funds and been incompetent, and I ask: did the former Police Minister raise these concerns with the Premier at any stage prior to his resignation and, if so, why did the Premier fail to take action?

**Mr W. K. GOSS:** I will not pre-empt or prejudice in any way the report in relation to the allegations. Despite the fact that there are extensive media reports in relation to the nature of the allegations and the outcome of the investigation, I have no knowledge of that. I am only the Minister for the CJC. I could not be expected to know ahead of the media what was involved in those matters, and I will not be canvassing them.

**Mr Elliott** interjected.

**Mr W. K. GOSS:** I was responding enthusiastically to Mr Turner's notice of motion.

**Mr Elliott:** It's a slur on the commission.

**Mr W. K. GOSS:** No, it is not. The honourable member is standing up for the rights and the standing of Parliament in our system, and I happen to agree with him. As to the relationship between the former Police Minister, Terry Mackenroth, and the Police Commissioner, Mr Newnham—I was aware in general terms of the break-down in that relationship over a number of issues, and that was a matter of some concern and disappointment to me. There was clearly a break-down on both sides, and it was disappointing to me, because I regarded the Police Commissioner as an honest person trying to do a difficult job to the best of his ability, and I regarded the former Police Minister as by far the best Police Minister that this State had seen for 30 or 40 years. In just two years he presided over the implementation of the great majority of the Fitzgerald report recommendations in relation to the Police Service—a task which was one of the most difficult for any Police Minister to undertake in recent times in Queensland, and indeed in Australia, but Mr Mackenroth successfully presided over that. However, notwithstanding the good qualities and abilities of both those men, there was a serious and increasing

break-down in the relationship on both sides. I think that is a great loss to the Police Service, unfortunately. The report and the issues that have been raised were matters raised by Mr Mackenroth in a private letter to Mr Newnham. Mr Newnham saw fit to publish it and call for a CJC inquiry. I will await the report, and I suggest that the honourable member does the same.

### **Police Commissioner Newnham**

**Mr BORBIDGE:** In directing a question to the Attorney-General in his capacity as the first law officer of the State and the Minister responsible for the Crown Law Division and the Office of the Special Prosecutor, I refer to the future of Police Commissioner Newnham and allegations made by the former Police Minister that the commissioner had misused public funds and had been incompetent. I ask: did the former Police Minister at any stage raise these concerns with him prior to the Police Minister's resignation? If so, why did he fail to take action?

**Mr Mackenroth:** The short answer is, "No."

**Mr WELLS:** The statutory responsibility in this area lies with the Police Minister. If the former Police Minister had sought legal advice from the office of the Crown Solicitor, he would have done so directly, not through me.

### **Public Service Salaries**

**Mr PREST:** In directing a question to the Treasurer, I refer to recent claims made by the Leader of the Liberal Party, Mrs Sheldon, that salaries for public servants in Queensland had increased by a massive 43.9 per cent this year. I ask: is this the same claim as the one that has been made by the Leader of the Opposition, Mr Borbidge? Can the Treasurer inform the House of the true situation?

**Opposition members** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! Under the Standing Orders, this is a valid question.

**Mr De LACY:** I just wondered whether members of the Opposition were going to answer the question, or whether the Leader of the Opposition wanted me to answer it.

**Mr SPEAKER:** I suggest that the Treasurer does so.

**Mr De LACY:** Mr Speaker, I think the House is interested in the coordinated efforts of the coalition. On 16 February, the Leader of the Opposition issued a statement under the heading "Huge bill for public service". He went on to state—

“. . . the Queensland Economic Review released this week showed salaries, wages and related payments would cost taxpayers about \$4000 million this financial year.”

He added—

“This was \$1240 million more than last year.”

In answer to a question from Mr Littleproud on Tuesday, I said that that was wrong and that it can be accounted for simply by a change in accounting procedures which was spelt out in the Budget documents and spelt out in the September edition of the *Queensland Economic Review*. In fact, so that in future the Leader of the Opposition does not make mistakes in interpreting data, I have asked Treasury to write to him every time an accounting change is made. It is simply not good enough for it to put a footnote at the bottom of the statistics. The Leader of the Opposition needs to have a private letter.

Two weeks later, on 2 March, the Leader of the Liberal Party issued the following statement—

“Treasury figures show that the wages bill for public servants in Queensland will grow by about 40 percent this financial year.”

She went on to cite the same statistics as those mentioned by the Leader of the Opposition. She was wrong in the same way as the Leader of the Opposition is wrong, but the fact is that it took her two weeks longer than him to be wrong. I do not know whether that is a positive or negative quality when it takes the Leader of the Liberal Party two weeks longer to be wrong than it takes the Leader of the Opposition, but if I can give the Leader of the Liberal Party any advice, it would be, “Don’t follow him because he is seldom right.” I draw the attention of the House to another statement he issued under the heading “‘Excesses’ cost QEC \$550m”. The statement reads—

“The Queensland Electricity Commission had been ordered to surrender \$550 million to Treasury to help compensate for overspending by the State Government.

...

The money should have been used to retire QEC debt and its seizure would have major long-term implications for Queensland jobs and power costs.”

That was what Mr Borbidge said, and I agree with him. Of course, the money should have been used to retire debt. However, as Budget Paper No. 3 states—

“Payments to service and redeem this debt are made by the Commission and will total \$550M during 1991-92.”

Every time Mr Borbidge looks at statistics, he gets them wrong. I say to the Leader of the Liberal Party, “Don’t follow him if you value your credibility.”

**Mr Livingstone:** What credibility?

**Mr De LACY:** That is right—“What credibility?” I am prepared to have a debate about Queensland’s financial performance, but let us see if we can keep the facts right and keep the debate on a higher plane by interpreting the statistics in the way in which they ought to be interpreted.

#### **Legal Aid Office Telephone Information Service**

**Mr PREST:** In directing a question to the Attorney-General, I refer to a recent initiative of the Legal Aid Office in establishing a telephone information service. I ask: has the information service demonstrated an existing need in the community? If so, what are the primary areas of advice given?

**Mr WELLS:** The Legal Aid Office is an independent commission, but is nevertheless a forward-looking commission and has introduced a system which has been immensely valuable to the people of Queensland. The Legal Aid Office’s telephone information service has had major success in increasing access to justice in this State. Since the service was first trialled in October last year, 12 000 people have received assistance from the service. Calls are being received at the rate of more than 200 a day, and 37 per cent of the people making those inquiries are from country areas. More than half of the people making those inquiries are women. The honourable member will be interested to know that the main topics of inquiry are as follows: 22 per cent, family law; 2 per cent, tenancy; 11 per cent, consumer rights; 10 per cent, neighbours; 9 per cent, traffic accidents and traffic offences; and 5 per cent, contracts.

The way in which the information service operates is that it does not seek to replace legal advice; rather, it seeks to channel people who make requests in the appropriate direction to most effectively resolve their problem. It is demonstrating that it can resolve issues quickly and identify options for action for the people who make the inquiries. Of the total number of people who inquire, 31 per cent are actually satisfied and there is no need

to refer the caller to any other services; 39 per cent of callers are referred to community resources; 22 per cent are referred to Legal Aid Offices; and 8 per cent are referred to private solicitors. Honourable members will see that the function of that service is to facilitate the resolution of problems. People often do not know whether their problem is a legal one. If they can ring a service such as the telephone information service sponsored by the Legal Aid Commission, they are able to find out very quickly and with great expedition exactly where they should go and how they should commence the resolution of their problem. I think that all honourable members will join me in congratulating the Legal Aid Commission on that initiative, as there would not be a member in this House whose constituents would not benefit from that service.

#### **Police Commissioner Newnham**

**Mrs SHELDON:** In directing a question to the Minister for Police and Emergency Services, I refer to speculation about the future of Police Commissioner Newnham, and I ask: pending the outcome of the CJC inquiry, has he recalled the Police Commissioner as a result of allegations made by his predecessor and, if he has not, how serious do the issues have to become for him to recall the top police officer in Queensland?

**Mr WARBURTON:** I have been advised by a senior officer in the Police Service that the commissioner will return to Brisbane today.

#### **Illegal Sex Industry**

**Mrs SHELDON:** I ask the Minister for Police and Emergency Services: in view of reports that nothing has changed in Queensland's illegal sex industry, what action will he take today to order immediate action against the so-called kings of the vice industry identified in news reports today?

**Mr WARBURTON:** The first thing that I will perhaps do is speak to the commissioner about it. I read the reports in the *Courier-Mail* with some interest, and I was very pleased to note the descriptive lesson given to us by the honourable member for Nerang. We as a Government are addressing the problem. Obviously, as has been said in this House by my predecessor, Mr Mackenroth, and by me, the laws—

**Mr Littleproud** interjected.

**Mr WARBURTON:** Members opposite ought to hear me out. I am about to make the big admission that the current laws under which the police are expected to work are in many ways deficient, which does not enable the police to carry out what the Opposition sees as their responsibilities. However, having said that, I can assure the honourable member that today I will speak to very senior officers in the Police Service about that important matter.

**Mr Connor** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! I warn the member for Nerang under Standing Order 123A for interjecting. Honourable members, I will not have the authority of the Chair disparaged in that way.

#### **Mining and Energy Industries**

**Mr PITT:** I ask the Minister for Resource Industries: as the new Minister in charge of this important portfolio, will he inform the House of any feedback that he has received

from the mining and energy industries about how those industries regard this Goss Government's performances and policies in that area compared with those of the previous Government?

**Mr McGRADY:** As the new Minister for Resource Industries, in the past two and a half months I have had the opportunity to travel round the mining communities of this State. I have been most impressed with what I have seen and, in particular, I have been most impressed with the attitude of both the management and the employees. The simple facts of life are that there is a feeling of optimism in that industry, and the industry certainly believes that the Government has its act together. The difference between this Government and the previous one is that this Government is prepared to sit down and listen to both sides of the industry and the communities concerned. That is what has happened. The days of confrontation in that industry are over. The days of the closed doors in the industry are gone forever because, under this regime, we are prepared to sit down and listen. The days of the mates' rates have gone.

I refer to recent comments in the *Courier-Mail* by the industry that it is delighted with the Government's performance so far. Let me contrast that with the record of the previous National Party Minister and the National Party Government. What happened then? For the first time in the history of this State, the mining council carried a vote of no confidence in the Mines Minister—and that is the difference. In my opinion, the industry is happy with the performance of the Government. I believe that the industry is in good hands and I am proud to represent it, because—unlike the people on the other side of the House—I see my job as getting out into the community to defend and promote that industry.

### Corporatisation

**Mr PITT:** In directing a question to the Treasurer, I refer to the release of the recent White Paper on corporatisation, and I ask: why is corporatisation better for Queensland than the Opposition's call for privatisation?

**Mr De LACY:** That is a very important question, because it could be fundamental to the political debate this year. Those States of Australia that embrace privatisation do so because of their financial situation. Some States are privatising, and the reason why they are privatising is that their debt levels are such that they need to sell off some assets to reduce their debts. Queensland is not in that situation. I am sure honourable members would know that the net debt per capita in Queensland is about one-fifth of the national average. Therefore, no pressure is on the Queensland Government to privatise to reduce debt. Having said that, some other issues remain. Both opposition parties increasingly embrace the concept of privatisation. What that really means is selling off our assets.

**Mr Coomber:** What about your prison?

**Mr De LACY:** The Government does not regard prisons as valuable assets. In respect of assets such as ports—and I notice the Leader of the Opposition is talking about privatising ports—there is one thing that we need to consider, and that is that they are a strategic asset. Ports are strategic assets; they are important assets. Are we going to sell them off so that they will be taken over by who knows what? They will eventually become the subject of strategic decisions that are important for Queensland and will eventually become agenda items in board meetings in Sydney, Melbourne or perhaps even Tokyo. There is one other important point that we should not miss. If we do have our revenue-producing assets owned by the public, then, as a matter of course, we do not pay taxes to the Commonwealth Government. The State Government does not pay sales tax, income tax or capital gains tax. As soon as State assets are sold off, of course, they become private, and taxes must be paid to the Commonwealth.

Once an asset is privatised, all those tax receipts are transferred from the State to the Commonwealth. The best example last year was Suncorp. Last year, we received a return from Suncorp of \$85m: \$15m by way of dividend and \$70m as payment in lieu of Federal Government tax. If the Government were to sell off Suncorp, that \$70m would go to the Commonwealth. The Queensland Government would get nothing back in return.

**Mr Borbidge:** You're wrong.

**Mr De LACY:** Not necessarily. Once it becomes private ownership, the Government is endeavouring to negotiate a three or five-year period when those taxes will not be paid to the Commonwealth. If they are owned by the private sector, income tax and sales tax inevitably goes to the Commonwealth, and that means we would be trading off in Queensland all that money that we now receive in lieu of Commonwealth tax. If the Opposition thinks it can balance the Budget by trading off revenues that way, it can stick to it. I know that it simply cannot be done. It seems to me that the opposition parties are prepared to compromise the financial position of Queensland just because of this ideological endeavour on which they are embarking.

**Mr Dunworth** interjected.

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

### Illegal Sex Industry

**Mr LITTLEPROUD:** In directing a question to the Minister for Police, I refer him to the growth in Queensland's illicit sex industry over which he and the previous Minister have presided. I ask: what action has the Minister taken in relation to past statements by the Police Commissioner that policing prostitution was not a priority of law enforcement? Further, why has the Government not previously ordered the police force, via the Commissioner, to enforce the law as it presently stands?

**Mr WARBURTON:** I am the first to admit that the laws under which the police have to operate are reasonably deficient.

**Mr Littleproud:** You said it would be a priority.

**Mr WARBURTON:** I can only tell the honourable member what I regard as the facts. The position is clearly that the Government is currently looking energetically at a response to this question. The Government is hopeful—

**Mr De Lacy** interjected.

**Mr WARBURTON:** And as the Treasurer says, the Government is very hopeful that after 30 years of neglect by the previous Government—I can recall a procession of National Party Ministers who visited the brothels and heaven knows what down the Valley and turned a blind eye and did nothing—

**Opposition members:** Who!

**Mr WARBURTON:** Opposition members now point to this Government in a critical way and suggest that it knows all the answers. I repeat that I am the first to agree. I agree with Commissioner Newnham when he says that the laws under which the police are currently required to operate are deficient. The second point I want to repeat so that the Opposition will understand is that this Government is currently energetically addressing that problem and, as soon as the Government policy in relation to this matter is finally determined, hopefully the Government will be in a better position to do what has to be done.

### Prostitution Laws

**Mr LITTLEPROUD:** In directing a question to the Attorney-General, I refer him to this Government's failure to enforce prostitution laws, with the result that some 10 brothels per month are reportedly opening in Queensland, and I ask: did the former or current Police Minister ever seek advice from him regarding the enforcement of prostitution laws? If not, as the chief law officer of the State responsible for enforcement of the Criminal Code, does he not have an equal responsibility to ensure that organised crime does not run rampant behind the illicit sex industry? Will he now act to ensure that his department supports the police effort against prostitution?

**Mr WELLS:** I do not have any recollection of the Minister for Police asking me to tell him how to do his job on any occasion. I do not have any knowledge of any convention whereby one Minister asks another Minister how to do his job or to support him enforce the resolutions that he undertakes in respect of those jobs. For a long period, this matter was before the Criminal Justice Commission because of a recommendation in the Fitzgerald report. The Criminal Justice Commission considered the matter. It made certain recommendations which were subsequently considered by the parliamentary committee.

The parliamentary committee, inspired to a certain extent by honourable members on the other side, took a different view from the commission on that subject. That is where things stand at the moment, and that has meant that the Government has to undertake a difficult process of analysis, which is ongoing. I believe that that adequately answers the honourable member's question. However, it is worth while emphasising that honourable members opposite ought to learn a bit about the processes of government, something that they apparently missed when they were part of something which called itself a Government. It is not a matter of one Minister telling another Minister how to do his job, or providing resources to assist him to do his job. The resources to undertake a particular job assigned to a particular portfolio are available within that portfolio. That is why the Government is divided into a number of ministries with a number of different portfolios.

### Dingo-Mount Flora Road

**Mr PEARCE:** I direct a question to the Minister for Transport. The Fitzroy Development Road, more commonly known as the Dingo-Mount Flora Road, services the central Queensland coal industry, the long-established beef industry and a developing grain industry. During times of coastal flooding, it is used significantly by heavy transport vehicles as an alternative route. The road is being steadily upgraded by reconstruction to double lane. I ask: will the progressive upgrading of the Dingo-Mount Flora Road continue? What programs are now under consideration for funding?

**Mr HAMILL:** I recognise the significance of the Dingo-Mount Flora Road to the honourable member's constituents. It is a major arterial route in his area. The honourable member is correct when he states that there has been a clear commitment from this Government to continue the upgrading of that very important route. Over the past two years, some 18 kilometres of road has been widened and strengthened at a cost of approximately \$4.8m. Currently, design work is continuing for other priority works between the Capricorn Highway and the Middlemount turn-off to provide access to the coal-mining communities in that area. Furthermore, a two-lane road connecting the Capricorn and the Peak Downs Highways via Dysart, which is used by bus services, is also the subject of design work to enable further improvements to be carried out in that area.

### Mines Rescue Brigades

**Mr PEARCE:** I direct a question to the Minister for Resource Industries. The Queensland coal industry is expanding its underground operations, which means that the number of underground workers will increase, thereby making it imperative that training and safety be afforded a high priority within the industry. I ask: what is the current situation with funding for mines rescue brigades? What action will the Minister take to ensure that mines rescue teams are fully trained and resourced?

**Mr McGRADY:** I thank the member for Broadsound for that question, and I acknowledge his interest in this matter. As we all know, the member comes from the coal industry and represents it in this Parliament. As I travel around his electorate, I am impressed by the high regard in which his electors hold him for his honesty and his integrity. This Government recognises the important role that the State mines rescue brigades play in the safety of coal-miners. It recognises the need that the miners be fully trained. As some members would know, the funding for these brigades is split three ways: the State Government, the coal companies and the Workers Compensation Board. At present, negotiations are taking place to see if the mine-owners will take over the responsibilities for those brigades. No decisions have yet been made. I will certainly be examining all the arguments which are put before me, but let me state that, unless there is a change for the better, the present arrangements will remain in force. There will be no change in this area until there has been full consultation with both sides of the industry. We believe that the coal-miners of this State are entitled to the best safety that money can buy. They deserve nothing less.

#### **Police Staffing**

**Dr WATSON:** I ask the Minister for Police: is it not a fact that, when the Queensland Police Service moved to a 38-hour week, that represented an effective 5 per cent reduction in the size of the service, making a mockery of the Government's claims that the extra 1 200 officers promised would make a real difference to the fight against crime in Queensland? Is that not yet another reason for the Government's inability to enforce the law?

**Mr WARBURTON:** Coming from a member of the Opposition, I find that an extraordinary question. It is true to say that the Industrial Commission granted a 38-hour week to the Police Service, just as it is true to say that the Industrial Commission has, relatively recently, granted two salary increases to the police officers of this State. If the honourable member wants to pursue the argument that that is the reason why there is difficulty in manning police stations and why this Government is facing some difficulties as a result of what the previous Government did not do, I guess that that is an argument he may wish to pursue, but it is not one with which I would agree. He is correct in one respect. Certainly, the granting of the 38-hour week did put a strain on our resources. He is correct in saying that the granting of two substantial increases and the possible granting of a further increase will put a strain on our financial resources and the Police budget. That is unquestionable. But I repeat that it is not going to prevent us from pursuing the reform programs that were, as the Premier indicated, put substantially in place by Mr Mackenroth during the two years that he was Minister for Police and are being pursued energetically and vigorously by the senior police officers of this State and me.

#### **Police Staffing**

**Dr WATSON:** I ask the Minister for Police: is it not a fact that the amount of resources being provided to the police of this State is so inadequate that police officers who go on leave from small country towns are not replaced, that at the weekend in many regional towns throughout Queensland there are no CIB officers on duty and that in

Brisbane suburbs and nearby towns patrolling has been dramatically reduced? Is that not just one more reason why the Government has been unable to protect Queenslanders and enforce the law?

**Mr WARBURTON:** The honourable member prides himself on having knowledge about the economy and financial matters, and I respect him for that. I would have thought that, being the sort of person he is, with his background and his academic qualifications, he would have read and been able to understand easily the last Budget papers. That being the case, he would have seen that there was a very, very substantial increase to well over \$400m in the Police budget. I really have to say again that I am amazed at the temerity of members of the National and Liberal Parties sitting opposite being prepared to criticise this Government for what it has done over the last almost two and a half years. It is true to say that there has been some difficulty in respect of the staffing of some police stations. However, this Government has regionalised the Police Service in this State.

**Mr FitzGerald:** Regionalised, ostracised.

**Mr WARBURTON:** If honourable members opposite want to sit in this place and knock the regional assistant commissioners——

**Mr Stoneman:** No.

**Mr WARBURTON:** Yes, they do. National Party members are doing it now. If they want to suggest that those regional assistant commissioners are not competent——

**Mr Stoneman:** They are.

**Mr WARBURTON:** Opposition members are saying that they are not. If they want to make that suggestion, let that be on their heads. The responsibility for the budgets of the eight regions throughout this State rests very firmly with the regional assistant commissioners in those particular regions.

I will conclude on this note: what is being seen for the first time in this State is the positioning of police officers without political interference. That is what is being seen. For the first time ever, police stations are being built without political interference.

**Opposition members** interjected.

**Mr WARBURTON:** Members opposite should not argue the point with me, or I will show them some correspondence. The position is clear.

**An Opposition member:** You're a bully.

**Mr Elliott** interjected.

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

**Mr WARBURTON:** I am not a bully.

**Mr Borbidge** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! I might even warn the Leader of the Opposition.

**Mr WARBURTON:** I would say that I have quite a reputation for not being vindictive. I have never been that way at all. I simply like telling the facts. I will conclude on that note. I simply want to assure all honourable members that everything possible is being done in the interests of the people of this State.

### **Criminal Justice Commission Report on Prostitution**

**Mr ELDER:** I ask the Premier: as the Minister who has responsibility for the Criminal Justice Commission, will he advise the House of the current position regarding the

consideration of the reports on prostitution of the Criminal Justice Commission and the parliamentary committee?

**Mr W. K. GOSS:** I think that, given some of the false hysteria that we have seen generated today and a touch of media manipulation in the morning paper, it is important to put certain things into perspective. This is a very complex issue and it is a complex problem. It is one that has been with society for hundreds—indeed, thousands—of years, and it will continue for another thousand years.

**Mr Santoro** interjected.

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

**Mr W. K. GOSS:** The situation is that it is only a few months since this Government received the report of the Criminal Justice Commission and subsequently the report of the parliamentary committee, which came to a different conclusion. They have had over 12 months. We will take as long as we need to effectively analyse the recommendations that have been put forward and take appropriate action.

Even if this Government was minded to pick up the recommendations of the Criminal Justice Commission 100 per cent as they are laid out in the report, it is not something that we could move on immediately because legislation would have to be drafted, a financial analysis would have to be prepared and an administrative framework—quite a substantial one—would have to be put in place in order to make it work. Extensive negotiations would have to take place with local authorities. So, even if one was minded to pick up the Criminal Justice Commission's recommendations, it is not simply a matter of endorsing them. There is a great body of work which was not done and which will still have to be done by this Government in order to do something practical, irrespective of what it is.

Intervening issues involving the CJC have been given priority over the prostitution report. We will now return to that report. As the Police Minister has indicated, it is currently under active consideration. The main concerns of this Government and the main issues from our point of view are those of health and organised crime, and they will be the priority. They are complex issues. We are not going to rush in, because while we are concerned about the current situation in relation to prostitution, we are also, on behalf of the community, apprehensive about a literal explosion—a dramatic expansion—in the level of male and female prostitution in this State, a dramatic expansion of the exploitation of women that occurs in this sordid, grubby industry and, furthermore, a lowering of the moral standards of the community if male and female single-operator brothels are going to conduct business in suburban homes in this State. Behind some of this false hysteria, the suggestion put forward is that nothing has changed. Let me make it plain that a very significant number of things have changed. Firstly, no longer in this State are the hands of police and politicians in the pockets of prostitutes.

**Mr FitzGerald:** How do you know?

**Mr W. K. GOSS:** That is my belief. If anybody in this place has any evidence to the contrary, he or she should take it to the Police Commissioner or the CJC.

The second significant factor that has changed under this Government is that we no longer have a ring of senior police running brothels like a Kentucky Fried Chicken franchise operation, which is how they used to operate. Furthermore, the third factor that has changed is that for the first time since this Government was elected we have some Ministers—in Mr Mackenroth and Mr Warburton—who are prepared to tell the truth about prostitution, namely, to admit that it does exist, it will always exist and that we will never stamp it out. We have never pretended that it is capable of being stamped out.

As to interjections from the member for Lockyer and others in terms of how we know that senior police are not running a franchise operation in the brothels as they used to

under the National and Liberal Parties—I happen to believe that senior police are not doing that any more. If there is any evidence to the contrary—

**Mr FitzGerald:** Do you back all your senior police officers?

**Mr W. K. GOSS:** Of course. If there is any evidence to the contrary from the onion-farmer from Lockyer, let him put his evidence on the table. This Government has given tens of millions of dollars to the Criminal Justice Commission and provided record increases in funds to the Police Commissioner and the Police Department to deal with criminal activity, and organised criminal activity in particular. I am confident that, if there was any evidence of organised criminal activity, the CJC and the Police Department would have become aware of it and taken action. If there is organised criminal activity in this area, I expect the Police Commissioner and the Criminal Justice Commission to be doing what they are paid to do and taking appropriate action.

I note that in recent times some arrests have been made and some action has been taken. As the Police Minister, Mr Warburton, said, the law in this regard is deficient. We will deal with that in the very near future, but we will deal with it in our own good time. When we do so, we will deal with it at a pace and at a rate whereby we are confident that we have got it as right as we possibly can. But even when we finally bring the reforms to this Parliament, we are not going to pretend—as the frauds in the previous Government used to pretend—that it is somehow solved. It cannot be solved. There are no solutions to this very depressing and tragic human situation. While I have my own personal views about this situation and will prosecute them, we as a Government have an obligation to consider the work done by the Criminal Justice Commission and the committee, and we will do that in our own good time.

**Mr Lingard** interjected.

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

#### **Brisbane-Gold Coast Eastern Transport Corridor**

**Mr ELDER:** In directing a question to the Minister for Environment and Heritage, I refer to Cabinet's decision not to approve the extension of the Brisbane-Gold Coast eastern transport corridor through bushland at Mount Cotton, Burbank and Sheldon. I ask: what action is the Government proposing to take to ensure that that significant koala habitat is protected from the impacts of future developments?

**Mr COMBEN:** The matters concerning that road were certainly handled adequately yesterday by my colleague the Minister for Transport. They involve balancing the need for a Brisbane-Gold Coast eastern transport corridor with the needs of the koala. It is important to ensure that, in the area about which the member is concerned, the management plan that has been foreshadowed by the Minister for Transport and the issues appropriate to koala management in that area are appropriately addressed. At present, my department is addressing the conservation needs and values of that area to see what we must do to ensure that that particular area remains probably the prime koala habitat of Australia, and thus of the world. Should money become available, we will be looking at the possible acquisition of a number of areas. In addition, last year I established a koala consultative committee to try to bring together the various groups in that area so that they can speak with one voice to Government, professional bodies and the academia involved. That will enable the committee to get on top of the needs of koala conservation.

I am very impressed by the member for Manly and his concern for the koala, in direct contrast to the member for Peak Downs, who, this morning, raised the matter of the wombat. I have sought from my professional officers the scientists' views on the issue of

crossbreeding the member for Peak Downs with a wombat, and I have been advised that there would be no benefit to the wombat.

### **Police Service Civilianisation Program**

**Mr TURNER:** I direct a question to the Minister for Police and Emergency Services. Although it is nice to know that everything is okay, I still ask: is it not a fact that the civilianisation program which was to have freed up 1 000 police men and women to the beat has stalled under his Government because it has not provided sufficient funds? Is it not a fact that this Fitzgerald recommendation has been so neglected by this Government that police have had to fill new jobs that could have been filled by civilians? If the Minister does not accept this proposition, I refer him to multiple references in the commissioner's foreword to the 1990-91 annual report of the Queensland Police Service, and to page 25 of that report.

**Mr WARBURTON:** It is true that the civilianisation program could be better than it is at the moment. It was a recommendation of the Fitzgerald inquiry. Although I do not have the figures with me today—in effect, considerable progress—

**Mr Borbidge:** Wayne said Terry was the best Police Minister for 40 years.

**Mr WARBURTON:** I ask the honourable member to let me finish. The present situation is not commonly known, and I was going to advise the House of it by way of a ministerial statement, possibly next week, but that might change. A committee comprising my ministerial office, the Police Service and the CJC constantly monitors the progress of reforms made as a result of the Fitzgerald inquiry recommendations. One of the reforms, of course, is the civilianisation of the Police Service. I can only assure the honourable member that the best that can be done is being done at the moment. It is currently being pushed along vigorously. It depends, of course, on finance. Hopefully, sufficient finance will be provided in the next Budget to ensure that that very important program proceeds.

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

### **GENERAL BUSINESS—NOTICE OF MOTION NO. 6**

#### **Condemnation of New South Wales Premier**

**Mr PITT (Mulgrave) (11.32 a.m.):** I move—

“That this House condemns the Liberal Premier of New South Wales for his insulting comments that only the south-east corner of Queensland is ‘economically relevant’ and, furthermore, reminds the New South Wales Liberal Premier that the north of Noosa and west of Ipswich untold wealth is created through mining, primary production and tourism.”

I am not only proud to be a Queenslander but also extremely proud to be a regional Queenslander. This is probably something that Mr Greiner, having been cloistered in Sydney all his life, fails to understand. The comments to which I refer were uttered by Mr Greiner in the wash-up of the daylight-saving referendum that was held in this State on 22 February. The New South Wales Premier, Mr Greiner, had the audacity to brand Queenslanders as “bloody idiots” for abandoning daylight-saving. His attitude, as evidenced by this outburst, tells us a great deal about the man. It also tells us a great deal about the thinking processes of the Liberal Party itself, not only in New South Wales but also here in Queensland. The Liberal Party is and has always been a party of the city. Any claims to the contrary are fictitious, and I will elaborate on that point later on. In New South Wales, the Liberals obviously believe that that State starts and ends at the boundaries of metropolitan Sydney and its environs. In Queensland, it is equally obvious that our own version of the born-to-rule merchants cannot see past the south-east corner of the State.

Their knowledge of this State outside that region is abysmal. It is interesting to note how many seats outside the south-east corner the Liberals actually hold. The answer is, "Zero." When one goes back through the records, it is hard to find too many seats outside south-east Queensland that were ever held by the Liberals. The only one that comes to my mind is the seat of Mount Isa, held by Mr Peter Beard. He obviously was a "oncer", because Mount Isa woke up to him.

I wonder why it is that the Liberals cannot maintain a presence in rural and regional Queensland. I believe that it is all to do with their policies. As far as rural Queensland is concerned, they just do not have policies. They do not understand the people out there and the problems that confront them. Therefore, they have no policies. I am sure that there are many members of the official Opposition who will support this motion. I may have criticised the National Party over many issues, but one can never criticise it for not at least having some feel for the bush. The other reason for the lack of a Liberal presence outside the south-east corner is that the Liberal Party has no interest in rural and regional Queensland. It is interested only in what goes on here in metropolitan Brisbane. I will give an indication of how pathetic their performance is in the bush using the 1989 campaign for the seat of Cairns held by our own Treasurer, Keith De Lacy, as an example. Because it had a business presence in the community, the Liberal Party decided that it was about time to put forward a candidate. A very capable young lady was selected, but the party failed to give her the support necessary to ensure that she could run a successful campaign. It could not even correctly organise her nomination. When the time came for nominations to close, it was found that her nomination form was deficient. I cannot imagine the two major parties falling to that low a standard.

On several occasions during our flights back to Cairns the member for Tablelands, Mr Gilmore, and I have discussed issues. One of those dear to our hearts was electoral redistribution. We discussed what the National Party submission was going to be and what the Labor Party submission would be. We were very pleased to discover that they were almost as one, which was very good for our respective seats. The Liberal Party's submission again indicates its lack of understanding of anything outside the south-east corner because it ignored community of interest in the far north. It ignored an important point that was going to be one of the bases on which the new boundaries were to be drawn. It also conveniently ignored geography. As a matter of fact, some people in the Liberal Party took a lot of time and patience to go through the metropolitan seats in the south-east corner to draw the boundaries as best they could. The rest did not count at all. They got the pencil out and drew lines on the map of north Queensland. Near enough was good enough. People who live outside the south-east corner of Queensland do not appreciate being treated in that fashion.

Obviously the Liberal Party has no intention of mounting an effective campaign in my own seat of Mulgrave. I know that recently the present leader of that party was in the north and indicated that this was one of the seats that the Liberal Party could win. I put it to her that I find that hard to believe, because a recent newspaper advertisement by the Liberal Party calling for nominations could not even get the name of the electorate right. The party called it Mulgrave River, not Mulgrave. I do not know how the heck the Liberals hope to get a decent candidate.

The Queensland Liberal Party's attitude to daylight-saving is also interesting, because this is a party that pretends it can understand rural and regional Queensland. This is a party which, in its own words, was unequivocal about its stance on daylight-saving. The Liberals supported the "Yes" case down to a man and a woman and there was no doubt in their minds that the "Yes" case had to be advanced. They forgot that the majority of Queenslanders—as evidenced by the referendum—actually voted against daylight-saving. The Liberal leader fell into line with the business community in the south-

east corner. These people who occupy the Liberal Party benches in this House do not understand anything outside the south-east area.

**Mr FitzGerald** interjected.

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

**Mr PITT:** The people of Brisbane whom the Liberal Party pretend to represent also do not understand what Queensland is all about. Thank goodness a significant number of people in this area decided to support the "No" case. On behalf of the country people, I thank those citizens in the metropolitan regions who did so.

The Liberal Party has no policies for regional Queensland. From time to time, I listen with bemused interest when people from that group stand up and pretend to speak wisely about issues affecting country Queensland. They know nothing about them. As a matter of fact, their primary industries policy is to let the bush go and only worry about the city. The Premier of New South Wales suggests that anything outside the south-east corner bounded by Noosa, Ipswich and the State border is economically irrelevant. After the comments that I have just made, the Liberal Party is politically irrelevant in those areas. The south-east corner is a very important part of our State and we who live outside it value its contribution to this State's economy and history. We understand that the commercial hub of Queensland must necessarily lie in Brisbane and that the business world must have its headquarters there. We also accept the fact that, because of the population in this region, manufacturing must be concentrated to a large extent in the south-east corner. However, Townsville in far-north Queensland is rapidly developing as an industrial centre in its own right, and I am sure that the member for Townsville, Mr Davies, will elaborate on that later in this debate.

The other important aspect about the south-east corner is the fact that it is an administrative headquarters. Until recently, almost everything that opened and shut in relation to any Government department was based in Brisbane. Since the election of the Goss Government, regionalisation is not only a catchword, but also a reality. Things that normally required attention in Brisbane are now being done in regional areas and so far this Government can stand proud on its record. I admit that in many cases some departmental restructuring and regionalisation is in its infancy and there are teething problems. However, I am sure that things will go well in the future. Unlike New South Wales, Queensland is a decentralised State. If one throws a blanket over Sydney, one finds most of the population of New South Wales located in that region. Successive Queensland Governments, both Labor and conservative, have always taken the line that Queensland should be a decentralised State, not only to advance the cause of populating the State, but also to take advantage of the natural wealth which lies throughout Queensland. This has been done at great cost to the various Governments of this State and is something that the New South Wales Government has never attempted to do in any realistic way. That great cost has resulted in a large return, because this is a State that is far more unified than other States. Whether people live on Cape York Peninsula or at Coolangatta, they feel proud to be Queenslanders and they also feel that they have an important part to play in our future.

The four industries of grazing, agriculture, mining and tourism give lie to the claim by the New South Wales Premier. Queensland leads the way in beef production and has a significant wool industry. Mr Greiner would know nothing about agriculture because there are not too many cane or wheat farms in metropolitan Sydney. I am sure that the member for Mount Isa will be able to speak at length about the importance of mining to the wealth of our State, as will the member for Bowen and soon-to-be member for Charters Towers, who will speak in support of the coal industry. As a matter of fact, Queensland leads the nation in most of these industries. I admit that the south-east corner has some pastoral industries—the dairy industry, to name but one. There is some agriculture, mainly small

crops. In addition, tourism is very important, particularly on the south and north coasts. If I may be somewhat presumptuous, I would add that far-north Queensland, north Queensland and central Queensland are rapidly overcoming the head start that the south-east corner had in the tourism industry.

The most significant aspect of the value of regional Queensland to the economy of this State is that it is largely responsible for Queensland's export earnings. I remember reading in EARC's final report about the distribution of wealth-earning capacity throughout Queensland. I know that EARC came up with figures that did not flatter regional Queensland quite as much as we would have liked and indicated that a lot of the wealth was produced in the south-east corner. Possibly that was done to create the impression that, by employing people and including their wages in that review, wealth was being produced. I do not think that anyone who wanted to look seriously at what Queensland earns, sells and receives from exports would dispute that regional Queensland is largely responsible for the creation of wealth in this State.

I turn now to agriculture. The *Queensland Year Book 1992* states—

“The agricultural and mining industries have been central to Queensland's economic development since the earliest days of settlement. Although tourism has grown in recent times, agriculture is still an important contributor to the State's economy and has maintained its vital role as a major export earner.”

It goes on to state—

“In 1989-90”—

which was the latest year for which figures were available—

“the estimated total value of agricultural commodity production reached a new peak of \$4,809m, 6 per cent above the previous record of \$4,520m set in 1988-89. The gross value of all crops reached a record of \$2,390m due mainly to large increases in the values of cotton, sugar cane, bananas and vegetables. The gross value of livestock slaughterings continued the rising trend, evident since 1983-84, to reach a record \$1,672m and the value of livestock products rose to \$746m, largely due to increased production and higher milk prices.”

When one speaks of agriculture, people tend to think mainly in terms of major industries such as sugar, wheat, cotton and tobacco. For the benefit of my Liberal colleagues, I make the point that agriculture is widespread throughout Queensland and is a very important part of this State's economic fibre. I ask honourable members to note the following statement that appears in the *Queensland Year Book*—

“In 1989-90 Queensland was the main Australian producer of: canary seed, grain sorghum, maize, soybeans, sugar cane, mung beans, navy beans, chick peas, panicum and millet, aloe vera, pigeon peas, peanuts, tobacco, ginger, coffee, tea, mandarins, avocados, mangoes, custard apples, papaws, bananas, pineapples, passionfruit, gooseberries, lychees, rambutans, eggfruit, lettuce, okra, rhubarb, cashews, rosellas, french beans, beetroot, broccoli, capsicums and chillies, chokos, cucumbers, marrows and squashes, zucchinis, water melons, pumpkins and sweet potatoes.”

That is not a bad list for a State that has nothing “economically relevant” outside the south-east corner!

For a short period, I lived at Mount Isa and I was very pleased to live in such a great city which produces silver, lead, copper and zinc. North of Mount Isa, Queensland has some of the world's largest deposits of bauxite. I am sure that the member for Cook, Mr Bredhauer, will also take offence at Mr Greiner's suggestion that there is nothing economically relevant outside the south-east corner of this State and will express his

views if he is given an opportunity to speak during this debate. The Bowen Basin, which contains one of the largest deposits of coal in the world, extends 500 kilometres south from the town of Bowen. It is a wonderful export earner for this State. The coal industry in New South Wales certainly pales into insignificance by comparison. Further south of Bowen, outside Rockhampton, mineral sands have recently been put on this State's economic agenda.

For a short time, I also resided in Kidston, which was named after a Premier of this State. The Kidston goldmine has been rejuvenated and is earning valuable export revenue for Queensland and for Australia. The Greenvale nickel mine has had a chequered history, but the significant point to remember is that it is viable. It is also significant that the Prime Minister recently announced in the One Nation package that \$20m will be put towards establishing new port facilities so that the industry can be even better exploited. Because I live in paradise in far-north Queensland, tourism is a subject close to my heart.

**Mrs Bird:** Hardly! The Whitsundays are paradise.

**Mr PITT:** As most members who represent northern electorates agree, features such as the reef, the rainforest and the outback have a major role to play in the tourism industry. These attractions draw tourists from all over the world, so much so that the Cairns Airport will soon become the second-busiest airport in the nation. Tourists will either arrive in Australia at Cairns and exit through Sydney or vice versa. This is a wonderful innovation because it will allow tourists to discover attractions at places that are located between those two major cities. The member for Whitsunday earlier mentioned the value of the Whitsunday area, which cannot be denied. Unlike Mr Greiner, I do not have a closed mind. In my view, the whole of Queensland has a valuable contribution to make to tourism. People who live in far-north Queensland are very lucky because the three features to which I have referred—the reef, the rainforest and the outback—are linked, thereby enabling overseas tourists to enjoy the experience that those areas of natural beauty have to offer. They all lie within a radius of a couple of hundred kilometres.

It is amazing that Mr Greiner could even suggest that industries and attractions outside the south-east corner of this State could be "economically irrelevant". To my mind, his comments are another example of Liberal Party philosophy which, to a large extent, revolves around privatisation and the sale of public assets. Having been in small business for a short period, I understand the value of private enterprise, but I certainly do not support the view that is being promoted by the Federal coalition as part of the GST package and Fightback policy, and supported by some of my colleagues in the National Party, that the privatisation road is the way to go.

Although I would like to address a range of issues, I will conclude my remarks by issuing a challenge to the official Opposition, which comprises members of the National Party. As I said earlier, much of the criticism that has been laid at their feet has been well deserved. It will be very interesting to see whether they vote for this motion or side with their rediscovered bedmates from the city. It will also be interesting to see whether they remain loyal to their country constituency and support this motion of condemnation of the New South Wales Premier's comments. For years, the Liberals of this State were seen for what they are, that is, the subservient cousins of the Nationals. Today, will we see the boot on the other foot? Will the National Party throw away its rural and its regional links to support Mr Greiner who, by his own admission, has shown a flagrant disregard for the great contribution made by Queenslanders who live outside the south-east corner of this State? I conclude my speech in the manner in which I began, by saying that although I am proud to be a Queenslanders, I am exceptionally proud to be a regional Queenslanders.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! Is there a seconder of that motion? I suggest to members that they actually jump. There is a tendency in this House for people to sit back and wait to be called.

**Mr Stoneman:** We'll give you a demonstration in a moment, Mr Speaker.

**Mr SPEAKER:** I would be delighted. I call the member for Townsville.

**Mr DAVIES** (Townsville) (11.52 a.m.): I have pleasure in seconding the motion because there has been a significant amount of indignation from north Queensland to the suggestion by New South Wales Liberal Premier, Nick Greiner, that we are not economically significant. As we are all aware, his outburst came in the wake of the success of the "No" campaign in the recent referendum on daylight-saving. Before I continue, I point out to Mr Greiner that we in the Queensland Parliament certainly work a lot harder than he does in his Parliament. During the past two years, the Queensland Parliament sat for 1 177 hours compared with the New South Wales Parliament's 929 hours. The Queensland Parliament sat for 248 hours more than the New South Wales Parliament.

**Mr Coomber:** How many hours was that?

**Mr DAVIES:** It was 1 177. As I said, Mr Greiner's outburst came in the wake of the success of the "No" campaign. I must say that I am not surprised at the outburst, because the Liberals not only in New South Wales but also federally and, most importantly, in Queensland, particularly in north Queensland, supported daylight-saving. In north Queensland, Liberal Senator Ian Macdonald said that the referendum was a complete waste of taxpayers' money. One must ask: why? Very simply, it was because his party supports daylight-saving and he thought that he was backing a winner. He thought that the "Yes" campaign would be successful and that he could then trumpet in north Queensland, "I told you so. We never had a chance of winning and the referendum expenditure was a complete waste of money." Well, he backed the loser. As for the Leader of the National Party—when the daylight-saving question came up a couple of years ago, he abstained and would not even vote in the House.

**Mr Katter:** You voted for it. You voted against your own constituents.

**Mr DAVIES:** Senator Macdonald ratted on the north and he supported the south-east corner party, the Liberal Party. The daylight-saving referendum really showed the Liberals for what they are.

**Mr Katter:** So did all your Federal members in north Queensland.

**Mr DAVIES:** The member for Flinders is ratting on the Queensland National Party by going to the Federal scene. The referendum really showed the Liberal Party for what it is—it is not only the party of the south-east corner but also it is a southern Australia party. Mr Greiner, Senator Macdonald and the honourable Joan Sheldon, Leader of the Liberal Party, all deserted north Queensland. Coincidentally, although Joan Sheldon had so much to say about split time zones before the referendum, she is not even here to talk about the issue. I am reminded by my colleague the member for Cook that the Leader of the Liberal Party left the House saying that she had better things to do. When the next election comes around in north Queensland, we will remember that she had better things to do.

**Mr FitzGerald** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Lockyer!

**Mr DAVIES:** Mrs Sheldon tried to have a dollar each way by supporting daylight-saving but saying that split time zones are the way to solve the problem. The results have shown that split time zones are not the answer. When Mrs Sheldon was in north Queensland or rural Queensland—if she has ever been there—she was trying to say the politically safe thing to say. Mrs Sheldon is finding that politics is harder than that. I would have said "as she is aware", but as she is not here, she will have to read my speech. How would she now draw the split time zones? Not only the people in north and western Queensland voted against daylight-saving but also the people in Toowoomba, where the

vote was almost 66 per cent against daylight-saving; Maroochydore, where the vote was 49.5 per cent against; Mooloolah, 46.9 per cent against; Ipswich, 47.1 per cent against; Ipswich West, 49 per cent against; Redcliffe, 45.9 per cent against; Nudgee, 43.3 per cent against; Noosa, 45.8 per cent against; and—wait for it—Caloundra, where Mrs Sheldon will run in the next election, where the vote was 49.4 per cent against daylight-saving. And Mrs Sheldon supports daylight-saving!

The Leader of the Liberal Party in Queensland, Mrs Sheldon, who calls press conferences in Townsville at 8 a.m. and then wonders why no-one turns up, has found that she has backed another loser with the split time zones. She only just got it right in the new seat for which she will run—Caloundra—by 0.6 per cent. If her political judgment is as bad as that, how can she ever hope to hold any higher office? As I said earlier, Joan Sheldon, Senator Macdonald and New South Wales Premier, Nick Greiner, are not interested in north Queensland or western Queensland. The Goss Government is, and the fact that only Tom Burns was prepared to support the “No” campaign is an indictment on the Liberals and, for that matter, the Leader of the National Party, Mr Borbidge, who, when the matter was raised a couple of years ago, ran out of the House and abstained. It is clear that in Queensland the National Party—previously, the Country Party—is becoming the Gold Coast connection. It is also clear that the coalition in Queensland is a lucky dip, because both Mrs Sheldon and Mr Borbidge will probably not even be here after the next election. The poor old Queensland Liberals still have their nappies put on by the National Party.

I will now concentrate on the economy of Queensland, in particular north Queensland, which New South Wales Premier, Nick Greiner, chose to denigrate. Before doing that, I remind Mr Greiner that many areas of New South Wales are still opposed to daylight-saving, despite it having been in operation in that State since the trial year of 1971. Broken Hill, for instance, operates on central time, not summer-time, as does Sydney. In other words, it aligns itself with South Australia and Adelaide. The daylight-saving task force reported to me in a telephone conversation a couple of years ago that each year in New South Wales thousands of letters are written by constituents to the New South Wales Government reiterating their opposition to daylight-saving, despite it having been in operation in that State now for nearly 21 years. So, Mr Greiner perhaps—just perhaps—should heed the advice of Queensland Deputy Premier, Tom Burns, and hold a referendum in that State, because he just might be surprised at the result. The referendum in Queensland has settled the issue democratically once and for all. In other words, the electorates, unlike in 1971, directly decided that the politicians should not give the answer but that it is a matter that the electorates should be able to decide, and they have decided it once and for all. It gives me some personal pride to have reasonably predicted the result. My public forecast for some time before the election was a 55 per cent “No” result and a 45 per cent “Yes” result.

**Mr Stoneman:** Why didn't you put your hand up and show your support for the people of Townsville when you had the chance? You didn't.

**Mr DAVIES:** Was the honourable member not in the House when the vote was taken recently? The Leader of the Opposition ran out of the Chamber and would not vote. At least I had the courage to vote.

The Government must thank the Deputy Premier, Tom Burns, for a significant proportion of the “No” vote. He barnstormed the State pushing the “No” vote and he deserves our thanks. Tom Burns showed us that he is more concerned about country and regional Queenslanders than the National Party, which currently represents more of rural Queensland than does the Government. Since its election in 1989, the Goss Government has delivered two Budgets which have been widely acknowledged as the best Budgets of all the States. It is significant that the member for Flinders is running out. Why is he

running out? Obviously the honourable member knows that he has no future in this House, that the National Party will never again govern in this State, and he hopes that he can get on the Hewson band wagon.

**Mr KATTER:** I rise to a point of order. I have been accused of ratting and running out on this place. I am taking the great abilities of this House to the Federal House.

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

**Mr DAVIES:** Both Budgets were characterised by increased spending on previously neglected social programs, no new taxes, no increases in existing tax rates and no increases in charges by more than the inflation rate. That is better than the National Party could ever do. The Government's Budget targets have also been achieved despite the impact of the worst national recession since the World War and an unprecedented wave of natural disasters that have had to be contended with in its first couple of years, such as the Charleville and western floods, cyclone Joy and, as recently as last year, widespread severe drought. Both Budgets featured operating surpluses and, more importantly, negative net financing requirements. In other words, the State Government was able to achieve its higher Budget targets without increasing debts or taxes. In fact, since its election, the Government has slashed debts.

Queensland has the lowest net debt per capita of all the States and is the only State in which debt levels are falling. This has meant that the Queensland Government has been able to keep State taxes at the lowest levels per capita in Australia and 50 per cent lower than those in New South Wales. So what has Mr Greiner got to crow about? The good financial management by this State Government has enhanced Queensland's sound financial position and has meant that the Government has not been forced to resort to imposing new or higher taxes to fund programs. Queensland does not have a fuel tax and it has no financial institutions duty. In addition, since its election, the Government has made significant cuts in existing taxes such as payroll tax and it has offered land tax concessions. Queensland's low-tax status is encouraging businesses to expand and invest in this State and is fundamental to this Government's economic development strategy. The merger of the Stamp Duties Office and the Land Tax Office to form the Office of State Revenue has led to an improvement in the efficiency and effectiveness of taxation collections and a better service to clients. A tax liaison group has also been established as a consultative mechanism to assist tax professionals in the private sector, which will eventually lead to simpler and more efficient tax legislation.

The Queensland Government is firmly committed to wide-ranging, micro-economic reform to improve the efficiency of the State economy. The main focus has been on streamlining the public sector and improving its performance. In August 1990, a Green Paper on corporatisation of Government-owned enterprises was released and, following public responses, the Government has endorsed corporatisation as the broad policy direction for reforming State trading authorities. A White Paper has now been prepared which will form the basis of future legislation. The establishment in May 1991 of the Queensland Investment Corporation made it Queensland's first Government-owned enterprise. The Queensland Treasury Corporation has a Triple A credit rating—the only unchallenged rating for such an institution in Australia. Its borrowing costs are the cheapest of any such institution in any State. A more efficient and commercially focused Queensland Industry Development Corporation has been attained as a result of recommendations in the Polichronis report. A complete review of the non-bank financial institutions has resulted in the other States adopting Queensland's moves to reform the industry by removing restrictive legislation and replacing it with a comprehensive system of prudential supervision. The Government has also been improving relations with the business community and has made a conscious effort to improve Treasury's relations with

the business community and the public in general. The *Queensland Economic Review* is published quarterly by the Treasury Department independent of the Government.

In the area of tourism—I note that the Minister for Tourism is in the Chamber—the Government has made substantial efforts. I cite the example of the restructuring of the QTTC. The Minister, through hard work and with the aid of the QTTC, is boosting air services into Queensland, in particular Cairns and other areas in north Queensland. I am informed that, in the near future, Britannia Airways will provide approximately 28 extra flights a week.

This Government is a Government of reform. We do not back away from that. As the Prime Minister said recently, the Labor Party is the party of reform. It is the only party that tackles the hard things, and we are doing that. The efficient operation of Queensland's transport system in all its forms is vital to the economic well-being of the State. The reforms undertaken so far will bring tangible benefits to everyone in the State, including our business and industry sectors. Services within the Department of Transport have been amalgamated to produce a more coordinated, efficient system for the benefit of taxpayers. Legislation, particularly amendments to the Railways Act and the Main Roads Act, has been introduced which will bring the transport industry into the twenty-first century. Queensland Rail has undertaken a \$277m urban rail expansion program which will greatly improve city train services for commuters. Operation Facelift has also been launched to progressively upgrade the railway stations to make them safer and more attractive.

I will now concentrate for a moment on north Queensland. I will quote from the *Townsville Bulletin* editorial which responded to Mr Greiner's attack on Queensland, and particularly north Queensland, in which he said that we were economically insignificant. It stated—

“New South Wales Premier Nick Greiner, having made a hash of leading his own State by turning a wave of goodwill and a record majority into a tide of anger and a hamstrung minority in just one term, is now giving Queensland advice on how to run its internal affairs.”

**Mr Barber:** What a joke!

**Mr DAVIES:** It is a joke. The editorial continued—

“It is advice we can well do without, lest Queensland, too, catches the Greiner disease, the symptoms of which are arrogance and gaucherie along with a large measure of ignorance. All of these are encapsulated in his statement published yesterday that Queensland should adopt two time zones, one for the south-east and the other for the rest of the State, so that, in his words, ‘the economically relevant part of Queensland (is) on the same time as Tasmania, Victoria and NSW and allows country Queensland to be treated differently’.

This patronising piece of puerility can only mean that Mr Greiner believes all of Queensland, apart from the south-east corner, is economically irrelevant—an appalling display of ignorance. The facts are: North Queensland's total annual exports of \$5.1 billion represent 60 per cent of Queensland's total exports and 11.8 per cent of Australia's total exports. And it must be noted that these figures are for the North only—they do not include the rich south-west of the State, for which separate figures are unavailable. To describe the North and south-west, particularly the North with its wide variety of products and the rich diversity of its natural resources, as economically irrelevant is fatuous nonsense. That it comes from the Premier of Australia's oldest and richest State illustrates the shallow and uninformed thinking of so many politicians, power brokers and businesspeople in the south, who regard the whole of Queensland as irrelevant.”

**An honourable member:** And the selfishness of the Liberal thinking, too.

**Mr DAVIES:** I take that interjection. The editorial went on to state—

“Regrettably, they are encouraged in this belief by many in the self-important south-east corner who have, since the decisive daylight saving vote, been denigrating Queenslanders for not having supported non-productive, computer-juggling stock exchange members, managers of corporate branches, Brisbane Lord Mayor Soorley and others who cannot handle an hour’s time difference. Shame on them—as Queenslanders and wimps.”

As I have only a few minutes left in which to speak—

**Mr Stoneman:** Thank God!

**Mr DAVIES:** I ask the honourable member if he is in favour of daylight-saving. His electorate voted 84 per cent against daylight-saving. Is he in the same boat as his Burdekin colleague Senator Macdonald?

**Mr Stoneman** interjected.

**Mr DAVIES:** The honourable member should answer the question. Finally, it is worth saying that in New South Wales—the so-called well-managed State that Premier Greiner trumpets—the State’s total liabilities are \$51,495,000,000, which represents a liability of \$8,726 for every man, woman and child in New South Wales.

**A Government member:** That is disgraceful.

**Mr DAVIES:** It is disgraceful. That astounding figure of almost \$9,000 per person made it essential that the Greiner Government had to savagely take the knife to Government expenditure.

Time expired.

**Dr WATSON** (Moggill—Deputy Leader of the Liberal Party) (12.12 p.m.): Before speaking to the motion moved by the member for Mulgrave, I move the following amendments—

“At line 1, delete—

‘condemns’

and insert—

‘disagrees with comments made by’ ”;

“At line 2, delete—

‘for his insulting comments’.”

It is absolutely incredible that, yet again, the Labor Party has come into this place and tried to suggest that something is wrong with what people of a different political persuasion might say. When people in this place suggest that the Government of this State has an economic agenda that can be determined, something is wrong. At the last State election, what was the economic agenda of the Labor Party? It was a State bank and closer ties with China.

**Mr J. H. SULLIVAN:** I rise to a point of order. The member for Moggill is completely misrepresenting the point.

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

**Dr WATSON:** I suspect that the member for Glass House did not even read the economic agenda—or lack of economic agenda—on which his party was running. The two issues which were being pushed were a State bank and closer economic ties with China. What happened to them? Closer economic ties with China died with Tiananmen Square. That is how long that part of the agenda lasted. The second issue, a State bank, died when

the Government found out that, under a Labor administration, John Cain's State Bank of Victoria went to the wall, followed very closely by the State Bank of South Australia. It was followed by the Rural and Industries Bank of Western Australia which, under Labor administrations, has been absolutely destroyed.

This Government has the audacity to come into this place and start talking about others, assuming or pretending that it actually has an agenda on which to run. It is no wonder that somebody from outside this State does not believe there is any economic agenda and does not believe that this Government cares about any part of Queensland, let alone those areas outside the south-east corner. That is the problem. When things are looked at in an objective sense, it will be seen that the Government has not done anything. It is no wonder someone can say that this Government considers anywhere outside south-east Queensland to be irrelevant, because that is the way in which this Government acts and portrays things. In New South Wales, Greiner and his Government do not have to listen to the rhetoric that we in this Chamber have to put up with when the Premier and the Treasurer make statements. Instead, they look at the actions of this Government, to which I will refer. It is no wonder that somebody outside this State says, "You guys are ignoring the area outside south-east Queensland." That is exactly what this Government is doing. At the last election, this Government's agenda was the Fitzgerald reforms. Today, we have seen in the newspaper and in this House the sorts of problems that the Government is running into and how far those reforms have gone. When the Government started to run out of reforms, it ran out of everything.

**Mr T. B. Sullivan** interjected.

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

**Dr WATSON:** Members opposite do not like the truth to be told. The only agenda that the Government had was one based upon what Tony Fitzgerald gave it. It did not have any economic agenda. It is no wonder that the Government is perceived to be doing nothing for this State.

**Mr J. H. Sullivan:** You are misleading the House.

**Dr WATSON:** In many instances, when it came to reform, the Government squibbed on it, and it has also squibbed on it when it has come to the economic agenda of this State. Let me refer to some of the decisions that this Government has made which affect areas outside the south-east corner of Queensland. I refer to the circumstances surrounding the Greenvale nickel project, which is in the area from which the member for Townsville comes. What has the Government done on that issue? It has squibbed on it. It has not been prepared to take the tough decisions to make sure that that project would go ahead and that it would be a viable, economic project. The Government wants to impose costs on some of the other users of the Townsville port, users which do not need the port expanded. But when it came to the tough issue of putting a new facility where it should have gone, where it would have been economically viable, the Government squibbed on it. It is no wonder people say that the Government does not care about north Queensland, because when it makes decisions, that is what happens. I refer now to the Gladstone Power Station. It was absolutely essential for the development of the—

**Mr DAVIES:** I rise to a point of order. The member said that we squibbed on it. It is in fact before the Administrative Appeals Tribunal.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! There is no point of order. Can I suggest to members that this Speaker is starting to get a little bit peeved by members taking frivolous points of order. I warn members not to take frivolous points of order.

**Dr WATSON:** As I said, I will refer to the Gladstone Power Station, which is an issue critical to the development of central Queensland—an area which is outside the south-east corner of Queensland. The Boyne Island smelter needs to expand. A few years

ago, there was a window of opportunity for it to expand by putting in a third potline. And what is critical to the development of a new potline at Gladstone? It is the cost of electricity. That is the fundamental issue. That is the most important element that goes into the refining and smelting process. What did the company want? It wanted a private power station because it wanted to be assured of a good, constant and cheap supply of electricity. The company was prepared to put up its money to buy the station and make the investment to make sure that that station was in fact economically viable, and then put in the potline. How much was that going to cost? It was probably an investment of \$1.5 billion. The construction of the project would have provided 1 200 to 1 500 jobs and, on an ongoing basis, 400 to 500 jobs, and would have made \$400m in export earnings. But what happened? The Government could not get its ETU mates to agree to the power station being privatised, and it squibbed on it again. No wonder somebody outside this State says, "Nothing is going on outside south-east Queensland." The decisions that this Government makes enforce that.

On the issue of privatisation, one should look at what Greiner has done in Port Kembla and Newcastle. In that area, he has privatised a port which is critical to New South Wales coal exports. All of the ports along the coast of Queensland, including Hay Point, service central and north Queensland—areas outside the south-east corner—but what has the Government done? Nothing! What has happened in New South Wales? Greiner said, "Yes, that is critical. We must get our coal exports going. We must reduce our costs. The way we will do it is by privatising the ports." That was done 12 months ago and fantastic results have been achieved. The prices for loading coal have dropped by \$1.23 a tonne, which is a 22 per cent reduction. The throughput of coal has increased. In 1989-90, throughput was 9.73 million tonnes. In 1990-91, it increased to 13.03 million tonnes, an increase of 34 per cent. Most importantly, this increase in throughput was met by a change in the tonnes per man-year going through that place. There was an increase from 25 600 tonnes to 56 673 tonnes per man-year. That is the difference that privatisation made. This State has to do the same thing. Industries in central and north Queensland—particularly those in central Queensland—depend very much upon the production of coal and the way in which that is sent to our export markets. What has this Government done about that? Not a damn thing! In no way has it tried to increase our coal exports or increase economic activity in that area.

Before the last election, Labor Party members went around board rooms promising to do something about coal rail freights. But what has been done? Not a thing! Those members talked about increasing the economic welfare of central Queensland, but they have done nothing about it. The Government was pushed to set up a committee, but it has been delayed and delayed. Despite the fact that representatives from coal companies have visited the Premier and the Treasurer, and despite the fact that a working group is now operating, the Government has been unable to deliver. Yet it claims to be doing something for the central Queensland coal industry. But what is it doing? Not a thing! It is no wonder that somebody from outside Queensland questions whether any economic agenda exists for central or north Queensland. Recently, I visited part of central Queensland and examined the citrus fruit growing industry and some of the problems that growers face with our ports. I was told in Gayndah—

**Mr Bredhauer:** It's outside the south-east corner.

**Dr WATSON:** It is outside the immediate south-east corner.

**Mr Nunn:** Where is it?

**Dr WATSON:** It is up to the member to find out. I spoke to one individual in Gayndah who has a fairly good production process and is trying to export his produce from Queensland. He told me that it costs \$2 more per carton to shift mandarins through our ports in Queensland than it does to do the very same thing through ports in North America.

That represents the equivalent of that grower's gross profit. But it is an example of the inefficiency that exists. The Government talks about increasing primary production and encouraging wealth outside the south-east corner of Queensland, but it is doing nothing about it. The Government should be considering what it costs growers to send cartons through ports in this State. It means a lot of money to those growers and to Queensland in general. What has happened to employment rates in Queensland outside the Brisbane City area? The latest employment figures were released only one hour ago. In terms of the actual number of unemployed people in Queensland, the figure has increased to 170 600.

**Mrs Bird:** You've got the wrong numbers.

**Dr WATSON:** That is the actual number of unemployed people. I am talking about the actual number of unemployed people and the families who are affected—not the seasonally adjusted econometricians' figures which will probably be referred to in tonight's news and upon which most people concentrate. I am talking about the real people. In real terms, 11.4 per cent of our labour force is unemployed. They are the people who are really hurting. In seasonally adjusted terms, the figure rose to 10.4 per cent. This is where this Government's policies are leading.

My colleague the member for Sherwood points out to me that the figure in New South Wales is 10 per cent. Therefore, according to the latest available figures—they were released only 57 minutes ago—Queensland's unemployment rate is 0.4 per cent above that of New South Wales. I thank the member for Mulgrave for allowing me to point out that the person in New South Wales whom he is trying to criticise has economic policies that are working to keep down unemployment levels in that State. But because this Government has no economic policies or economic agenda, our State's unemployment rates are increasing. I guarantee that a break-down of figures from CES offices in every regional centre in Queensland outside the south-east corner will reveal that unemployment rates are increasing quite substantially. I am sure that more people are now on—I was going to say the dole—Jobstart programs than there were when this Government came to office, and that their numbers have been increasing in the past few months. It is no wonder that somebody outside Queensland is claiming that nothing is being done in this State outside the south-east corner. Queensland provides a greater proportion of exports for this country—

**Mr J. H. Sullivan:** What sort of exports?

**Dr WATSON:** All types of exports. The point is that this Government has done nothing about exports from central and north Queensland.

**Mr J. H. Sullivan:** What about rail freights?

**Dr WATSON:** I have already mentioned rail freights. The Government has also done nothing in that regard. Because of the importance of trade and the port system in Queensland, and because we must be internationally competitive, the Government must do something about these issues. If we are to have rising standards of living, decreasing unemployment rates and greater job opportunities we must ensure that our traditional base, which is in mining, agriculture and developing tourism—most of which is outside the south-east corner—is promoted so that those industries increase their efficiency and their competitiveness in the world. But this Government is doing nothing to improve our position.

It is amazing that the individuals who represent the Labor Party in this House are trying to berate opposition members. Prior to the change in the Prime Ministership, those Labor Party members were strong Hawke supporters, but they are now strong Keating supporters who will go with him to the grave. I wish them good luck. They seek to impose on Australia a regime which is destined to lead us into greater foreign debt. There is no doubt that, because of the additional expenditure generated by the Federal Labor

Government, which is not funded in any particular way, we will be facing significant Federal Budget deficits.

The potential tax cuts are obviously just figments of Keating's imagination. These things are way out in the distance. They are figments of his imagination. Australian people will never see them. If we do see them, they will be at a great cost. The cost will be significantly higher deficits in this country and a significantly higher balance of payments problem. The tax on goods and services has been eschewed by Labor. The Federal Government wants to continue to penalise Australian businesses by making sure they continue to pay for things such as the wholesale sales tax and the excise duty on fuel. Those are the types of things which make Australian businesses, particularly those in Queensland, less competitive. The Federal Labor Government seems to want to make sure our industries have to compete on an unequal basis with imports. It seems to wish to make sure our export industries have to compete on an unequal basis because these industries are paying taxes which people in other countries do not have to pay because they have a value-added tax. Those are the policies of the Government. It is no wonder nothing is happening outside south-east Queensland. The policies adopted by the Queensland Government discourage it. It is about time this Government started adopting some of Greiner's policies to get this State and our country going again.

**Mr STONEMAN** (12.33 p.m.): I rise in this debate to second the amendment moved by the honourable member for Moggill. In doing so, I ask: why has the Government chosen to bring on this debate today? It raises a major question for the people of this State whom we collectively represent. The four Bills that have been on the notice paper since 5 December 1991 are being ignored. A long time has passed since the adjournment of the House prior to Christmas. No legislation that is in the interests of this State is being brought forward by any Ministers. That is the work for which we are being paid. I have to ask the reason for this debate today. If Terry Mackenroth had been the Minister in charge of the House, this would not have happened. Mr Mackenroth was able to see the wood from the trees. The man who could direct this must be writhing in shame that the House has fallen into such disrepute in a few weeks in the eyes of the people in this State. I am not pointing at Mr Gibbs. I know that he is filling in for the man who has no substance—the new Leader of the House. Why can we not debate something worth while from the notice paper? For instance, Mr Beanland has given notice of motion about the 1 881 election promises that have been broken in respect of increased taxes and charges. That affects Queensland directly. Why are we not debating Mr Borbidge's motion concerning more than 150 000 Queenslanders out of work? Today's figures indicate that 170 000 Queenslanders are out of work. Why are we not debating Mrs McCauley's motion concerning the unbelievable situation which exists on the Darling Downs and in other areas of the State in relation to the changed structures in the Health Department? Why are we not talking about the focus of a great deal of today's debate, the problem of the police, the running-down of the Police Service because of the restructuring of the finances of this State? Why are we not talking about that? Why are we not talking about things which Mr Santoro has brought before the House concerning the special increased powers of union members—

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! I am giving the honourable member some latitude to get back to the motion. I hope we do not have to go through every notice of motion.

**Mr STONEMAN:** I am rounding up the point, Mr Speaker. I believe we have to come to an understanding of why the Government would bring on this particular debate. I think it is worth while making a few other points. Members of the previous Government referred to daylight-saving. The original motion and the amendment deal with the economics of this State, not about daylight-saving. Yet Government members, particularly the member for Townsville, focused on that issue. It was interesting that he did not read four pages of his speech when he was reminded that he, along with every member

of the Labor Party, voted to support daylight-saving. The people of the State failed to have their say through their members in this House. The member went through the process of talking about daylight-saving, which has nothing to do with this motion, or with the amendment, which I support. This motion diverts attention from the major problems in law and order. It draws particular attention to the waste of taxpayers' money.

Today we are using up one hour of the time of this House on some frivolous, throw-away comment made by an out-of-towner, the Premier of New South Wales, who has his own agenda. That is his problem. This Government feels that the comment that the New South Wales Premier made is relevant to the people of this State and wants to debate it. One must look at why the Premier of New South Wales might make such a comment, which is really just a bit of political flotsam in the sea of statements that are made from time to time. The statement has no economic relevance to Queensland, yet it has been taken up as a major issue. Mr Greiner probably does not even recall making the statement.

Let us look at what the Premier of New South Wales might be looking at when he looks north. He would have to wonder what is going on up here. I will quote from the latest *IPA Review* of 1992 and make the point that the things Mr Greiner would be reading about which might pre-empt some of his statements are covered on page 39 of this latest volume. An article relating to an overview of the State budgetary processes states—

“For the second consecutive year, the Lemon Award goes to South Australia. Victoria and Queensland were joint runners-up for the Lemon Award—Victoria for continuing not to live within its means and Queensland for dissipating its inheritance.”

That is the sort of thing that Mr Greiner would be looking at. Just in case members on the Government side of the House say that that is a bit of conservative rhetoric, I advise them that the man who wrote this was a staffer of Mr Dowding's in Western Australia and a well-known Labor-based operator. I will read a couple of other comments from that article because they are relevant and are the sorts of things on which Mr Greiner would make his judgment. Further on it states—

“Although the Goss Government has not squandered the sound fiscal position it inherited from its predecessor, it plans to take a step towards doing so in 1991-92. Queensland's 1991-92 Budget includes a 10.3 per cent increase in recurrent expenditure. Most of the additional recurrent expenditure is to be consumed on higher wages and more staff, with 2,000 more full-time positions to be added to general government sector agencies during 1991-92. Capital outlays are expected to grow by a colossal 35 per cent.”

The article concludes—

“However, Mr Goss will have to stop his big-spending ways if he is to avoid dissipating one of Queensland's greatest assets—a fiscally sound public sector.”

I return to the basis of Mr Greiner's comments. Why would he have made them? One only has to look a little beyond the boundaries of Noosa and Ipswich to find the answer. For instance, if Mr Greiner comes up to north Queensland into my own electorate, he will find a uranium mine which has been sitting there for thousands of years. All the necessary environmental impact studies have been carried out and there is no reason not to mine that facility. It is just outside the towns of Townsville and Thuringowa and right alongside where the member for Townsville lives. It would replace the concrete factory that one of my colleagues spoke of a moment ago. It would create between 1 100 and 1 500 jobs and billions and billions of dollars worth of export income for this nation, and this State in particular. That is the sort of thing we need. Mr Greiner would have to wonder what is going on. Why are we locking up sustainable resources such as timber and closing the timber industry down? Products have to be imported from other areas. Why would Mr Greiner

wonder what we are up to? Why lock away those resources? Mr Greiner would also be wondering why we are closing down services to our great primary producing sectors. Why are we increasing taxes payable by primary producers? Leasing costs are increasing astronomically and Department of Primary Industries services are diminishing dramatically across-the-board. We are purchasing huge tracts of productive land at great public expense and turning them into unmanaged national parks. The list goes on. Government members will need to contemplate this matter, because those are the sorts of problems that this State will be increasingly faced with if this fiscal policy is allowed to continue.

This Government talks about responsibility, but that is the rhetoric of a group of people who are using past good practices to change entirely the structure of the Government's resources. Why are those leased lands being priced out of viability? I note that this review states that in the next 10 years, in respect of farm managers and workers across Australia, growth will be a negative 11 per cent. The number of people who produce the wealth of the nation will be reduced, but at the other end of the scale the need for social workers is being generated by the degradation of the common, basic factors of life that our party holds so dear and which conservative members of Parliament across Australia have tried to uphold for so many years. These values are being undermined and taken away by this Government under its social justice structure. In the next 10 years, the number of social workers in Australia is anticipated to grow by 83 per cent. Already there are huge numbers of social workers, but the number is to be increased eightfold. The number of people in the primary industries sector will decrease by 11 per cent because of the imposition of charges and so on. One would have to wonder what sorts of signals these actions are sending to the community. Unfortunately, the way things are going, Mr Greiner may well turn out to be correct. There is a contraction of this Government's focus away from the north, the west and the areas beyond the Noosa River and west of Ipswich and a concentration on the south-east corner.

**Mr BARBER:** I rise to a point of order. The member is seconding the amendment that this House disagrees with comments made by the Premier of New South Wales. He has just said that Mr Greiner may well be right.

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

**Mr STONEMAN:** For a moment I was hoping that the member's point of order might be relevant. I make the point that Mr Greiner would see that contraction. I take the point made by the honourable member that we disagree with that comment but, unfortunately, the facts of life are that it could well come to pass unless the people of this State wake up—I am sure that they will—and remove the problem, which is the centralist Government that is squandering the assets of Queensland's past.

Too much attention is being focused on gross State production and not enough attention is being given to the traded goods sector. At the end of the day, if the farm does not produce more than it costs to run it, it will go broke. This is a problem that has been created by the policies of the Goss Government. The Premier of New South Wales, Mr Greiner, is surrounded by States that have similar structures of mismanagement, with Victoria to the south, South Australia to the west and Queensland to the north. He would know that Cain did to Victoria what Wayne Goss wants to do to Queensland, and he would be aware of the contraction of services and the huge levels of indebtedness of some State Governments. John Bannon is Premier of the lemon Government of Australian politics—the man who was a past Federal President of the Australian Labor Party—and Mr Greiner would be aware of the way in which Mr Bannon has mismanaged the South Australian economy. He would also be reading about the Queensland Government's second-worst lemon award. Having said that, I return to the point I wish to make in seconding the motion moved by the member for Moggill, Dr Watson. I emphasise that the Opposition disagrees with the comment that anything outside the south-east corner of this

State is “economically irrelevant”, but I emphasise that in spite of the unfortunate disagreement between the Queensland opposition parties and Mr Greiner, the purport of his comments could well come to fruition if current trends continue.

One must consider why a Government would bring on a debate on a motion such as this today. Why would a Government waste an hour of the time of this Parliament to discuss matters such as daylight-saving? I take up the point made by the member for Townsville in relation to daylight-saving, which has huge relevance to the productive areas of this State. The member for Townsville should have followed the example set by the Leader of the Opposition by first and foremost representing the wishes of his constituents and acknowledging the basis upon which his constituents elected him to this Parliament. The Leader of the Opposition reflected those commitments, and the Opposition is flexible enough to acknowledge that the role of a parliamentarian is to faithfully represent all people across the State. What does this Government do? Without question, the member for Townsville voted against the wishes of his constituents that were later expressed by a 75 per cent “No” vote when the referendum was held. In fact, the vote recorded in the area that now comprises the Burdekin district showed even more strongly the feeling against daylight-saving, yet that man and his party are so out of touch that they took an overall policy stance and said, “This is what the people of Queensland want.” And did they get a thrashing at the referendum! The member for Townsville is now trying to lambast the Leader of the Opposition for representing the wishes of all the people in his electorate who had contacted him and who wanted daylight-saving.

**Mr McGrady:** He didn't vote for it the first time.

**Mr STONEMAN:** In the Leader of the Opposition's electorate, 100 per cent of the people were in favour of daylight-saving.

**Mr McGrady:** He was outside in the corridor.

**Mr STONEMAN:** The Minister for Resource Industries, who is also the member for Mount Isa, knew full well and has said day and night since the trial was introduced that daylight-saving was a disaster, yet he did not have the fortitude to vote against it, and neither did the member for Barron River and all the other wimps. None of them had the fortitude to stand up and represent the preference of people by whom they were elected.

**Mr McGrady:** What did your leader do?

**Mr STONEMAN:** I have already covered that. The Minister should have been in the Chamber a couple of minutes ago. A reference was made by way of interjection to the Fightback package, which has the capacity to impact on the whole nation. If members of Parliament wanted to send a message to the people who elect them, why would the Government not bring forward a debate on the Fightback package—if it is so terrible—so that a comparison can be made between the One Nation package and the Fightback package? Honourable members know that all the orders come from Canberra and that the script has not yet been written. The Prime Minister is exhibiting diversionary tactics because when the One Nation package saw the light of day—as the law and order issue will see the light of day in Queensland today—what did Mr Keating do? He did a bit of Pom-bashing. I know that the member for Barron River and the member who hails from Liverpool will be incensed at those remarks. I am proud of my English heritage which stretches back over seven generations. I revere my forebears and I am mindful of the strategies of diversion that are used in many political forums.

The purpose of this debate is to divert attention from the real issue, which is the 170 000-odd people who are out of work. The Government is trying to divert attention from the fact that the economic development of Queensland has ground to a halt because

investors no longer have enough confidence to bring their businesses to Queensland. The Government also seeks to divert attention from the question that the Minister for Land Management would not answer— which has nothing to do with legislation that is before the Parliament— and wants to divert attention from the fact that the Minister gave a promise which has been broken. What will the people who are affected by that decision do? I guess they will not join the Labor Party, but will take their money to some other place. They will move their investments off shore or, unfortunately, they could move south into Mr Greiner's territory. Mr Greiner's job is to do the best he can for his State of New South Wales. I say that the Government and members of this Parliament should be doing the best they can for this State and should not be engaged in a debate on a flotsam issue. The Government should be giving support to the people of this State, ensuring that kids are being given jobs, ensuring that investors are given confidence and that this State is put back on the rails to fulfil its logical role, which is leading the nation in economic development and job creation. I have much pleasure in supporting the amendment that has been moved by the member for Moggill, Dr Watson.

**Mr PITT** (Mulgrave) (12.52 p.m.), in reply: What a disgraceful performance this afternoon by the Liberal Party and the National Party. It was a good example of hypocrisy on the part of the Liberal Party. That party does not know anything about Queensland outside the south-east corner. This afternoon, the Liberal Party spokesman, with no compass and no map, lost his way to central Queensland. I wonder what else members of the Liberal Party know about the rest of the State. Again, the National Party was a disgrace. Members of the National Party, along with Premier Nick Greiner, should be condemned. This afternoon, the National Party indicated that it is now engaged in toadyism. Once upon a time, the National Party dog wagged the Liberal tail. It would appear now that the Liberals at the Federal level have some sort of ascendancy to the National Party in Queensland, which will be the tail of the Liberal dog in Canberra.

I am very concerned that Dr Watson did not raise the subject of privatisation of Queensland Rail. I live at the far end of the north coast line, and I can tell the House that if Dr Watson and his people—along with the Greiners of this world—had their way, that line would be privatised, and I could guarantee the people of Queensland that those who live outside the south-east corner would not get the services that this Government and previous Governments have tried to put in place for rural Queenslanders. Dr Watson stands condemned. The member for Tablelands did not speak in the debate, but I have no doubt that he would have stood up and given the Liberal Party a good serve on the tobacco tax. This morning, the Treasurer rose in the House to indicate that the GST package contained an element that would indicate that, at the retail point of sale, 40 per cent would be added on to the price of tobacco. If the member for Tablelands had influence over his National Party colleagues, he would have indicated to them that that would be disastrous for the Mareeba/Dimbulah area.

There is no doubt in my mind that the National Party has sold out on the issue. National Party members are so keen to get into bed with the Liberals in Queensland that they are willing to sell out their principles. I always thought that the National Party stood for something in the bush. It appears now that, because the Liberal Party is needed to gain Government again—if the National Party is ever going to gain Government—National Party members are willing to prostitute themselves in an electoral sense. The amendment put forward by the member for Moggill and supported by the member for Burdekin is certainly not acceptable to the Government. We on this side of the House are proud to stand up for Queensland. We are not frightened to tell Mr Greiner where to go. He should stick his nose into somebody else's business and keep it out of Queensland. Over the years, the National Party has had a proud record of "Queensland first". It now appears that

it is not "Queensland first"; it is "votes first" and a chance to crawl back into bed with the Liberals and get into Government.

Today, I was proud to move the motion. I thank the member of the Government who seconded the motion, Mr Davies. I will pick up on one point that he made, which puts to rest any argument put forward by Mr Greiner. North Queensland—which, admittedly, is only part of the area of Queensland outside the south-east corner—contributes \$5.1 billion to the State's economy. That is 60 per cent of Queensland's export revenue and 11.8 per cent of Australia's export revenue. We are proud of what we are doing in far-north Queensland, north Queensland and throughout the State. Mr Greiner has again made a goose of himself.

Question—That the words proposed to be omitted stand part of the motion—put; and the House divided—

AYES, 45		NOES, 27	
Ardill	McGrady	Beanland	Watson
Barber	McLean	Booth	
Beattie	Milliner	Connor	
Bird	Nunn	Coomber	
Bredhauer	Palaszczuk	Elliott	
Briskey	Pearce	FitzGerald	
Campbell	Power	Gilmore	
Casey	Robson	Goss J. N.	
Clark	Schwarten	Hobbs	
Comben	Smyth	Johnson	
D'Arcy	Spence	Katter	
Davies	Sullivan J. H.	Lester	
Dollin	Sullivan T. B.	Lingard	
Eaton	Szczerbanik	McCauley	
Edmond	Vaughan	Perrett	
Elder	Warburton	Randell	
Fenlon	Warner	Rowell	
Flynn	Welford	Santoro	
Foley	Woodgate	Sheldon	
Gibbs		Slack	
Hamill		Springborg	
Hayward	<i>Tellers:</i>	Stephan	<i>Tellers:</i>
Hollis	Prest	Stoneman	Neal
Livingstone	Pitt	Turner	Dunworth

Resolved in the affirmative.

Motion agreed to.

Sitting suspended from 1.03 to 2.30 p.m.

## CRIMINAL JUSTICE COMMISSION

### Report

**Mr SPEAKER:** I have to inform the House that today I received from the Chairman of the Criminal Justice Commission the report entitled *Report on an inquiry into allegations made by Terence Michael Mackenroth MLA the former Minister for Police and Emergency Services; and associated matters.*

Ordered to be printed.

## VALUERS REGISTRATION BILL

### Second Reading

Debate resumed from 5 December 1991 (see p. 3852).

**Mr HOBBS** (Warrego) (2.31 p.m.): I am pleased to be able to speak today to this Bill before the House. Work has been going on for a number of years in an effort to streamline legislation to enable registered valuers, the Government and the public to work more closely together so that the community in general will have confidence in the process of valuation. The Minister for Land Management introduced this Bill into the House on 5 December 1991 and, for the benefit of those members in the Chamber today, I will outline some of its objectives. It replaces the Valuers Registration Act 1965 with an updated and modernised Act expressed in plain English. It strengthens the powers of the Valuers Registration Board to take disciplinary action against registered valuers. It provides for the appointment of two assistant members who may be co-opted to attend disciplinary hearings. It increases the penalties which may be imposed on all persons who contravene the provisions of the Act, whether registered valuers or not. In addition, it provides a more uniform method of determining the time which must elapse and the practical experience which must be acquired before registration is granted. The Bill also clarifies the circumstances in which it is prohibited for an unregistered person to practise as a valuer. It strengthens the powers of the Valuers Registration Board in dealing with applications for registration by valuers whose registration had previously ceased. Further, it gives almost unlimited powers of investigation and entry of premises of those facing a disciplinary hearing. It also modernises some of the machinery provisions of the Act.

Firstly, let me say how pleased I am that this Bill has been drafted in plain English and in a manner that can be understood easily, with references straightforward and with next to no double talk, as has usually been the case with much of the legislation in the past. I hope that other departments will follow this example which will lead to a better understanding of legislation by the general public. It will take away much suspicion when dealing with phraseology that requires careful interpretation in much of the legislation that is before us today. The Opposition will be supporting this legislation, with reservations pertaining to the powers of investigation. We do need good straight guidelines, and the strengthening of those powers of the Valuers Registration Board will help to do that. The board, in future, can be assisted by the appointment of two assistant members to assist at disciplinary hearings. At present, the board is constituted by three members. However, should one of those members be involved in any disciplinary hearing, that board is then left with only two members to carry on the function.

I believe it is necessary to be able to expand that total membership to five, which would enable the board to make a fair and unbiased decision on the matter at hand. Membership of the board will consist of the following members—

- a nominee, who is a valuer, for the chief executive;
- two registered valuers, one of whom is to be appointed from names submitted by the Australian Institute of Valuers and Land Economists; and
- two assistant members will be appointed, one from the names submitted by the Australian Institute of Valuers and Land Economists, and the other by the Real Estate Institute of Queensland.

Overall, industry will be able to play a large part in the administration of their profession.

The Bill imposes various conditions, provides procedures to be followed, clarifies circumstances and, in general, gives guidelines to the board to enable it to operate under most circumstances that would seem appropriate at this time. The Opposition does, however, have some reservations about the power of investigation in this legislation. I note that the Bill states that the committee must observe the rules of natural justice. However, when looking closely at what action an investigator might take to obtain evidence, it becomes apparent that natural justice could be denied to a good and honest

citizen who was the subject of a frivolous complaint. A similar situation may arise in the investigation of a valuer who finds himself unregistered for one reason or another—it may not be his fault—and who could then be facing serious criminal offences with penalties up to \$6,000. I believe these powers are grossly excessive. There does not need to be a power to search residential property in the wee hours of the morning because of an accusation that a valuer may not be registered. That search should be done by people trained in the field, for example, police officers.

In an effort to alleviate frivolous complaints, I believe the complaint must not just be in writing, but should also be signed. Perhaps the Minister would clarify that point in his reply to the debate. Consideration should also be given to empowering the board to require that complaints should be sworn. The first task of an investigator should be to fully inform the person under investigation of the full details of the complaint and the identity of the complainant so that that person is really given natural justice in the first instance. The investigator should then have the power to require the person who is the subject of a complaint to give a full explanation on the subject inquiry. Should an unsatisfactory explanation be given, then the investigator's powers, under clause 45, should then be implemented. I believe that the intent of the Bill is genuine. However, the actual workings and consequences of perceived misconduct may place a fellow Queenslander in a position where he is, in fact, denied natural justice.

**Mr NUNN** (Isis) (2.37 p.m.): I wish to speak briefly to the Bill, which has the support of both the opposition parties. More importantly, it has the support of the valuing profession in Queensland. On the face of the legislation, it would appear that this is a simple and straightforward Bill. Because it is simple and straightforward, many people would regard it as being an unimportant piece of legislation. However, it is exceedingly important, principally because it addresses the inadequacies of the old Act. Since we came to Government, we have had to revise a few of the old Acts that have been on the statute book for some time. This Act was last reviewed in 1965, which is a period of 27 years. In that time the inadequacies of the Act have amply manifested themselves to all concerned.

I will address briefly the disciplinary action which can be taken against valuers. Currently the board can take action only if a member of the public submits a written complaint. That is quite good as far as it goes, but it denies the board the right to take action on some misdemeanour that the board itself discovers. This Bill addresses that matter. If the board comes across a misdemeanour by a valuer, it will now be able to take action. It must be remembered that members of the public are not versed or skilled in detecting wrong-doings under the Act by valuers. In the main, the board must rely on those inexperienced people to discover problems. Usually, it is only when a member of the public has a personal complaint that that person may bring the matter to the attention of the board. If the person fails to detect a problem or if, through lack of confidence or through lack of knowledge on how to approach the board, a person ignores a problem, the matter goes not only undetected but also unpunished, and the profession as a whole suffers.

The increase in monetary penalties to be imposed on all persons who contravene the provisions of the Act, whether they be valuers or not, makes it apparent that the value of this Act lies also in the alteration of penalties. The maximum penalty that was allowed to be imposed 25 years ago was \$100. In that instance, a valuer dealing in a matter amounting to millions of dollars could earn a hefty fee with the prospect of a fine of only \$100 if there was any irregularity. This Bill increases that fine to \$6,000, which will make most valuers think twice before they do anything that will incur that penalty.

For the first time, the board is able to initiate an investigation into the activities of a valuer who is not registered. All members know that unregistered valuers, or those who

hang up their shingle saying "free valuations", are men of whom they should beware. People in the community who would not know worth from value hold themselves up to be expert valuers qualified to give evidence in cases, yet nine times out of ten their opinion is not worth two bob.

**Mr Rowell:** They wouldn't get a foot in the door in a court.

**Mr NUNN:** I beg to differ. Matters have been dealt with in all courts of law. I instance in particular the Family Court.

**Mr Rowell** interjected.

**Mr NUNN:** Exactly. That is what this Bill does. I am pleased that the Opposition supports the Bill. The other matter I draw to the attention of the House is that the Act also provides for the making of regulations. New regulations have been drafted and will be submitted to the Governor in Council when and if the Act is adopted. Those regulations include a revised, uniform code of professional conduct which has been agreed to in principle by the valuation regulatory authorities of all States in Australia. With mutual recognition of standards and regulations in Australia being introduced, it was considered that a uniform code was desirable. The code of professional conduct is the first to be included in any valuers' registration legislation in Australia. Other States are looking to Queensland and are quite keen to follow any worthwhile lead that we give them. As I said, this is an important Bill which does not need any elaboration. It is supported by both the Opposition and the valuing profession as a whole. I support the Bill.

**Mr BEANLAND (Toowong)** (2.43 p.m.): At the outset, let me congratulate you, Mr Palaszczuk, on your appointment as Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees in this place. I am sure that we can look forward to a very just and impartial chairmanship during your time in the chair. The Liberal Party supports in principle this legislation. It has some reservations with some aspects of the legislation, which I will touch on briefly in a moment. The legislation rectifies some deficiencies in the current legislation. It is important that we analyse the legislation briefly, because we are talking about the system of valuations, having registered valuers and the important role that registered valuers play today in our community. When we think about registered valuers and valuations, we often think of local government rates and land tax, through which this Government is so fond of reaping a windfall.

Registered valuers play a very important role in many other areas, particularly when dealing with private transactions involving land. Such transactions are handled on a broad scale every day. The role played by a registered valuer in ensuring that proper valuations are carried out and that proper pricings are arrived at in relation to land transactions is a very important one indeed. Because of that, I am pleased to see that the Minister has rectified some deficiencies and is giving valuers the credibility and the standing that their position so richly deserves.

However, I notice that the Valuer-General will no longer be a member of the Valuers Registration Board. No longer is the Valuer-General a person appointed to that board by the Government or by the chief executive officer of a particular department. That is a matter about which I am concerned. I know that the legislation provides that a board member shall be a person with valuation qualifications. Perhaps it is the case that the Public Sector Management Commission has struck yet again. If it has—and I am told on the grapevine that it has—then I believe that it is doing a grave disservice to this State and to the Government. The Valuer-General holds a very important position and plays a very important role. The role of the Valuer-General is like that of the Surveyor-General. I understand that the Minister is also in the process of giving that position the axe. They are both important, longstanding, statutory positions that have a significant role to play in the conduct of the relevant professions. Now this Government has come along and, with one

stroke of the pen, wiped them out. I do not think that, at the end of the day, the standard of conduct and professionalism that we have seen in the past will be maintained without people being appointed to those particular roles. I am very disappointed indeed to see that the Government is going down this road. Whether the Valuer-General is the chief executive officer, the deputy, the assistant deputy director-general, or whatever title one likes to give that person, I believe that someone still ought to hold the position of Valuer-General within the Department of Lands—or whatever the Minister calls the superdepartment these days. That position should still exist, upholding the fine professionalism that it has upheld in the past. I understand that these changes have come about because of recommendations of the Public Sector Management Commission. I think it is a very sad day indeed when that position no longer exists and when the person who used to hold that position will not be a member of the Valuers Registration Board.

I turn now to the committee itself. A committee will be set up which will have two assistant members. That committee will hear disciplinary charges. However, I have not noticed in the legislation any mention of a quorum for that committee. It could be that the Minister is relying on the committee having a majority, namely, three of the five members. In relation to the board, which will have three members, the legislation spells out that the quorum will comprise two members. But that is not spelt out in relation to the committee. Just exactly how many members will be required to form a quorum is of some concern to me. The two assistant members have been appointed to bolster the numbers when the committee has to carry out disciplinary hearings. That is fair enough. I think the Minister should be commended for that. However, I think that the number required to form a quorum should be spelt out in the legislation. That may have been overlooked. If it has, I am sure that it can be fixed by an amendment being made to the legislation. I am pleased to see that the assistant members are to be registered valuers who will be appointed by the Minister on the recommendation of the Australian Institute of Valuers and Land Economists and on the recommendation of the Real Estate Institute of Queensland, which are two very fine bodies indeed. I am sure that they will put forward people of fine attributes to fill the roles on that particular body.

I turn now to that part of the legislation dealing with search warrants and the investigations that may be carried out. I understand that the Queensland Law Society has also taken up this matter with the Minister and has written to him in some detail about it expressing its concerns. I can understand its concerns, because the powers contained within the legislation are quite broad and very comprehensive. I think one could argue that perhaps some of the powers ought to be left to the Police Service and that they ought not be given to investigative officers because, after all, the investigations in this case arise because people are acting outside the legislation—that is, they are not acting as registered valuers, because they do not have the qualifications.

A search warrant may be obtained if there are grounds for suspecting the presence of evidence relevant to the investigation. An investigator has only to suspect the presence of evidence relevant to the investigation and he can obtain a search warrant. It is not even necessary to suspect that the evidence is relevant to an offence. I think that is particularly important. A particular investigation may arise from an unjustified complaint or an error, and, as we know, that occurs quite a bit in the community. The powers of search proposed pursuant to the obtaining of a search warrant include specific powers that are perhaps inappropriate to be exercised by any persons other than properly trained police officers. In addition, the powers are, in any event, grossly excessive. I think that has been pointed out to the Minister by the Law Society, and there is some justification for that. I believe they are grossly excessive for the investigation of alleged criminal offences of the type provided for in this legislation. I would ask the Minister to reconsider those matters. I trust that he has received that submission from the Queensland Law Society and that he may make some comments about it when he replies. Apart from those few

comments, I indicate that the Liberal Party has pleasure in supporting this Bill which brings the legislation up to scratch and puts it in tune, I think, with the sort of legislation that we want to see in the 1990s.

**Mr BARBER** (Cooroora) (2.52 p.m.): This Bill helps the House to answer that age-old question: how long is a piece of string? The role of a registered valuer in society is vital if equitable solutions are to be reached on those occasions when parties to a dispute or transaction are uncertain as to the value of the property in dispute or the subject of the transaction. The role of a valuer in the community is to provide professional valuation advice in relation to all facets of real property. I shall deal, firstly, with the role that a valuer provides when he gives property value advice in matrimonial property settlements. It is important that people divide property in an equitable manner, availing themselves on those occasions of the mediation processes that now exist under the Goss Government, the expert advice of their own family solicitor and, if necessary, the conference and trial remedies that are available to them under the Family Law Act 1975, as amended. Otherwise, one spouse—the overbearing spouse—can browbeat and dupe the weaker party as to the appropriate division of property, the identity of the property, the extent of that property and, most importantly, the value of that property. If the division of matrimonial property proceeds on the basis of a wrong valuation, one party is bound to be aggrieved. Valuation is the base from which all other negotiations and discussions can proceed. It is the condition precedent for equitable settlement of matrimonial property.

In my view, marriage in the twentieth century is still very much a proprietary relationship. Certainly in centuries past it could be described as nothing more than a proprietary relationship in which dowries were given and people were sold into marriage. These days, one would think that in the event of a marriage break-down people would say, “Hang the property, I am off to lie in the sun or to grow crops in the Lockyer Valley.” Many people who observe the property that they have accumulated during the course of a marriage see their life history reflected in those items of property and say to themselves, “I want a neat end to this relationship, and I also want a neat end to the division of property.” In this regard, the role of the registered valuer is vital.

Similarly, in instances in which the property of a land-holder is to be resumed by a public utility, in the interests of equity it is vital that a fair valuation of the resumed parcel of property be obtained. In a growing community such as the Sunshine Coast, Government resumption of parcels of private property is common place. I instance the resumptions involved with the Boreen Pocket Dam, the Nambour by-pass and, most recently, the Pacific Paradise State School. On those occasions, it is vital that the weaker party to the transaction is not ripped off, and that the negotiations proceed on the basis of a fair and expert valuation. In this regard, the registered valuer plays a vital part.

As to assessment and review of commercial rentals—there is a great danger that the weaker party, that is, the lessee stands to be ripped off in the marketplace unless he can avail himself of the services of an expert and independent registered valuer. It is a vital shield for a tenant upon renegotiating the term of a lease upon its expiry. Most commercial leases provide for registered valuation in the event of the landlord and the lessee failing to agree upon a fair market rental once the lessee has exercised his option of renewal of the terms of the lease. Without this provision the landlord could simply say to the tenant, “This is the rent, take it or leave it.” That is a difficult position for a tenant who has built up a substantial goodwill, poured his life-savings into his business, is happy with his present premises and the business is identified by the location. If the landlord holds that over him, the tenant may be likely to cave in and sign up for an unfair market rental. Landlords can be capricious. They can consider the wrong indices by which to set the market rental. They can say that, because the tenant drives a fair sort of a car and lives in the best suburb in town, he can afford to pay an above-market rent. Landlords can impose above-

market rents instead of letting tenants play on a level economic playing field. On those occasions, a fair and expert valuation is needed as a shield to protect tenants in the free market.

I turn now to Australian codes, which have a long history. I believe that they are desirable. They are certainly economically very desirable. In fact, they are vital if Australia is to compete internationally during the next century. The Honourable Edward Gough Whitlam said as much in 1990 during his Denis Murphy memorial lecture in Nambour. He said that if Australia did not move soon towards uniform codes in financial transactions, company law and particularly the economy, we would simply be left behind. I join with him in echoing that sentiment. I am pleased that State Parliaments are moving in that direction every year. I well remember 1969, when my father worked in New South Wales on a New South Wales building code.

**Mr Beanland** interjected.

**Mr BARBER:** The member for Toowong should listen to this, because it is important. That New South Wales building code has since become a uniform building code for Australia. In the areas of construction—the Liberals are always telling us that the construction industry is vital—we need uniform codes. Similarly, I am pleased to applaud the introduction of uniform defamation laws. This code of conduct is an attempt by the Queensland Government to pioneer what may become a code of conduct for Australia in the area of valuations.

**Mr Foley:** An attempt to move beyond the old slogan of States' rights that might be an impediment to economic reform.

**Mr BARBER:** Quite so. This code of conduct is a new approach. I am optimistic about its success, and I wish the Minister well with this new approach to uniform economic regulations and laws for Australia. I want to deal with the furphy raised by the members for Warrego and Toowong when they made the claim about section 46 of the Act and the search by warrant provisions. To my mind, there is no reason in principle why an investigator under the Act should not exercise the powers of search rather than the police. I hope that if there are further speakers from the other side of the House they will elucidate on that point, because it is certainly lost on me. The provision is, as is normal and acceptable, that an application will be made to a magistrate for the grant of that warrant. In my view, the Liberal concerns regarding section 46 are scare-mongering and unfounded. Similarly, section 45—the investigation provision—is similar to the provision contained in the Auctioneers and Agents Act, with which I am familiar. In my former capacity as a solicitor, I have represented clients facing similar provisions in the Auctioneers and Agents Act. They are acceptable under civil liberty considerations and the common law. This provision in section 45 subsection 5 has that common law principle of non-incrimination. It is good to see it there. Once again, there can be no objection raised to that provision.

**Mr Foley:** It just shows how the Liberals are blindly unaware of civil liberties.

**Mr BARBER:** Quite so. I thank the honourable member for that observation. This Bill is another piece of Goss Government rationalism. It is another Bill in the interests of the economic health of Queensland, and I support it.

**Mr DOLLIN** (Maryborough) (3.03 p.m.): Prior to 1965, there was no controlling body to govern who could establish himself as a valuer within the State. Accordingly, any person within the community with or without formal training could hold himself out as a valuer. This led to gross valuation inconsistencies, depending on the client's instructions as to the purpose for which the valuation was required. I experienced that myself when constituents complained to me.

**Mr FitzGerald:** Did you overcharge them?

**Mr DOLLIN:** No, I do not charge. I understand that my predecessor used to.

**Mr FitzGerald:** For doing income tax returns.

**Mr DOLLIN:** In some cases, partners have had disputes and have been bluffed into believing that their properties had a very low valuation. This gave one partner a great advantage but put the other at a grave disadvantage. In 1965, the Valuers Registration Act was introduced to regulate the valuing profession. It established the Valuers Registration Board and provided for the registration and discipline of valuers. The board's principal objectives were to provide a measure of protection for the public and to improve the standard of valuers in Queensland. This Bill will become an updated and modernised Act expressed in plain English and will replace the original Valuers Registration Act of 1965, as amended. This Bill will strengthen the regulation of approximately 1 200 registered valuers throughout the State of Queensland. The role of a valuer in the community is to provide professional valuation advice in relation to all facets of real property. Examples of valuers being required to give such professional advice include finance institution lending, property value advice for the Family Court, re-financing purposes, business transactions, property resumption, commercial rental assessments and reviews, and rating and taxing.

The Bill enables the Valuers Registration Board to take more stringent disciplinary action against valuers. Currently, the board can only take action on receipt of a written complaint. Under the new provisions, the board can itself instigate proceedings when it reasonably suspects negligence, misconduct or some other contravention of the professional code. The increased penalties will be imposed on all persons, whether they are valuers or not, who contravene the Act. The existing penalty of \$100 was set in 1965 and is now totally unrealistic. This has now been increased to a maximum of 100 penalty units or \$6,000. This provision also allows the board, for the first time, to initiate an investigation into activities of a valuation nature carried out by persons who are not registered valuers. As previous speakers have mentioned, there are a few of these unregistered valuers around. The provision should make such people think again. Two assistant members have been appointed. They may be co-opted to attend disciplinary hearings. This gives the board a broader base of opinion and therefore provides a more equitable decision-making process when disciplinary matters are being heard. An appointment by the board of an appropriate person other than a board or assistant board member to independently investigate any matter of a disciplinary nature has been made. The Bill gives an investigator wide powers in regard to entry to premises in order to obtain documents or other material relevant to complaints. This is very necessary if the legislation is to have any teeth at all. The Bill provides for a more uniform method of determining the time which must elapse and the practical experience that must be acquired before registration is granted. At present, it is possible for an applicant who has undertaken the four-year part-time valuation course to be registered sooner than an applicant who undertakes a full-time degree course. This anomaly will be rectified by the new Act. In the absence of a board member, the chairperson may authorise an assistant member to act as a member during that period of absence. This provision ensures that in almost every case the board will be fully constituted. It would only be in an extreme unforeseen circumstance that a quorum of two would constitute the board.

The Bill also provides for the making of regulations. New regulations have been drafted and will be submitted to the Governor in Council, if and when the Bill is adopted. These regulations include a revised code of professional conduct which has been agreed to in principle by the valuation regulatory authorities of all States in Australia as a uniform code. Because mutual recognition of standards and regulations in Australia have been introduced, it was considered that a uniform code was desirable. This code of professional conduct is the first to be included in any valuers registration legislation in Australia. Most

of the members of this House seem to be in agreement with this Bill and are supporting it. I support it.

**Mr SZCZERBANIK** (Albert) (3.09 p.m.): Mr Palaszczuk, I add my voice to the congratulations that other members have expressed to you, Mr Deputy Speaker, on your attainment of the position of Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees in this House. I hope that one day I will follow in your footsteps. This Bill provides for the revamping of valuers registration in this State and will protect those people making the greatest investment of their lives, which is the purchase of a house. A house is a person's greatest asset. This Bill provides that valuers will be registered under the Bill and will conduct themselves in a befitting manner. My electorate contains one of the fastest-growing residential areas in Australia. In the last 12 months, lending by Metway Bank on the Gold Coast totalled \$54.26m and that figure comes from only one financial institution on the Gold Coast. That represents a lot of houses on the Gold Coast and the fulfilment of many people's dreams. It also creates jobs for people in the community. Houses are being built. Jobs are being provided for people during the construction phase, and people are involved in the supply of building materials for those houses.

Valuers play a big part in the construction of these estates, because people want value for money. When people purchase properties, they do not want to be led blindly into the purchase. The same applies to people who are selling property. If I sold my house, I would go to a registered valuer. I would make up my mind as to whom I sold the property and for how much. The Gold Coast is a rapidly growing area. During 1991, \$65.7m worth of raw real estate was sold at Robina. There were no houses or other development on that land. It was sold to prospective buyers from southern States who want to move to Queensland to enjoy the good life. Real estate is important to the economy of the Gold Coast. It is one of the leading indicators that show that this State is coming out of the recession. The figures have increased dramatically over the years. 1991 was a difficult year but, even so, a lot of real estate was sold on the Gold Coast. We have done it hard, but we have done it well and the Gold Coast will continue to lead this State out of the economic gloom and doom that is spread by members of the Liberal Party. There is a shortage of good residential properties on the Gold Coast real estate market and many people from interstate are moving to Queensland.

**Mr Connor:** It's red tape.

**Mr SZCZERBANIK:** I do not believe that it is red tape. The doom and gloom that is coming from the people in the back corner of this Chamber is clouding people's judgment when they are trying to make up their minds to buy. People have to have a roof over their heads. Twelve months ago, the interest rates were 18 per cent, but they are now dropping and housing loans can be taken out at an interest rate of 9.5 per cent. People are purchasing property on the Gold Coast.

**Mr Beanland:** What about those terrible Housing Commission loans that Burns is putting through at 14.9 per cent?

**Mr SZCZERBANIK:** I thank the member for Toowong for his comment. I also refer to the recent comments made by the member for Nerang during a meeting at Highland Park in his electorate. He said that if and when the Liberal Party ever got back into power it would sell that land back to private investors and have no Housing Commission homes on the Gold Coast.

**Mr CONNOR:** I rise to a point of order. I made no such comment. The honourable member is misrepresenting me.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Mr Palaszczuk): Order! There is no point of order. The honourable member will resume his seat.

**Mr SZCZERBANIK:** I understand from people who attended the meeting that the honourable member said that he would sell the land off and there would be no Housing Commission homes in the area.

**Mr CONNOR:** I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! I ask the member to resume his seat.

**Mr CONNOR:** I am seeking leave to make a personal explanation.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member will resume his seat. I ask the member for Albert to continue.

**Mr SZCZERBANIK:** Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. The understanding I have been given by the Deputy Premier is that 5 per cent of those lots will have Housing Commission residences built on them and another 10 per cent will be used for rental accommodation, while the remaining lots will be sold under the HOME Scheme. The trouble with the member for Nerang is that he does not listen to the Deputy Premier's comments.

**Mr CONNOR:** I rise to a point of order. I find those words offensive and untrue, and I ask for them to be withdrawn.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Nerang finds those words offensive. I ask the honourable member for Albert to withdraw them.

**Mr SZCZERBANIK:** Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. I withdraw those comments. The Gold Coast has a shortage of Housing Commission properties for rent. I find it offensive that members of the Liberal Party who are seated in the back corner of this Chamber represent half the Gold Coast electorates, but perhaps they will represent only a quarter of them after the next election. There is a shortage of Housing Commission rental accommodation on the Gold Coast, and the comments made by the member for Nerang merely serve to inflame the situation. The Department of Housing is trying to integrate public housing into the community on the Gold Coast. There are Housing Commission residences in my electorate and they are not offensive. People who live next door to Housing Commission properties would not know that those residences are occupied by Housing Commission tenants.

**Mr Connor:** Don't you live in one?

**Mr SZCZERBANIK:** I live in a Housing Commission house.

**Mr Connor:** That's disgraceful. He gets \$65,000 and he lives in a Housing Commission home.

**Mr SZCZERBANIK:** I do not think it is disgraceful. I pay a higher rate of interest than I would if I had bought my home through the private sector. The problem is that I have to look after my family's future. Housing Commission tenants are good people and are friendlier than some others who live in my area.

**Mr Connor** interjected.

**Mr SZCZERBANIK:** I would not need it. After the Government is re-elected, I believe it would be a good idea to develop other Housing Commission areas on the Gold Coast. People have to have a valuation done on their property to on-sell it. Problems arise when people are conned by unscrupulous real estate agents who pretend to be valuers and who value properties at inflated prices. Later on, when people try to resell the property for the price that they believe it is worth, they get caught. I support the Bill.

**Mr ARDILL (Salisbury) (3.18 p.m.):** I support the Bill because I believe that professional valuing standards should be upheld and enforced. It is a very important aspect of daily life that correct valuations are attributed to an area because, first and foremost, it is in the interests of the property-owner and the prospective buyer that the exact value of the property is known. Secondly, it is also important to have a true

assessment of the value of properties when resumptions and acquisitions are made by the Crown. Probably one of the most important aspects of valuations from the point of view of the ordinary person in the street, though, is the fact that they are used for the purposes of setting rates by local authorities and, to some extent, in the levying of land tax by the State Government.

During this debate, I wish to address my remarks principally to the issue of rating. In recent years, I have found that valuations in many areas get out of kilter because of an occasional, unwise purchase by people from overseas in older, established areas. This has a marked effect on the valuations of an entire area which would otherwise be very stable because very few sales and changes in ownership take place. Occasionally, however, a property will come onto the market as a result of death or transfer and an unwise purchase by a buyer from overseas or interstate suddenly increases the price of properties in the area, which is reflected in the ratings set by the local authority. Admittedly, local authorities have a discretion in the rates that are set, but a standard must be set and adhered to. I do not believe that it is desirable for local authorities to change the rates applicable depending on the area concerned. They certainly have the right to exercise a discretion in changing rates as they apply to land use, but I believe it is undesirable for local authorities to exercise a rating discretion in relation to residential areas. The valuation of properties should be based on reasonable prices paid, not on the occasional blunder made by an unwary buyer.

This matter must be addressed in the near future. I do not believe that the Government can continue to ignore the fact that real estate purchases made by overseas buyers, for example, have an influence, particularly in expanding areas and in areas that are not subject to normal changes in valuations. The result is that many people on fixed incomes who have very little ability to face sudden increases in rates or land tax are disadvantaged. I believe that some provision should be made to ensure that valuers take into consideration whether an increase in price is general throughout the area or whether it is an aberration. Presently, that factor is not taken into account. In the very near future, I hope that it will be considered. In supporting the Bill, let me also say that I believe it is a great step forward in setting standards for valuers. They are people of very high standing in the community who can normally be relied upon to do the right thing by their profession. This Bill will serve to ensure that that continues to be the case.

**Mr WELFORD** (Stafford) (3.23 p.m.): I have pleasure in supporting the Minister's introduction of the Valuers Registration Bill. As previous speakers have indicated, the Bill provides for the registration of valuers. The entitlement to practise as a valuer is controlled by that registration, so the key to the Bill is that, if one wants to practise as a valuer in Queensland, one must obtain registration under the Act. An application for registration is made to a board established under the Act, accompanied by an application fee. Clause 30 sets out particularly the qualifications that a person must have to be a registered valuer and includes the following: that the person is of good fame and character and is a fit and proper person to be registered as a valuer. Those sorts of qualifications are often incorporated in the requirements for professional registration of a number of professions and, of course, can often be open to some dispute. The valuers' profession is often conducted not only by people who act only as valuers but also by people who have other careers, such as those in the real estate industry. Considering the difficulties that are often experienced with conduct and behaviour in that industry, obviously the question of whether a person is a fit and proper person can be a matter of some dispute.

To obtain registration, one must also hold a certificate of competence that is recognised by the board and have passed an examination that is approved by the board. I note also that, to be registered, a person must have sufficient practical experience over a period of at least five years since starting an approved course of study. One would

assume that anyone wanting to become registered as a valuer would work in a field that involves that person regularly valuing land. However, presumably, before such people can hold themselves out as valuers and do the valuations alone or in their own business, they must obtain registration. Before a person can be registered to practise as a valuer, that person needs five years' experience.

The concept of land valuation and property valuation seems to me to be a bit of a speculative exercise. Recently, we have had much dispute about the valuations of land by our own department. That is not new; it has been a problem for Governments in Queensland over many, many years. Indeed, in the fifties and sixties, much concern was expressed about the quality of the valuers who were employed in the Government's Valuer-General's Department and about some of the rather irregular practices that were often complained about in the department.

**Mr Elliott** interjected.

**Mr WELFORD:** It was under the Government of the honourable member's party. When the National Party Government was constantly interfering in the professional affairs of departments, many departments were infested by undesirable individuals and one would not be surprised if the Valuer-General's Department was one of them. The Act provides also for a person's name to be removed from the register in certain circumstances. In circumstances in which there is no suggestion of misconduct, people can apply on their own account requesting that they be removed and, naturally, if people die, they can also be removed. That is provided for under clause 37.

**Mr Connor** interjected.

**Mr WELFORD:** The member for Nerang observes most brilliantly that, if one is already dead, one cannot request one's own removal. I am not surprised that that is the level of intellectual dexterity displayed regularly in this place by the member for Nerang, because that is about the best he can do and is as much as he ever offers.

Under clause 39, the board can order that a valuer's registration be cancelled. Registration can be cancelled upon a number of grounds, for example, if a valuer becomes mentally or physically incapable of managing his or her own affairs, or if that person does not possess the qualifications entitling the valuer to registration. That second matter in clause 39 (1) (a) is curious. It seems to provide for a situation in which the board makes a mistake in registering someone who does not have qualifications and later discovers that that person did not have the qualifications that he or she purported to have or that the board thought that person had, so the board can deregister that person. If a valuer is convicted of an indictable offence in Queensland or elsewhere, the board can also use that as a ground for cancelling that person's registration.

Probably the most important of the four grounds is the ground which entitles the board to cancel a valuer's registration if the valuer is guilty of "misconduct in a professional respect". The board cannot act on any of those grounds unless the valuer is given written notice of the board's reasons for proposing the cancellation. The valuer then has 30 days in which to make oral or written submissions to the board about those reasons. Under clause 40, the valuer can make a formal application to the board for his name to be restored to the register in circumstances where registration has been cancelled on any of the grounds contained in clause 39.

I will mention briefly the provisions relating to the powers of investigation under Part 4 of the Bill, which allow a complaint to be made against a valuer to the board. Those complaints must be in writing and, on the basis of a complaint, the board can authorise an investigation if it suspects on reasonable grounds that, for example, a registered valuer has contravened a prescribed code of professional conduct. Another basis for an investigation is if the board suspects on reasonable grounds that a person who is not a

registered valuer is conducting such a profession or holding himself or herself out as a registered valuer in breach of the offence provision in clause 63.

The board is not required to authorise an investigation for other matters that are referred in clause 39, for example, the fact that the valuer does not possess qualifications. There does not seem to be any provision for an actual investigation to be carried out in those circumstances. Presumably, the board would make its own inquiries without authorising or empowering a particular investigator to do so. Similarly, if a valuer becomes mentally or physically incapable of managing his affairs, there does not seem to be any provision in clause 44, specifically, for the board to authorise an investigation into whether those facts are established. Where there are reasonable grounds for suspecting that there has been a breach of professional conduct or that a valuer—that is the person holding himself out to the public as a valuer—is practising without registration, then the board can authorise an investigation. In doing so, the board can appoint an investigator to investigate the allegations in the complaint. Included in the extensive powers of the investigator is the power to require the valuer to attend before the investigator at a time which the investigator appoints and, according to clause 45 (1) (a), there and then answer any questions and produce to the investigator a document or thing in the person's custody or under the person's control.

At first glance this would suggest that the right to remain silent, or the right to refuse to answer questions on the grounds that to answer those questions might incriminate the valuer, seems to be abrogated. But if one reads on, one can see that is provided for in clause 45 (5), where persons under investigation can refuse to comply if they have specific reasonable excuse that to comply with such a requirement would tend to incriminate them. However, if that is not the basis, and if a person does not have a reasonable excuse on that ground for refusing to comply but simply refuses to cooperate with the investigators without claiming his or her right to that privilege, then that person has committed an offence under that clause for failing to comply with the requirements of the investigating officer. Similar provisions apply in respect of entry and search, and I am pleased to note that care has been taken in relation to those provisions to provide proper judicial protection for the issuing of warrants to investigators to enter a place and search for evidence relating to any offence under the Act. Clause 46 (3) limits the rights of an investigator to enter a place or exercise any power to search to those circumstances where the occupier of the premises consents to the entry or, rather, where a warrant under section 48 has been issued in relation to the evidence authorising the entry or the exercising of the power to search.

The Bill also provides that to obtain a warrant an application must be made to a magistrate and the magistrate can require the person applying for a warrant to provide further information, either orally or upon affidavit. When the investigator reports to the board, the board can take certain action. In particular, if the investigator is satisfied that there is made out a prima facie case of misconduct in a professional respect or—and I note a further basis for a charge here—incompetence or negligence in the person's performance as a valuer, then the investigator can charge a person with either of those disciplinary charges. Those disciplinary charges are distinct from criminal offences which appear elsewhere in the Bill. The board will appoint a committee to consider the investigator's report on any charge laid with respect to those disciplinary matters and the committee can commence, or must commence, proceedings once a charge has been laid and notify the person charged of the time and venue for the hearing. Those hearings before a committee appointed by the board in respect of professional misconduct, incompetence or negligence in their performance as a valuer can be heard in camera if the committee determines or if the valuer, who is subject to investigation, so requires.

I point out a drafting matter in clause 51, which permits the committee to have its proceedings heard in public. The presumption is that the proceedings will not be held publicly unless the committee determines or unless the registered valuer concerned so requires. One would infer from that that the registered valuer concerned, of course, is the registered valuer against whom the charge has been laid, although that is not self-evident in the drafting of that clause. However, I suspect that that is how the proceedings are to be conducted. The proceedings are not judicial in the strict sense in that the committee is not bound by the rules of evidence; but, as is proper in proceedings before administrative tribunals of this kind, the committee must observe the rules of natural justice, and that is specifically provided for in clause 53. I am also pleased to note that the person who is subject to the proceedings by a committee in disciplinary matters has a right to legal representation by counsel or solicitor. That is another commendable protection which I note the Minister has incorporated in the Bill.

The role of valuers is important in the management of land and in the assessment of taxes, rates and charges imposed at both local and State level. Valuers have an important responsibility and obligation to carry. I hope that the board established under the Bill will be able to maintain proper professional standards in this profession for the benefit of all Queenslanders. I have long held the view that, in a mixed economy such as ours, land prices are very much subject to market fluctuation. Those who believe in the perfection of the free market would say that leaving property values to market fluctuations is a good thing; that, whatever the outcome, the best way to set land values is to allow the free market to operate. I am not so convinced of that. I believe that, in the proper management of land resources—particularly in Queensland with an increasing population, and especially in south-east Queensland where the increase in population is even greater—there may be a role for Governments to intervene in the release of land for development and in the control of that release of land, as has occurred in South Australia under the South Australian Housing Trust. The Minister for Local Government and Housing, Deputy Premier Tom Burns, should be encouraged, through his department, to be active in the marketplace not only to provide affordable housing for those people in the community who cannot afford the market rates for housing but also to provide some positive and responsible role for a Government in managing the costs and availability of land to people in the Queensland community.

I know that the free marketeers of the conservative parties would recoil at that proposition, but I believe strongly that, when the public interest is at stake, there is a proper role for Governments to intervene in these circumstances to regulate the availability of land and the type of housing that can be made available. In that respect, that is relevant to the question of valuation because values can be brought under some control. Rather than having the massive fluctuations of boom and bust, as has occurred in property values particularly on the Gold Coast and in other similar tourist areas, a situation can exist whereby property values are under greater control and there is less fluctuation and fewer rapid increases in land values which price ordinary Queenslanders out of the market. We need a system which enables land to be made available and priced with some consistency that protects the public interest, and particularly those young Queensland families who are trying to embark upon building a home or buying their first home. I commend the Minister on the introduction of this Bill. I certainly hope that its future operation will augur well for the Queensland people.

**Mr CONNOR** (Nerang) (3.41 p.m.): Property values are an important facet of the Valuers Registration Bill. As the member for Albert commented, the location and the number of Housing Commission homes have an effect on the value of other properties in an area. The honourable member commented specifically on my electorate, to which I shall refer. In my electorate, I inherited an estate known as Swift Park which was designated as a Housing Commission area by the former Government. At that stage, nothing had been

built on it. Up until two weeks ago, Housing Commission homes had been built on 40 per cent of that land. As I understand it, the Government's stated policy on Housing Commission homes is that they should take up no more than 20 per cent of an estate. There is almost double that number of Housing Commission homes on that estate. That has a definite effect on the value of other properties in that estate. Valuers would take that into consideration. The people residing on that estate obtained valuations which revealed that the value of homes worth \$180,000 had been reduced by approximately \$40,000. I point out that the people who had built in Swift Park prior to the Housing Commission buying land in the estate were given compensation. I give the Housing Commission full marks for that. People were allowed to sell their properties at full investment cost, which was very reasonable. What is not reasonable is the number of Housing Commission homes in that area, because it has definitely affected valuations.

Because of the effect that Housing Commission homes have on valuations in that area, the Government has realised that it cannot introduce any more into the estate, and it has now developed a further 237 building blocks in Worongary. The local residents are quite fearful of the effect that it will have on their property values. I called a public meeting and invited a representative from the Housing Commission to present to the people the effects of valuations and to explain what development would occur in the area. I made no comment whatsoever in relation to what was going to happen there. That was presented by a representative of the Housing Commission. The local people decided that they wanted a resolution. A motion was put before the meeting, and that motion was along the lines of the Government's policy, namely, that the number of Housing Commission homes should be no more than 20 per cent. I might add that I moved that motion, and that is the Government's policy.

**Mr Szczerbanik:** And they chucked it out.

**Mr CONNOR:** Exactly. As the member for Albert said, they threw it out. They in turn moved an amendment to that motion whereby the number of Housing Commission homes would be no more than 5 per cent. From a property value point of view, those people felt that, with such a percentage, the value of their properties would not decrease. They also wanted, again from a property value point of view, the area to have a brick and tile covenant and they wanted the school that had already been allocated a block of land to be completed at the same time as the Housing Commission estate so that no additional pressure would be put on the existing school. Again, that was a property value issue. That motion was passed unanimously, and it was in turn——

**Mrs WOODGATE:** I rise to a point of order. Mr Deputy Speaker, I draw your attention to Standing Order 253. The debate is to be relevant, and when a clause is under discussion, the member should confine himself to the subject matter of that clause. I do not feel that the comments being made by the member for Nerang are relevant to the Bill under discussion.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Mr Palaszczyk): Order! In relation to the honourable member's point of order—I understand what she is saying. However, a lot of leniency has been allowed this afternoon in the debate. I have allowed the member to continue in that vein. He has been doing so for five minutes. I would remind him that I have been overly lenient with him up until now and I would ask him to return shortly to the Bill.

**Mr CONNOR:** I thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker, for your consideration. It is appreciated. As the member for Albert raised this issue and made relevant accusations concerning my conduct, I thought it was only fair that the other side of the coin was shown. I appreciate your understanding, Mr Deputy Speaker.

**Mr Welford:** You misled those people down there.

**Mr CONNOR:** I made no statements in relation to what was going into that area. Those statements were made by the Department of Housing. The commitment was not forthcoming from the Deputy Premier, who is the responsible Minister. There was no commitment about the resolution that was passed. That does affect very much the values of the area. The other request that was made was that, if the Housing Commission estate was going to go ahead, proper compensation be paid for the devaluation of the area. One of the recommendations was that valuations be made before and after the estate's establishment, and if there was a reduction in the valuations, the local people should be compensated. Again, that comes back to what this Bill is all about, namely, valuers. If this Government makes a decision to move a Housing Commission area into one particular suburb, it should, having proper legislation in place, trust the valuers to come up with a reasonable finding.

I made a commitment to the people that, if there was a change of Government, that resolution would be honoured. By the same token, I said also that under no circumstances would any person be thrown out of his home. That is the aspect on which the member for Albert was misleading the Parliament. Under no circumstances would a Liberal Government throw persons out of their homes. The reason why property values decrease in an area where there is a big proportion of Housing Commission homes is that such areas have a tendency to have a greater crime problem. The Government understands that. That is why its policy is that the proportion of Housing Commission homes in an area should be no more than 20 per cent. In the case of Swift Park, the Government has not honoured that commitment because the number of Housing Commission homes in the area has been increased to 40 per cent. The Government should also consider the fact that the Worongary area has made a request that the number of Housing Commission homes be no more than 5 per cent. I am sure that the people in that area would negotiate to a certain degree. However, I think it is quite unfair that no commitment whatsoever was made in relation to the percentage of Housing Commission homes. I have said that I have no objection to Housing Commission homes going into any area within my electorate, as long as they are properly and evenly disbursed throughout the electorate. The other thing that I feel is quite unreasonable—again talking about valuations—is people having Housing Commission homes when they do not deserve them.

**Mr Ardill:** Who judges that?

**Mr CONNOR:** Would the honourable member not consider that someone on \$65,000 a year plus a car allowance—plus, plus, plus—would not be in a position to need a Housing Commission home? Would he not consider that someone such as that was rorting the system? If a person is on \$65,000 a year plus electoral allowances and all the other expenses that he receives for doing his job, then it really is stretching the realms of reasonableness—

**Mr Ardill** interjected.

**Mr CONNOR:** I suppose in certain circumstances, if that person felt that he would be on such a high rate of income only temporarily, that would be quite reasonable. As I said, the valuation of a particular area is affected by the percentage of Housing Commission homes in that area. If an area comprises 100 per cent of Housing Commission homes—and there are 237 blocks in Worongary—that must have a dramatic effect on valuations in that area. At this stage, the Deputy Premier has made no commitment in relation to that. As well, if he does go to that stage, he has made no commitment as to whether or not he would compensate people for that valuation. As to someone who earns \$65,000 per year plus extras—it is quite unacceptable for any member of Parliament to live in a Housing Commission home.

**Mr FITZGERALD** (Lockyer) (3.53 p.m.): In joining this debate on the Valuers Registration Bill, I shall make a couple of points about the registration of valuers. First of

all, I will comment on a statement made by the honourable member for Stafford in response to an interjection. He said that there may have been a lot of corruption on the Opposition side of the House with regard to valuations, but certainly not on the Government side of the House. I remind the honourable member that the Valuation of Land Act is under the control of the Minister for Land Management. The Minister who preceded the previous Labor Lands Minister resigned in disgrace because of corruption in his department. I do not wish that upon this Minister, because I have great respect for him. That Minister's name was Foley, but he is not to be confused with the honourable member for Yeronga. That other member was known as "Fine Cut" Foley. He certainly could not be confused with the honourable member for Yeronga.

The honourable member for Stafford proposed that this State should manage the release of land and control the value of land in south-east Queensland. I totally disagree with him. I do not believe that the State Government is an appropriate body to control the release of land or the values of land in south-east Queensland. I look upon that socialist statement from the honourable member for Stafford as being akin to a statement made by his colleague the honourable member for Isis, who stated in another debate in this Chamber that he believes that it is immoral for anyone to own freehold land, that it is as immoral as owning the air that we breathe, and that all land should be leasehold. I couple those two Labor members together.

**Mr Welford:** I didn't say that.

**Mr FITZGERALD:** I acknowledge that the member for Stafford did not say that, but his colleague did. He cannot deny it, because it appears in *Hansard*. I simply couple their socialist views, which I am sure the people of Queensland will reject. As to the valuation of land—I note that persons applying for registration must meet particular qualifications. I draw to the attention of the House that the University of Queensland Gatton College issues a Diploma of Valuations. Many young people who undertake that excellent course are generally well respected and obtain a good deal of experience in that area. Because Gatton is my home town, I see many of those valuers. I know that they look forward to the passing of this legislation, as do those who hope to be registered as valuers.

As other members have said during this debate, it is important to have qualified valuers. They stated that an accurate valuation must be placed upon land when it is valued. Valuers can ascertain only in their minds what they believe to be the correct value. They have to prove that valuation to the best of their ability. Sometimes they have to prove before a court that they have the necessary competence and are fair in their valuation. They might also have to reveal the source of the figures they used in order to prove that they have determined a subjective valuation.

In the past, during the terms of previous Labor Governments, it was necessary to have many valuers. I refer particularly to death duties. At that time, when somebody died, the date of the valuation of his property had to be done as at the date of his death. As a result, properties had to be valued lock, stock and barrel. Some people have told me that, when somebody in town died, all the relatives and neighbours would turn up, the silver would be taken out of the cupboards and it would be taken home and hidden under beds. People made sure that they offered sympathy to the grieving widow, but they left with books hidden under their coats. They did that to try to avoid death duties. Some of those people probably voted Labor. That system of socialism was so degenerate that people had to resort to those hideous measures in an endeavour to avoid the taxman, because that dead hand would come upon them. That unfair system made criminals and tax-evaders out of ordinarily honest people and made them take extraordinary steps. I realise that the members for Stafford and Manly are very upset about this, but that was a fact of life. When the National Party came to power in Queensland, death duties were abolished. I have

heard also about the experiences of the family of a deceased property-owner in the Balonne electorate in western Queensland. Because their father died during the wool boom, they carried on with the estate and eventually wound it up about three or four years later. The total sale value of the estate did not even meet the death duties payable on that property at the time.

**Mr Welford:** Rubbish!

**Mr FITZGERALD:** This is not rubbish. I can provide the member for Stafford with the relevant names. As I said, this happened in the Balonne electorate. The death of the property-owner occurred during the wool boom of the 1950s, but the property was not sold until a couple of years later when it could be sold. However, because that person had died during the boom, and because of declining land values since then, the total sale of the property and all assets did not even meet the death duties that were levied. That was obnoxious and disgraceful. It is no wonder that the first thing the conservatives did when they got into power was to get rid of that obnoxious tax. We were very proud of that. We needed valuers in those days, and it was despicable that they had to do that job. I shall not delay the House further. Most of the Labor members who spoke during this debate were just filibustering. I have made my points, and I shall now resume my seat.

**Hon. A. G. EATON** (Mourilyan—Minister for Land Management) (4 p.m.), in reply: I will be brief. I would like to thank and compliment the members who made a contribution. They knew what they were talking about. I have taken on board a couple of matters that were raised by honourable members and I will respond to those generally later in my reply. I am quite proud that the Lands Department has drafted this Bill. There has been a need to debate the Act for a long time. This legislation is going to make Queensland the leader in Australia. From time to time, discussions were held with the various departments from other States. I feel that the Queensland legislation will set the standard right across Australia. Many speakers have acknowledged that it is setting the standard. Since coming to power, the Goss Government has made a lot of changes. We are trying to implement them in consultation with the community and industry. A great deal of legislation has to be amended to bring about a standard in Australia. There are a lot of differences in the legislation of the various States. Queensland is not too proud to pinch a good idea if another State has one. We are finding now that other States are doing the same. If Queensland has something that is working very well, other States are quite happy to consult with us on making improvements in various areas.

I will address the concerns raised by honourable members and refer to the relevant clauses. The member for Warrego, Mr Hobbs, was concerned about unlimited powers. When he receives a proper interpretation of the clauses, he will find out that clause 46 sets out certain conditions regarding the matter that he raised. It strengthens the powers in some areas. Previously, if one was not a registered valuer, nothing could be done about it. The same thing occurred in the surveying area. Anyone could set himself up as a valuer. He could rip off people, and the only recourse they had was to initiate a civil action at their own expense. The Government did not have the responsibility, and the regulations could not be enforced. This has meant that the Government has had to assume responsibility for the protection of those people.

Mr Nunn showed the knowledge which he gained from his experience in real estate. Mr Beanland made a couple of points about the position of the Valuer-General being abolished. That is not going to have any effect whatsoever on this legislation. Although the importance of the position of the Valuer-General has been acknowledged, this Bill has not degraded or removed the valuation ability and expertise which remains in the department. I am proud to say that there are many people within the department whose great expertise has been recognised throughout the State for a long period. The abolition of the Valuer-General's statutory position will not make any difference, because the

person who occupied the position is still there. He still has the same expertise. He has not been downgraded. There are many other valuers within the department who have a similar amount of experience and expertise. The Government, the community and the courts will call on that experience and expertise from time to time in trying to settle family disputes that come before the courts, where expertise in the area of valuations is important. The department has a very important role to play in that area. I think that answers the criticism of doing away with the position of Valuer-General.

Concern was also expressed about disciplinary action. If disciplinary action is to be taken, clause 50 states only that the board must comprise three members, plus the two assistant members. For other matters, only the full-time board members are required to be present. Concern was also expressed that penalties were increased by too great an amount—from \$100 to \$6,000. Penalties were increased because the Government does not want to encourage the breaking of the law. In many areas, because of the rise in the standard of living and of costs in general, it is sometimes cheaper to break the law than abide by it. Mr Ardill spoke of his experience in dealing with his constituents and of the problems faced by the community, particularly in the area of local government. Mr Welford, the member for Stafford, showed a good understanding of all sections of the Bill.

**Mr FitzGerald** interjected.

**Mr EATON:** I am dealing only with the facts; I do not deal with fiction.

Motion agreed to.

### Committee

Hon. A. G. Eaton (Mourilyan—Minister for Land Management) in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 5, as read, agreed to.

Clause 6—

**Mr BEANLAND** (4.07 p.m.): This clause refers to the membership of the board. I thank the Minister for clarifying the position that the Public Sector Management Commission has had its way and will abolish the position of Valuer-General. I am not impressed with that and I am sure that the community generally will not be impressed. In addition, in due course those people involved in valuations will not be impressed that the Minister has taken this course of action. The Minister has bowed to the pressure of the Public Sector Management Commission. He did not stick up for the people in his department and those who are involved in the profession of valuing generally. It will be a very sad day when the position of Valuer-General is abolished. I thought that the Minister would give members the reasons why the position is to be abolished, but I have not heard one so far. It is another change for change's sake by the PSMC.

**Mr EATON:** I thought I explained this in my reply to the second-reading debate. This clause does not downgrade or take away any of the expertise in the department. The expertise still exists. It is merely a matter of streamlining the department. Many other people with the same ability are still in the department. We have streamlined the department and implemented regionalisation. We are trying to give the regions of Queensland more autonomy. I have never denigrated the Valuer-General. He did a great job and was highly respected. The clause is self-explanatory. The Valuer-General is still there and has the same expertise. His title is a little outdated. I thought the member understood that when I gave my first explanation.

**Mr BEANLAND:** I hear clearly what the Minister is saying, but we still have not received any explanation as to why the position has been abolished. The Minister talks about streamlining the department. He has not explained how the abolition of the position of Valuer-General will streamline the department, nor have we heard any other

explanations from him. I have listened very intently to what the Minister said, but we still have not got to the bottom of the reason why this position is to be abolished, apart from the fact that yet again the Public Sector Management Commission thought it was a good idea to give it the axe.

**Mr EATON:** The honourable member is trying to split hairs and put words into people's mouths. He fully understands the problem. It is a Government decision. We are the Government of the day. We are implementing this legislation, and the honourable member will have to accept the explanation that is given in the Explanatory Notes.

Clause 6, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 7 to 42, as read, agreed to.

Clause 43—

**Mr HOBBS** (4.10 p.m.): This clause states—

“A person who is aggrieved by the conduct of a registered valuer may complain to the board.”

That complaint must be in writing, but I ask: will the person making the complaint have to sign that document?

**Mr EATON:** Yes.

Clause 43, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 44 to 49, as read, agreed to.

Clause 50—

**Mr BEANLAND** (4.11 p.m.): In my speech during the second-reading debate, I raised a point in relation to clause 50. This clause concerns the committee that will be set up. I heard what the Minister said in relation to the board. I have used the same words myself. He said that the quorum for the board is set out elsewhere. The quorum is two members and the composition of the full board is three. In relation to the disciplinary committee—the full committee comprises five members, because two assistant committee members have been added, but there is no reference to what number will represent a quorum. I accept that a quorum is mentioned elsewhere, but it is not mentioned anywhere under clause 50 or any of the other clauses that I can discover. I stand to be corrected, if the Minister can point out to me that it appears elsewhere, but I have spent some time looking for it. It may be that the Minister will use the general principle that three out of five is a majority and that will constitute a quorum, but again that is not spelt out anywhere within this clause. I accept the point that the Minister referred to the fact that the committee would have a maximum of five and he hoped that five members would be present. Five members will not be present at every disciplinary hearing.

**Mr EATON:** We feel that the clause is self-explanatory. A quorum was not included because the position could arise whereby one member had a pecuniary interest. The Government decided that all five members should be compelled to sit only on disciplinary matters. If a member had a pecuniary interest, the committee would be leaving itself open to criticism if that member sat on that particular matter. That could happen if it was compulsory for all five members to constitute a quorum. That is why the clause is worded this way. If a member has a pecuniary interest, then four members will constitute the committee.

**Mr BEANLAND:** I take it from the Minister's explanation that, with the exception of pecuniary interests where there is a conflict, in every other case all five members will be required to be present for any committee hearings?

**Mr EATON:** Yes, that is correct.

Clause 50, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 51 to 70 and Schedules 1 to 3, as read, agreed to.

Bill reported, without amendment.

### Third Reading

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

### ADJOURNMENT

**Hon. R. J. GIBBS** (Wolston—Minister for Tourism, Sport and Racing) (4.15 p.m.):  
I move—

“That the House do now adjourn.”

**Mr BORBIDGE:** Mr Speaker, I wish to move an amendment to the motion, “That the House do now adjourn.” My amendment is—

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! It is out of order to move an amendment. The question is, “That the House do now adjourn.” As many of that opinion say “Aye”—

**Mr BORBIDGE:** Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr BORBIDGE:** I move—

“That the honourable member for Surfers Paradise be heard.”

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! The moving of such a motion is out of order.

**Mr BORBIDGE:** I rise to a further point of order.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! I have stated the question. I warn the Leader of the Opposition. He will resume his seat.

Question—That the House do now adjourn—put; and the House divided—

AYES, 44

NOES, 30

Ardill	Hollis	Beanland	Springborg
Barber	Livingstone	Booth	Stephan
Beattie	Mackenroth	Borbidge	Stoneman
Bird	McGrady	Connor	Turner
Bredhauer	Nunn	Coomber	Watson
Briskey	Palaszcuk	Elliott	
Campbell	Pearce	FitzGerald	
Casey	Power	Gilmore	
Clark	Robson	Goss J. N.	
Comben	Schwarten	Hobbs	
D'Arcy	Smyth	Horan	
Davies	Spence	Johnson	
De Lacy	Sullivan J. H.	Katter	
Dollin	Sullivan T. B.	Lester	
Eaton	Szczerbanik	Lingard	
Edmond	Vaughan	Littleproud	
Elder	Warner	McCauley	
Fenlon	Welford	Perrett	
Flynn	Woodgate	Randell	
Foley		Rowell	
Gibbs	<i>Tellers:</i>	Santoro	<i>Tellers:</i>
Hamill	Prest	Sheldon	Neal
Hayward	Pitt	Slack	Dunworth

Resolved in the affirmative.

The House adjourned at 4.23 p.m.