

**FRIDAY, 17 SEPTEMBER 1993**

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

**PETITIONS**

The Clerk announced the receipt of the following petitions—

**Belyando River**

From **Mr Mitchell** (40 signatories) praying that the Parliament of Queensland will ensure that moneys are made available to complete the sealing of 33 kilometres of road at Belyando River.

**Native Animals and Plants**

From **Ms Robson** (12 737 signatories) praying that the Parliament of Queensland will actively maintain legal sanctuary and permanent preservation for all native animals and plants in Queensland national parks and revoke all sections of Acts which appear to allow hunting or gathering of native wildlife.

**Amby State School**

From **Mr Hobbs** (165 signatories) praying that the Parliament of Queensland will take action to reverse the decision to close the Amby State School at the end of 1993.

Petitions received.

**STATUTORY INSTRUMENT**

In accordance with the schedule circulated by the Clerk to members in the Chamber, the following document was tabled—

Industrial Relations Act—

Amendments to the Rules of Court of the Industrial Court promulgated on 12 October 1990. The amendments were made on 13 August 1993 and take effect from 1 September 1993.

**PAPERS**

The following papers were laid on the table—

Premier and Minister for Economic and Trade Development (Mr W Goss)

Reports for the year ended 30 June 1993—

Department of the Premier,  
Economic and Trade Development

Department of the Co-ordinator  
General

Office of the Queensland  
Parliamentary Counsel

Office of the Cabinet

Public Sector Management  
Committee

Queensland Public Sector Training  
Council

Electoral and Administrative Review  
Commission

Fifth and Final Report for the period 1  
July—30 August 1993—

Electoral and Administrative Review  
Commission.

**MINISTERIAL STATEMENT****Draft Strategy on Disability Services**

**Hon. A. M. WARNER** (South Brisbane—Minister for Family Services and Aboriginal and Islander Affairs) (10.03 a.m.), by leave: I seek leave to table the document titled *The Draft Queensland Government Strategy on Disability* and to have my ministerial statement regarding the document incorporated in *Hansard*.

Leave granted.

Mr Speaker, I seek leave of the House to make a Ministerial Statement regarding the draft Queensland Government Strategy on Disability Services.

Over the past two years the disability field in Queensland has been characterised by a process of rapid change. You may recall, Mr Speaker, that in June last year I introduced the Disability Services Bill, which relates to the provision of services for people with disabilities.

The preparation of the legislation was a requirement of Queensland signing the Commonwealth/State Disability Agreement.

The Agreement, signed in July 1991, came into effect in June 1992 with the passage of the Queensland Disability Services Act.

As I pointed out in the second reading speech for last year, prior to the introduction of the Disability Services Bill, Queensland had no unifying set of principles and objectives to direct the development of disability services.

Furthermore, there was, Mr Speaker, no framework to allow service providers to respond to State Government priorities or to take advantage of opportunities to co-ordinate their efforts with the diverse range of services provided by the Government.

Now the Queensland Disability Services Act is recognised as integral to the framework for the provision of services and supports to people with disabilities.

One of the distinguishing features of the Act is that it applies across the State Government to any programs or services which can or do affect people with disabilities. This whole-of-government approach was developed in recognition of the fact that people with disabilities have the right to access the full range of services provided by the State Government.

The Disability Directions Committee, comprised of the Chief Executive Officers of thirteen Queensland Government Departments and agencies, was established to provide a co-ordinating mechanism for the whole-of-government approach established in the Act.

In endorsing the establishment of the Disability Directions Committee, Cabinet charged the Committee with the significant responsibility of developing a broad Queensland Government Strategy on Disability Services.

Earlier this afternoon, I had the pleasure of releasing the draft Strategy on Disability Services at a launch held in the Parliamentary Annexe. The launch was attended by approximately forty representatives of the non-Government sector and marks the beginning of a period for community comment until November 1993.

The release of this document, Mr Speaker, is significant for two reasons. Firstly, it signals the culmination of a period of laying foundations—foundations necessary to establish a strong basis for supporting people with disabilities in Queensland.

More importantly, the release marks the continuation of a process of dialogue between the Queensland Government and people with disabilities, their families, carers, advocates and service providers.

The draft Strategy seeks to articulate how the Queensland Disability Services Act can be implemented beyond the funding and provision of specific disability support services.

The document reflects the current status of disability service provision in Queensland and maps out the activities that can be undertaken within the first twelve months to address the issues that have been identified.

The Strategy will be reviewed annually and community input will be part of the ongoing review process.

The objectives of the draft Strategy have been drawn directly from the Terms of Reference of the Disability Directions Committee.

The first objective, Mr Speaker, is a review of the framework for disability service provision across the Queensland Government, and perhaps the best example of the activities proposed under this objective is the proposal to develop a Queensland Government policy and plan on institutional reform.

You will be aware, Mr Speaker, that many State Government services to people with disabilities are presently delivered within institutions. People with disabilities have long been denied their rights as Australian citizens to live in, and be part of, the general community. A policy of institutional reform will therefore establish the principles by which transition to independent living will occur, and a plan will ensure that current and future activity is managed in a co-ordinated way.

The second objective of the draft Strategy is to further progress the rationalisation of roles and responsibilities between the Queensland and Commonwealth Governments. Under the auspice of the Disability Directions Committee, the Queensland Government will be equipped to adopt a whole-of-government position in working with the Commonwealth on issues of joint concern to people with disabilities.

The third objective of the draft Strategy is the development of collaborative plans for disability services. This objective takes account of the fact that the primary focus of service provision must be on the individual rather than on artificial administrative boundaries.

There are a number of specific issues which require a co-ordinated response across a number of Departments and agencies and the activities proposed under this objective highlight some of these.

A good example, Mr Speaker, is the need for Government to develop options for young people with disabilities in their transition from school to work, access to further education and training, and other life options.

The period of community comment on the draft Strategy extends until November 1993 and represents an unprecedented opportunity for collaboration between the non-government sector and all key Government agencies.

The community will therefore play a vital role in moulding the way in which the Disability Directions Committee approaches the proposed changes.

I believe that the draft Strategy represents the establishment of a mechanism for ensuring that the Queensland Government is able to respond to the needs and wishes of people with disabilities in a flexible and innovative manner.

I am therefore delighted to table this document before you today, Mr Speaker, and I commend it to the House.

## MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

### Jobs Plan

**Hon. M. J. FOLEY** (Yeronga—Minister for Employment, Training and Industrial Relations) (10.04 a.m.), by leave: Almost a year ago to the day, the Goss Government was re-elected for a second term with a mandate to introduce its \$150m Jobs Plan. Funded by an increase in the tobacco franchise fee, the Jobs Plan was intended to hasten the recovery of the labour market in Queensland. With the funds provided from that increase, the \$150m Jobs Plan had provided assistance to more than 28 000 Queenslanders to 30 June. Specifically, by the end of the 1992-93 financial year, 2 520 jobs had been created, 3 301 people had been placed in jobs, 11 255 people had been placed in training, and the remainder had received other assistance, including the provision of business advice.

I am able to provide for members' information the details of the seven programs of the Jobs Plan and the results achieved by each of these programs. Rather than take up the valuable time of the House, I seek leave to have these incorporated in *Hansard*.

Leave granted.

The \$150 Million Jobs Plan assisted more than 28,000 Queenslanders to June 30, 1993 through:

payroll tax incentives

increases in the payroll tax threshold and extension of a rebate to employers who take on long-term unemployed people;

\$8 million Community Jobs Plan

to assist 5,000 people, particularly mature-aged long-term jobseekers, through community-based activities such as interest-free loans for unemployed people to start their own businesses; grants to community groups for training and job placement projects and the development of an additional five community-owned and five more enterprise centres to foster the development of small business and job creation;

\$15.2 million Safe Bikeways Program

to provide a network of bicycle paths throughout Queensland directly creating 330 jobs and more indirect jobs;

\$5 million Jobs for the Environment

600 training positions for long-term unemployed people and 200 other jobs improving national park facilities;

\$7 million Youth Jobs Plan

to assist 1,700 young people through extra training opportunities and jobs in the private and public sector, including 200 extra subsidised apprenticeships and traineeships in public sector agencies; awarding of public housing contracts to group training companies to allow them to employ apprentices; 140 training positions in an expanded Youth Conservation Corps and the appointment of 20 extra youth employment consultants across the state to help place young people in jobs and training;

\$19 million Jobs Through TAFE

to employ 500 TAFE tutors, creating 3,100 extra student places and appoint job placement officers in every college to help graduates find work;

\$60 million schools refurbishment

to spend \$60 million over two years fixing Queensland's schools, creating 1,200 jobs for unemployed people.

## \$150 M Jobs Plan—Details of Employment by Program Element to 30 June 1993

Program Element	New Jobs Created	People Placed into Jobs	People Placed into Training	People Receiving Other Assistance	Total Assisted (target)
Payroll Tax Incentives Plan	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Youth Jobs Plan	840	1,042	1,665	1,414	5,056
Community Jobs Plan	245	113	3,828	5,169	8,994
Jobs through TAFE	533	2,146	5,462	6,392	13,321
School Refurbishment	476	NA	NA	NA	476
Safe Bikeways	311	NA	NA	NA	311
Jobs for the Environment	115	NA	300	NA	415
Totals	2,520	3,301	11,255	12,975	28,573 (21,006)

NB: Because a client may receive multiple forms of assistance and therefore be listed in both a job column and training column the sum of the columns may exceed the number of persons assisted.

**Mr FOLEY:** Over the next 10 days, the results to 30 June will be announced on a regional basis, as will the Government's regional employment programs for the 1993-94 financial year. As outlined by the Treasurer in his Budget Speech, the Goss Government will continue to focus on jobs in 1993-94, with 25 000 people to be assisted during the second year of the Jobs Plan.

Unemployment brings great social and economic costs to a community. It is a challenge, therefore, which the whole community has a collective responsibility to tackle. The Jobs Plan has succeeded not only because of the State Government's commitment to fighting unemployment but also because of the support of other levels of Government, community groups, employers and many individuals. On behalf of the Goss Government, I seek their support again in creating jobs and opportunities for Queenslanders in 1993-94.

## PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEE OF PUBLIC WORKS

### Resignation of Mr V. G. Johnson

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! Honourable members, I have received a letter dated 15 September 1993 from the member for Gregory advising of his resignation from the Parliamentary Committee of Public Works.

### Appointment of Mr G. J. Healy

**Hon. T. M. MACKENROTH**  
(Chatsworth—Leader of the House)

(10.06 a.m.), by leave, without notice: I move—

“That Mr Johnson be discharged from further attendance on the Parliamentary Committee of Public Works and that Mr Healy, having been duly nominated in accordance with Standing Order 188, be appointed a member of the Committee.”

Motion agreed to.

## QUESTIONS UPON NOTICE

### 1. Australian Labor Party, Invoice

Mr LINGARD asked the Deputy Premier, Minister for Administrative Services and Minister for Rural Communities—

“With reference to a computer disk from a company I have in my possession showing an invoice for \$25,000 dated 3 January 1990 and made out to the ALP ‘Attention: Wayne Swan’ and headed ‘Re: Archives – Account Rendered as Agreed’ and to the advice of the Attorney-General that no work has been carried out at the Archives under his control—

Has any work been carried out at Archives under your control to substantiate a cost of \$25,000 around that period?”

**Mr MACKENROTH:** I respond to that question on behalf of the Deputy Premier. He advises that he has had this matter investigated by the State Archivist, Ms Lee McGregor. She has advised that the State Archives has not employed the services of any

person or organisation to complete work for the ALP during the periods in question. She has also advised that the State Archives did not perform any work to the value of \$25,000 for the ALP.

In addition, yesterday the Deputy Premier contacted the State Secretary of the ALP to inquire whether the ALP had employed any person named J. Duran or the firm Yates Professional Investigations and Security Pty Ltd—named in the member's previous questions—to perform work to the value of \$25,000. The secretary has advised that no such payments have been made. For the information of the honourable member, I table a copy of a memo to the ALP State Secretary from the ALP accountant to that effect.

## 2. Government Aircraft

Mr COOPER asked the Minister for Police and Emergency Services—

“(1) How many trips has he taken using Government aircraft since he became Minister for Police and Emergency Services?”

(2) Will he outline in detail the time, dates, costs, reasons and destinations for all these flights, together with the names of those on the flights?”

**Mr BRADY:** I inform the House that the Goss Government has very strict guidelines in relation to ministerial use of aircraft and that those guidelines have at all times been adhered to by all the Ministers of the Goss Government.

I have prepared a schedule showing the use by me of the Government aircraft commencing on the first occasion on 14 October 1992.

**Mr Borbidge:** The police aircraft as well.

**Mr BRADY:** All Government aircraft, including police aircraft.

**Mr W. K. Goss:** Including a comparison with the previous Government.

**Mr BRADY:** I will make some comments about the previous Government and about Mr Cooper in particular. The schedule—

**Mr Veivers** interjected.

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

**Mr BRADY:** The schedule shows the details requested. The Government Air Wing does not, of course, have a specific costing for those flights because they are not commercial

flights or charter flights. However, the details, the dates, the type of aircraft, the sectors flown, the purpose of the flight and the passengers are all outlined in the schedule.

When some of these details were published in the *Courier-Mail*, Mr Cooper got on the bandwagon very early and started making allegations about taxis. That was the cynical and incorrect statement that he made. The schedule will reveal that on only seven occasions in the course of the year I was involved in Brisbane-Rockhampton flights, as distinct from flights to other destinations as well, such as Mount Garnet, Emerald or Townsville.

**Mr Cooper:** Just a straightforward question.

**Mr BRADY:** The reason I am making this distinction is not because of the question itself, which is perfectly proper—and to which I have no difficulty giving the information—it is because the comments that the member for Crows Nest, Mr Cooper, made outside this place specifically accusing me of taxi flights to my electorate. I reject that.

There have been only seven flights, and the details are contained in the schedule. Of those flights, a typical one was when I accompanied the Premier to the opening of the Stanwell Power Station. We left Parliament that day, flew to Rockhampton and returned to Brisbane. That is the type of flight that was made. I flew seven times only to Rockhampton in the course of the 12 months, as distinct from flights to Rockhampton that were included in Statewide trips that I took as Minister for Police and Emergency Services.

I will also table a schedule showing the flights from 1 October 1989 to 1 December 1989—two months—by the present member for Crows Nest on Government aircraft. Although he had access to domestic and charter flights, I am referring only to Government aircraft. In two months, he flew out of Roma seven times out of nine flights. This is the member who was saying to me a moment ago, “I don't want to talk about this. Just table it.” However, out of this place he accused me of improper use of this aircraft.

I table my schedule of flights. I table also the schedule of flights for two months by the present member for Crows Nest.

## 3. Inter-hospital Patient Transfers

Mr LINGARD asked the Minister for Police and Emergency Services—

"With reference to his statement to this House on 1 September regarding inter-hospital patient transfers by the Queensland Ambulance Service wherein he said that such costs 'are able to be paid under the arrangements for patient charges in relation to the Health Department'—

From what date prior to 1 September were all inter-hospital transfers of patients, who are not ambulance subscribers, paid under these arrangements."

**Mr BRADY:** I thank the honourable member for the question. The matter raised is addressed as one of the Goss Government's initiatives in the current Budget. The Government has provided \$12m this financial year for inter-hospital transfers. The decision to charge the public hospital system for inter-hospital transfers applies from 1 August 1993. The system which will be followed is that it will be paid in quarterly amounts of \$3m. The first payment was made on 1 August.

In addition to that, the Bureau of Emergency Services and the Health Department will review the number of inter-hospital transfers. During the course of the year, there will be negotiations which will lead, if necessary, to increased payments in next year's Budget. The Health Department and the bureau will have a user-pays relationship in relation to inter-hospital transfers.

#### 4. Threats to Media

Mr CONNOR asked the Premier, Minister for Economic and Trade Development—

"(1) Did any member of the Government or their staff recently threaten a member of the media with words to the effect that they would 'go the same way as Bornhorst if they did not behave'?

(2) If so, is this a proper tactic to use in dealing with members of the media?"

**Mr W. K. GOSS:** I table the answer and seek leave to have it incorporated in *Hansard*.

Leave granted.

No.

#### 5. Business, Industry and Unions

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

"The Business Regulation Review Unit of the Department of Business, Industry and Regional Development, which was established to deal with the problems associated with 'red tape', has identified 470 regulatory regimes that affect business—

- (1) How many regulations have been abolished or amended?
- (2) How many new regulations are there affecting business and how many business licences have been abolished?
- (3) How many new ones have come into existence and what are they?
- (4) How many grants have been made to industry groups and unions for research?
- (5) What funds were paid to each group and how many people are involved in each project?"

**Mr ELDER:** (1) As at 16 September 1993, the following action has been taken in relation to regulations—

repealed legislation/regulations	43
legislation/regulations removed from program	56
reviews completed but not fully implemented	81
reviews in progress	261
reviews yet to commence	28

(2) The processes of the systematic review of business legislation and regulations are focused on existing regulatory regimes, because they were not effectively evaluated for their impact on business at implementation, even though the Regulatory Reform Act legislation was enacted in 1986 by the previous National Party Government. All regulatory regimes known to affect business at 31 December 1991 were included in that review.

All new regulatory regimes since 1992 have been subjected to scrutiny through the processes set out in the *Cabinet Handbook*. The Queensland Business Licence Information Centre has deleted 81 licences from its database since 21 April 1992.

(3) Since January 1992, 36 new licences were added to the QBLIC database. The majority of those licences on the list have come about through reforms and changes to the Liquor Act. For the interest of honourable members, I point out that the last four, which refer to milk licences, are concerned with transitional arrangements in the milk industry.

For the information of the House, I table that list.

(4) No grants have been made under the review program administered through the Business Regulation Review Unit. However, the Department of Business, Industry and Regional Development administers the Peak Bodies Liaison Scheme, whose purpose is to improve the relationship between Government and business.

Under this scheme, the salary of one officer in each of three industry organisations—the Queensland Confederation of Industry, the Metal Trades Industry Association and the State Chamber of Commerce and Industry—is funded by the Queensland Government. The duties of these officers include identification of regulatory issues which are investigated by the Business Regulation Review Unit when they are brought to its attention. The maximum Government contribution is \$50,000 per annum to each organisation during the current three-year agreement with those associations.

(5) See (4).

## QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

### Rail Closures

**Mr BORBIDGE:** In directing a question to the Minister for Transport, I refer to his threats yesterday both public and private that, if he were made to keep country rail services open, other cutbacks would have to be made in his department, in particular road funding. I ask: can he assure the House that there will be no cuts to road funding this financial year as a result of the review of rail closures?

**Mr HAMILL:** I give that assurance.

### Comments on Australian Republic by Governor-General

**Mr BORBIDGE:** In directing a question to the Premier, I refer to comments made by the Governor-General, the Honourable Bill Hayden, expressing concerns about the Prime Minister's republican proposals, in particular that replacing a constitutional monarchy that "works well" with a republic could create "unstable Government". I ask: does the Premier support these concerns so clearly expressed by the Governor-General?

**Mr W. K. GOSS:** I think that most reasonable and fair-minded Australians would agree that the current system of democracy that we have in this country is a good one. By comparison with just about any other place

that I can compare it with, I think we are very fortunate indeed.

It is a separate question, however, as to how we see our national identity and how we would want to have ourselves seen internationally. I do not believe that the transition to a republic will be a transition to instability, but I believe that, in making that transition—one which I think will inevitably occur—all Australians have to be mindful of the fact that we should seek to do that in a way that has the broad support of the Australian community. If we move in that direction on the basis of division, on the basis of partisan argument, there may be a possibility that the transition will be less stable than we all would wish.

I believe that all reasonable and fair-minded Australians value the current democratic system and institutions that we have. But, similarly, they all share the belief, whether they are in favour of a republic or not, that, if that transition occurs, we should all seek to ensure that it does occur in a way that maintains the values of the current democratic system that we have. I believe that can occur, but I believe that we have to be very careful to avoid some of the partisan aspects of the debate that we have seen in recent times.

**Mr Borbidge:** You don't agree with Bill Hayden.

**Mr W. K. GOSS:** I did not say that. I am speaking for myself.

**Mr Borbidge:** You don't agree with Bill Hayden.

**Mr W. K. GOSS:** No, I am speaking for myself. If the honourable member cannot understand the answer, it is because he does not want to understand the answer.

**Mr Borbidge:** Do you agree with Bill Hayden—"Yes" or "No"?

**Mr W. K. GOSS:** The honourable member asks the questions; I give the answers. His question is designed to achieve the very thing that I am warning against.

**Mr Borbidge** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! The Leader of the Opposition will cease interjecting.

**Mr W. K. GOSS:** The approach of the Leader of the Opposition in this place and in public debate generally is to introduce as much spite, small-mindedness and division as he possibly can. That is an approach that I am sure the Governor-General would reject. It is an approach that I reject. I have the greatest respect for the views of the Governor-General. I am expressing my views. I share the view of

the Governor-General that our current system works well. I share the view that the transition to a republic is inevitable and desirable. But I stress again that we should all work together—not on a party or partisan basis, which the Leader of the Opposition has tried to inject into this debate—and move in that direction only on the basis that the broad cross-section of the Australian community is comfortable with that move.

### Law and Order

**Mr PITT:** In directing a question to the Minister for Police and Emergency Services, I refer to criticism by the Opposition spokesman for Police and Emergency Services in regard to certain law and order initiatives of the Goss Government, and I ask: can the Minister shed any light on these claims?

**Mr BRADY:** One of the very specific targets that the Goss Government has reached over the past four years has been a very large increase in terms of Budget moneys and personnel. When we came to office in December 1989, some 5 200 police were working in Queensland. There are now almost 6 400. Despite the efforts of the member for Crows Nest to decry that, they are the statistics that the Police Service supplies and which are real. Mr Cooper, the member for Crows Nest, seeks to ring the alarm bells whenever he can and jump on any bandwagons that are passing by.

In relation to Logan City—Mr Cooper seeks to give support to those who will not face reality. When the National Party was in Government, there were 137 police at Logan City. There are now 316. Despite that, Mr Cooper, the member for Crows Nest, tries to argue that that is inaccurate. Our first Budget allocation for Logan City was in 1990-91, involving the sum of \$10.4m. That figure is now \$15m—an increase of 44 per cent in the Logan City area alone. The crime clear-up rates in the Logan City district are on a par with the State average. This Government is continually increasing police numbers. In recognition of local needs, the number of CIB officers in the Logan district was increased recently from 21 to 31. They are the sort of statistics that the member for Crows Nest seeks not to know, or to hide.

**Mr Cooper:** The crime rate is going up.

**Mr BRADY:** The crime rate in many areas of Queensland is falling. Statistics that will be published shortly will show that, for the first time, in several areas where there is a

serious crime problem, Queensland is turning the crime rate around.

The member for Crows Nest made efforts to cover the absence of the Leader of the Opposition in the Budget debate. The Leader of the Opposition went missing the day after the Budget was released. Only Mrs Sheldon and Mr Cooper were talking about it. The Leader of the Opposition had nothing to say. The member for Crows Nest was publishing false statistics and crying wolf in relation to police matters. He has been exposed for what he is.

### Local Authority Leaders

**Mr PITT:** I ask the Minister for Housing, Local Government and Planning: is he aware of the debate at the Local Government Association conference yesterday in regard to recommending a preferred title for elected leaders of local authorities? Can the Minister advise the House of his views in relation to this matter?

**Mr MACKENROTH:** Nothing has caused more problems in local government over the past year than what we are going to call the heads of local authorities. We released a proposed Act. Nothing in that Act has caused more debate throughout Queensland than what their title should be—whether we should change it from “Chairman” to “Chairperson”. At one stage, it was suggested that we could consider “President”. But it was stated yesterday that there was some concern that the term “President” could cause confusion during the republic debate. I do not know what they are going to do in New South Wales and Victoria, because those States have presidents of local authorities. Perhaps they will have to look closely at that.

On Tuesday of this week, I suggested that perhaps people involved in local government should consider whether or not we could call all heads of local authorities—because I would have thought that all heads of local authorities in Queensland were equal—mayors. But during that conference yesterday, one delegate called it an absurdity that the head of every hick village be called a mayor. These were members of local authorities talking at their own conference. One delegate went on to call the debate—

“. . . the highlight of the whole week. This has caused more show of egotism and discussion and it is marvellous to see that we have at last found a subject that touches the hearts of all delegates.”

The conference was split down the middle as to whether or not they should change the title, or go different ways.

**Mr Elliott** interjected.

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

**Mr MACKENROTH:** Later today, I have agreed to meet with a group of female chairmen. We will have a discussion on what they would prefer to see as the title for elected heads of local authorities.

### **Election Commitments; Tobacco Licensing Fees**

**Mrs SHELDON:** I direct a question to the Treasurer. Yesterday, he stated that Labor election promises were to be funded by increased tobacco licensing fees. I table his election eve press release titled "Full Cost and Funding for Goss Government Policies"; a Budget overview extract showing that \$96.6m was raised in extra tobacco tax; and page 28 of his Annual Statement showing that \$177m in expenditure was due significantly to election commitments. I ask: why did the Treasurer mislead the voters of this State and the members of this Parliament yesterday; cheat in his Budget comments on 5 November; and steal tens of millions of dollars worth of unfunded campaign promises from Queensland taxpayers?

**Mr De LACY:** I find the whole question a bit hard to follow. The increased return from the tobacco licence fee during the last financial year was \$96.7m. Honourable members might recall that our Estimates were \$97m—spot-on—even though some members of the Opposition seem to want to criticise Treasury because of the inaccuracy of its forecasting. In this financial year, we are forecasting an increase in tobacco licence revenue of something like \$170m in a full year. Members will recall that last year was not a full year. That is now factored into all our revenue, from which we have met all our election commitments.

As I said in my Budget Speech, I believe that Queensland is unique in Australia in the sense that we have met all our election commitments in full and on time from available resources without increasing taxes, running up debt, selling off assets, or doing a range of things that other States are doing. How the honourable member could imply that somehow we have misled the people or that we are taking money from some source which is improper, I do not know. But that is perhaps

the convoluted way in which members of the Opposition tend to read Budget papers.

### **Smorgans**

**Mrs SHELDON:** I ask the Minister for Transport: in view of the three-week strike which has crippled operations in Smorgans' abattoirs in both Townsville and Rockhampton, which has cost that company hundreds of thousands of dollars and which has affected Queensland's business reputation, will the Minister tell the people of Queensland why he has allowed Queensland Rail management and workers to take part in an illegal secondary boycott of Smorgans by refusing to load cattle trains at abattoirs? What action has the Minister taken to rectify this illegal action.

**Mr HAMILL:** In response to the honourable member's question, I have given no directions to Queensland Rail in relation to this matter and have given no directions to workers in Queensland Rail in relation to this matter. What they do is their business.

### **Ambulance Services**

**Mr LIVINGSTONE:** I ask the Minister for Police and Emergency Services: is he aware of recent comments by the Opposition spokesman on Police and Emergency Services about ambulance services in Queensland? Has the Minister the facts on the restructuring of the service?

**Mr BRADY:** The member for Crows Nest has again been trying to ring the alarm bells in relation to the Ambulance Service. The major claim that he makes in relation to the funding of the Ambulance Service should be rebutted in this House in perhaps the forlorn hope that he will then tell the truth. The member for Crows Nest has been comparing last year's budget for the Ambulance Service of about \$115m with this year's budgeted amount, and saying that there has been no increase because this year's budget allocation is \$114.8m.

He is aware that the Ambulance Service budget is substantially contingent on subscriptions. He also would be aware that in the course of last year, because the subscriptions did not rise by the large amount that was budgeted for, the budget was, in fact, changed to \$111m.

**Mr Cooper:** How many subscriptions officers have you sacked—you sacked 56.

**Mr BRADY:** He also knows from the Budget papers—if he would stop interjecting and listen—that the actual amount of money spent last year on the Ambulance Service was \$110.5m. This year, the Government is budgeting for \$114.8m, and that is a budget figure which the Government believes is extremely realistic. This year, the Government's contribution has increased from \$30m to \$45m. The estimates in relation to subscriptions is realistic, and what is occurring—

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! I inform the Minister that later we are going to go to the Committee stage of the Appropriation Bill, and I do not believe that we ought to be debating Budget matters.

**Mr BRADY:** I will move to the matter of ambulance officers, which is another area about which the member for Crows Nest tries to cause alarm. It is interesting to make a comparison with ambulance services in other cities. In Brisbane, we have some 470 ambulance officers compared with the city of Auckland in New Zealand—a city with a similar population—which has only 200 ambulance officers. There are more ambulance officers stationed on the Gold Coast—which the member talks about a lot—than there are in Canberra in the ACT. There are more ambulance officers in the Gold Coast than there are in the city of Christchurch. All the comparisons with similar cities in the country show that the numbers of operational ambulance officers are among the best anywhere in the Western World. Again, the member for Crows Nest has attempted to be dishonest and to stir up mud in relation to this matter. Again, his credibility is on the line. His lack of credibility has been exposed.

#### **Rural Fire Services**

**Mr LIVINGSTONE:** I ask the Minister for Police and Emergency Services: is the Minister aware of misleading statements about rural fire services? Has the Minister the facts on this important community service?

**Mr BRADY:** In relation to rural fire services, one would think that the National Party member, the member for Crows Nest, would be well aware of the details of this issue but, yet again, he has issued an alarmist statement claiming that rural fire services have not been properly funded. This statement comes from a former Minister who would not give the volunteers in Queensland's heartland protective clothing to fight the serious bush fires that they encounter. The Labor Party had to do that when it came to Government. The

member for Crows Nest and his party, when there were in Government, failed to do that. Now he is crying wolf and in relation to this issue.

The allocations for rural fires services for 1991-92 was \$2.4m. That amount has been increased, along with a significant allocation for clothing. This Government handed out 6 530 sets of personal protective clothing last year—clothing that the honourable member for Crows Nest and his party failed to provide when they were in Government. Yet Mr Cooper and his party claim that the Government is not looking after rural fire services. The rural fire service of this State has never been better equipped, better clothed or better resourced than it is at the present time.

#### **School Dental Service**

**Mr HORAN:** I direct my first question to the Minister for Health. In view of the Government's allocation in this year's Budget to extend the school dental service to Years 8, 9 and 10, and the emerging concerns for infection control in dental procedures, I refer him to the current policy of the Australian Dental Association that all dentists use handpieces suitable for heat sterilisation, that all handpieces be sterilised by autoclave before use with each patient and that these procedures be in place by the end of 1993, and I ask: can the Minister guarantee that these infection control arrangements will be in place at every school dental service by that date?

**Mr HAYWARD:** That is a question that I want to give a full and detailed answer to. I request that the honourable member put the question on notice if he wants such a detailed answer.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! Will the member do so accordingly?

**Mr HORAN:** I do so accordingly.

#### **Regional Health Authorities Productivity Dividend**

**Mr HORAN:** My second question is to the Minister for Health. With regard to the productivity dividend imposed on regional health authorities, I ask the Minister: how is the productivity dividend determined and collected from regional health authorities and hospitals within those authorities? To whom is the collected amount paid—the Health Department or consolidated revenue? How much productivity dividend is estimated to be paid in 1993-94?

**Mr HAYWARD:** The productivity dividend is an important part of the process of the budget within Queensland Health. It works in a number of ways, but in determining the budget allocation to Queensland Health, part of the consideration, during the Cabinet budget review process, is the necessity to provide a productivity dividend. That dividend is obtained on the basis of the allocation of the money, and then, from the point of view of the central office of Queensland Health, we allocate that productivity dividend across the regions in proper amounts proportionate to the Budget allocation that they receive.

#### **Badges of Office for Justices of the Peace—Qualified and Commissioners for Declarations**

**Mr PYKE:** I ask the Minister for Justice and Attorney-General: would he outline the badges of office initiative for justices of the peace—qualified and commissioners for declarations and explain how justices and commissioners can purchase badges of office?

**Mr WELLS:** My department has developed a series of badges of office to recognise the high esteem in which commissioners for declarations and justices of the peace—qualified are held, and to enable members of the community to contact them.

The range available includes badges, scarf pins, key rings, cuff links, wall plaques, letterbox signs and window stickers. There is a display in the Legislative Council Chamber today, and I hope that honourable members will go in there and have a look at it.

**Mr Santoro:** Have you employed a sales assistant or are you the chief salesman?

**Mr WELLS:** The honourable member can see the Registrar of Justices, who will provide him with the appropriate order forms, which he can take back to his electorate office and provide to his constituents.

Honourable members will be pleased to know that there are a number of members of this House who have supported the reform process to the extent of actually holding office in the new system. The honourable member for Mount Ommaney who asked the question is known to his constituents as "Mr Peter Pyke, Commissioner for Declarations". Mr Peter Pyke is today wearing the cufflinks of a commissioner for declarations. Very recently, the honourable member for Sandgate became a justice of the peace—qualified. He is known to his constituents as "Gordon Nuttall, Justice of the Peace". Honourable

members might think that the red rosette he wears on his lapel is the only thing he wears on his lapel, but what he also has is a badge of office of a justice of the peace—qualified. The honourable member for Kurwongbah has been a justice of the peace under the old system for as long as I have known her, and she is now a commissioner for declarations.

**Mr SPEAKER:** I think that is sufficient.

**Mr WELLS:** Mr Speaker, there is just one more. The justices of the peace initiative is entirely bipartisan. When somebody acts as a justice of the peace in a quasi-judicial capacity, it is entirely above politics. This initiative is above politics. There are members on the other side of the House who are also part of the system. The honourable member for Beaudesert is known to his constituents as "Mr Kevin Lingard, Justice of the Peace—Qualified", and I understand that today he is wearing the cufflinks appropriate for a justice of the peace—qualified. I urge honourable members to get the order forms and take them back to their electorates.

#### **Ambulance Service Vehicles**

**Mr PYKE:** I ask the Minister for Police and Emergency Services: is he aware of claims that the Queensland Ambulance Service is using unroadworthy vehicles? Is there any need for patients to be concerned?

**Mr BRADY:** Claims have been made that concerns have been expressed in relation to ambulance vehicles. Of course, those concerns have been stirred by the honourable member for Crows Nest. One would think that he would take more of an interest in the real advances that have been made by the Queensland Ambulance Service.

**Mr Elliott:** He's really getting under your skin, isn't he?

**Mr BRADY:** No. I am enjoying it immensely. Under the old system, when we came to office, a considerable number of vehicles in the Ambulance Service throughout Queensland were in fact unsuitable. We had to remove 100 from the fleet immediately because they were entirely unroadworthy or unsuitable, leaving a fleet of 944 vehicles. Admittedly, there is still a large number of vehicles in the fleet that are beyond the desirable life span, but none of them is unroadworthy.

There is a very good system in operation. The fleet has a very good repair and maintenance system that is carried out either by mechanics in the Queensland Ambulance Service or by contracted garages. In addition,

in this year alone, 55 new ambulance vehicles will be purchased for the Queensland Ambulance Service at a cost of \$4.7m.

I reject the slur on the roadworthiness of the ambulance vehicles. I ask all honourable members to pay heed to the truth in relation to the advances that are being made in the ambulance fleet.

### Rural Training Schools

**Mr SANTORO:** In directing a question to the Minister for Employment, Training and Industrial Relations, I refer him to last year's review of Queensland rural training schools and to the facts that on 15 January this year a report was completed and distributed to rural training schools; that the responses of the rural training schools were returned to VETEC shortly afterwards; and that he received a briefing at the end of June. I ask: when will he announce the results of the review? What legislative action is to follow?

**Mr FOLEY:** I thank the honourable member for the question. Rural training schools make an important contribution to the system of vocational education and training throughout this State. The review was undertaken by Dr Alexander on behalf of the Vocational Education Training and Employment Commission—VETEC. The commission was established by legislation to provide strategic advice to this Government.

The review identified a number of matters, including those which required further consideration by VETEC. One of those matters which caused some delay in the processing of this review was the cost per student of delivering vocational education and training through the rural training school. The point is simply this: because those schools provide residential facilities and because they provide a range of training in rural industry—from working with horses through to such matters as using explosives, general work with stock and work with various types of grain—they cost a significant amount more per student contact hour than is the usual for the delivery of, say, TAFE services. Hence, the matter went back to VETEC for further consideration.

That matter has been back to VETEC, and since then has been brought back to me for further consideration. I hope to be able to announce the outcome of that review within the next two months.

### Unemployment Statistics

**Mr SANTORO:** In directing a question to the Treasurer, I point out that during a radio interview on the ABC's *Late Edition* program on 9 September, he stated that, in light of the massive jump in Queensland unemployment from 10.3 per cent to 11.2 per cent—the biggest jump in the country for the August figures—he would have to go back and rework his forecast for employment and its impact on the economy. I ask: has he reworked his employment forecasts in the light of the blow-out in unemployment percentages, which casts extreme doubt on his Budget forecast of an average State unemployment rate of 10.1 per cent in 1993-94?

**Mr De LACY:** No, I have not, and I think the honourable member has placed an interpretation which is quite false on some comments that I made.

**Mr Santoro:** That is precisely what you said. Are you denying that you said that?

**Mr De LACY:** The member should just listen. I am answering his question. The projections in the Budget were for employment growth of 2.7 per cent. As far as I am concerned, that 2.7 per cent is still on track and the average unemployment rate throughout the year will be 10.1 per cent, which is still on track. What I did say in that interview is that one swallow does not make a summer.

**Mr Santoro:** Be careful, because I have a transcript. No, you didn't; you said you would rework the figures. As the Premier says, the honourable member has asked the question; I will give the answer. I have answered, "No, I will not be reworking the figures." If the member wants a simple answer, it is, "No, I will not be reworking the figures", because what I said as clearly as I possibly could is that one single month—

**Mr Santoro** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr De LACY:** What I said was that when one looks at unemployment, one has to look at trend lines. I know that members of the Opposition have jumped on the August unemployment figures with great glee—with undisguised glee—because there was an increase in the unemployment figures for that month. But every month that I comment on unemployment figures, I caution, "Don't read too much into a single month. What you must do is look at the trend lines."

**Mr Santoro** interjected.

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

**Mr De LACY:** The fact is that Queensland is creating employment and will continue to create employment, and the August figures were not consistent with all the other leading indicators that we have. I am standing by the forecasts that were in the Budget and I am still quite confident that those forecasts will be achieved, despite all the wishful thinking on the part of the members of the Opposition.

### **Cleveland District State High School**

**Mr BRISKEY:** I ask the Minister for Education: with respect to the Cleveland District State High School, what has the Goss Labor Government done over the last four years to ensure that only the best quality of education is being provided for the students of this high school? Further, what is planned for the Cleveland District State High School in the future?

**Mr COMBEN:** I thank the honourable member for that incisive and very good question on what the Government is doing for education in Queensland. The Cleveland District State High School is a typical Queensland high school that has benefited enormously over the past four years. Earlier this year, I had pleasure in visiting that high school and meeting with Paul Bancroft, the principal. He is supported by a very able, active and informed P & C. He is supported also by the member for Cleveland, in making his representations.

Capital works undertaken at the school over the past four years are as follows: senior manual arts machine shop—\$376,000; four-space science block—\$519,000; conversion of old science laboratories—\$50,000; home economics redevelopment Stages 1 and 2—\$622,000; and currently an upgrading of the art block—\$110,000. That totals \$1.6m in capital works. Over the past three years, expenditure on minor capital works and maintenance has totalled \$630,000.

Under the current School Refurbishment Program, \$111,000 is expected to be expended on various upgrade works. The feasibility of further upgrading the art block is being considered. In 1989, the school grants payments to the Cleveland District State High School totalled \$101,000. In 1993, they totalled \$268,000—an increase of 282 per cent. On top of that, as with every school in Queensland, the Computers in Schools Program will start to show its effects. Shortly,

the Cleveland District State High School will have computers.

The Government will provide the basics kit for P & Cs, which is money to be put into our schools across the State. It will also provide funding for regional P & Cs. That is where the money is going. It is being provided to our 300-odd high schools and 1 300 primary schools. At Cleveland, the Government will look also at a range of other projects. The good education that is provided at that school, which is supported by the member for Cleveland, will continue.

### **Timber Industry**

**Mr BRISKEY:** I ask the Minister for Primary Industries: with respect to the Queensland timber industry, could he advise on the progress of the Goss Government's commitment to providing native forest resource security in that industry?

**Mr CASEY:** The timber industry in Queensland is concerned with a growing resource. The Goss Government is a signatory to the national forest policy statement and is committed to providing a more stable investment environment to enable wood processors to obtain raw materials from Crown native forests in Queensland. This week, Cabinet considered the matter of providing greater planning certainty for Queensland's wood product industry based on Crown native forests, and it has adopted a strategy for that, which was part of the announcement that I made in the Parliament yesterday about the directional flow of primary industries in Queensland.

The Government has approved a policy that is designed to provide greater planning certainty through a three-stage process. Two years ago, that process was used very, very successfully. In conjunction with the then Minister for Environment and Heritage, Mr Comben, I used the process as a pilot program in the Conondale area of Queensland, where there was some considerable controversy about what resource should and should not be used. Adapted from that is the broader policy that the Government has approved. In conjunction with the current Minister for the Environment, the Honourable Molly Robson, I will do the same thing Statewide with the present project.

The first stage of the project will involve the introduction of regional land use planning for forestry use, followed by ecologically sustainable forest management and compensatable, long-term agreements for

wood supply from particular areas of Crown land, if that becomes necessary. However, I do not believe that it should. The project will be implemented in stages. The first round of regional assessments for the major resource in south-east Queensland, from the Maryborough region through to the region just north of Brisbane, will be completed by 1995. That will mean that the assessments for the rest of the State will be completed by 1996.

I am confident that both conservation and industry groups will support and accept the broad thrust of the Goss Government's policy, which provides the mechanism for the honouring of existing Government commitments.

### Queensland Treasury Corporation

**Mr CONNOR:** I direct a question to the Treasurer. On an analysis of the latest Queensland Treasury Corporation annual report for 1991-92—it was produced as at 30 June 1992—I note that the QTC holds a massive foreign currency exposure. At page 45 of the report, the exposure is detailed at \$2.2 billion in outstanding offshore indebtedness. I ask: will the foreign currency losses incurred by the QTC as a result of the depreciation of the Australian dollar mean higher interest charges for councils that are now forced by him to borrow from the QTC?

**Mr De LACY:** The short answer is, "No". There is no way that the Queensland Treasury Corporation would raise finance overseas if it were not taking appropriate measures to hedge that borrowing against changes in the currency. The only reason that the QTC raises funds overseas is that it can raise those funds at a cost that is cheaper than the cost for which it can raise those funds domestically. There is no other reason. It is a very professional——

**Mr Connor:** Is it hedged with QIC?

**Mr De LACY:** It is hedged in a range of ways. The Queensland Treasury Corporation is a very professional operation. The net result of its overseas borrowings is that the funds are cheaper than they would be if it were to confine all of its activities to the domestic capital market.

### Queensland Treasury Corporation

**Mr CONNOR:** I ask the Treasurer: in light of his answer, can he tell the people of Queensland whether the money used to hedge against the QTC's losses on the foreign exchange market is coming from the Public

Service Superannuation Trust or, for that matter, any other trust funds held by the Queensland Investment Corporation?

**Mr De LACY:** No. It is a silly question. It means that the honourable member did not understand the answer that I just gave. No funds were used to cover the losses, because the QTC did not make losses. That is what hedging means. In other words, the QTC is not exposed to the changes in the exchange rate. No losses are made. It is all about the cost of funds. There are no losses. The cost of funds is cheaper.

**Mr Connor:** It's on page 45. You've got \$2.2 billion in foreign currency bonds you've got to pay back. It's probably \$3 billion now.

**Mr De LACY:** I am saying that the borrowings are hedged. In other words, they are brought back into Australian dollars. Therefore, there are no losses. They have been hedged. When one borrows overseas, one gets the money at a substantially cheaper interest rate than one can get in Australia. One then hedges that back into Australian dollars. When it is all worked out, the cost of overseas funds is cheaper than the cost of funds in Australia.

It is a fairly complex area. Obviously, the honourable member does not understand it. To suggest or imply that, somehow, it is paid for by superannuation funds invested by the Queensland Investment Corporation demonstrates that the honourable member is not even at first base in understanding the operations and the respective roles of the QTC and the QIC. Nothing goes on between the two of them. One invests superannuation funds; the other is a central borrowing authority. The two corporations have no relationship with each other. To suggest that they do means that the honourable member does not understand anything about them.

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

## APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2)

### Committee

Schedule 1—

### Premier and Minister for Economic and Trade Development

**Hon. W. K. GOSS** (Logan—Premier and Minister for Economic and Trade Development) (11 a.m.): For this year's Budget, all Ministers will again provide comprehensive information to the House supporting their expenditure Estimates. This

information is provided in the public interest and reflects the Government's commitment to open and accountable administration. As Premier, my contribution to the debate will cover the activities of the Department of the Premier, Economic and Trade Development, the Parliamentary Commissioner for Administrative Investigations or Ombudsman and the Queensland Audit Office. The budget for my ministerial office, along with all ministerial offices, is included in the Estimates of my colleague the Honourable the Treasurer. In summary, the Budget provides funding of—

\$64.52m for the Department of the Premier, Economic and Trade Development;

\$2.414m for the Parliamentary Commissioner for Administrative Investigations; and

\$10.811m for the Queensland Audit Office.

I will deal, firstly, with the expenditure Estimates of the Department of the Premier, Economic and Trade Development. The overall budget for the department for 1993-94 is \$64.52m, representing a decrease of 4 per cent on the comparable 1992-93 budget, after allowing for the following—

special funding of \$3m for the Government's contribution to the Magnesium Metals Pilot Project and \$5.1m for costs associated with the proposed sale of the Gladstone Power Station;

an expanded program of assistance available to Queensland exporters under the Queensland Export Development Scheme; and

new funding of \$2m for projects and initiatives which have the potential to advance the economic well-being of Queenslanders and to promote trade in targeted areas.

The decrease in the level of funding for my department reflects my commitment to developing quality and cost-effective services. In the current fiscal environment, the department has reassessed its priorities in a responsible way and has achieved a reduction in outlays by rationalising and streamlining administrative practices. Honourable members should note that the reduction in outlays will be achieved without reducing either the quality or the level of services provided. Further, there will be no need for the department to implement radical cost-cutting measures to operate within the reduced resource base.

The budget for the various programs of department is as follows—

The Office of Cabinet. The budget provides \$7.409m for the Office of Cabinet and includes corporate service costs of \$1m. Honourable members should note that, accounting for user-pays budget adjustments, this budget represents an effective decrease on both the actual expenditure and the budget for the prior year. In broad terms, the functions of the office are to—

support me as Chair of Cabinet in the conduct of Government business;

coordinate and develop policy, especially from a whole-of-government perspective; and

assist in identifying emerging issues and carrying out practical forward planning.

The office achieves these objectives through the activities of six policy units and a Cabinet secretariat.

In summary, the budget provides—

\$754,000 for the Economic Policy Unit, which provides policy advice to the Government on significant economic issues, both of a short-term and longer-term nature;

\$727,000 for the Social Policy Unit, which is responsible for providing advice on cross-portfolio policy issues and for ensuring that the social implications of policy decisions are fully considered during the decision-making process;

\$697,000 for the Legal and Administrative Policy Unit, which is responsible for providing advice on legal and administrative policy matters considered by the Government, including advice on the recommendations submitted by the Electoral and Administrative Review Commission;

\$306,000 for the Environment and Land-Use Planning Unit, which in its first full year of operation will be responsible for facilitating cross-portfolio consideration of key environmental and land-use planning issues and for providing policy advice to the Government in these areas;

\$1.083m for the Women's Policy Unit, which provides policy advice on a range of social, economic and legal issues of importance to women in Queensland. The unit also operates Women's Infolink, an information and referral service for women instituted by this Government, and provides secretariat support for the

Queensland Women's Consultative Council;

\$180,000 for the Policy Planning Unit, which undertakes policy development and coordination across a range of Government activities, especially from a long-term policy perspective; and

\$589,000 for the Cabinet secretariat, which provides secretarial, operational and other support services to me, the Cabinet and the Cabinet committees.

The Parliamentary and Government Services Program is one which provides advice and support to me on a range of matters relating to Executive Government, the Parliament, constitutional issues, elements of the Government's agenda for administrative reform, protocol and hospitality and elements of inter-governmental activities. The program's 1993-94 budget is \$7.825m and includes—

an amount of \$2.972m for Government and Executive services and State protocol;

funding of \$1.221m for the offices which support the Leader of the Opposition and the Deputy Leader of the Coalition; and

an allocation of \$1.158m for the Ministerial Support Unit and the Premier's Correspondence Unit.

I turn now to the Coordinator General's program. The Government continues to place the highest priority on the realisation of projects which will contribute to the State's economic growth. During 1992-93, the Office of the Coordinator General was established and subsumed the former Economic Development Division of the department. The main objective of the office is to secure sustainable development and value-added enterprises for Queensland. The budget includes an allocation of \$20.456m for the Coordinator General Program—a significant increase on 1992-93. This increase in funding reflects the Government's clear endeavour to develop Queensland's economic potential and, by doing so, increase employment opportunities and the overall well-being of all Queenslanders.

In its pursuit of opportunities for Queensland, the major initiatives funded include—

an allocation of \$5.1m for legal, financial and other costs associated with the proposed sale of the Gladstone Power Station to Comalco Limited;

an allocation of \$3m for the Government's ongoing contribution to the

Magnesium Metals Pilot Plant Project, which is jointly undertaken with the CSIRO and the private sector;

new funding of \$1m for the Carpentaria/Mount Isa mineral province study, a significant project for the State and indeed the nation which is also jointly funded by the private sector and the Commonwealth Government;

an allocation of \$2.584m for major land use studies, including \$2.234m to progress the Cape York Peninsula Land Use Strategy and \$350,000 to finalise studies into the long-term industrial potential of the Gladstone region; and

an allocation of \$600,000 to fund a collaborative development with the private sector of the Gateway Ports area in Brisbane.

During the year, the office will continue with its efforts to achieve the identification, evaluation and facilitation of new projects of strategic importance to the State. In this regard, an allocation of \$500,000 has been provided, with targeted attention being given to interstate company relocations and expansions and private sector infrastructure development.

The Trade and Investment Development Program is an important one for this State. The attraction of foreign investment into Queensland and the expansion of exports are the key to the realisation of Queensland's economic potential. Accordingly, support for these activities remains a high priority of the State Government.

In recognition of this, the Trade and Investment Development Program will receive \$13.558m in 1993-94. The allocation will be used to support the Government's export development and investment attraction programs and to manage Queensland's overseas representative offices.

This Budget will allow the program to continue to provide high quality facilitation services to Queensland's exporters, in a manner complementary to assistance available through Austrade and other agencies, but with a specific focus on Queensland's needs and priorities. It will also allow extra attention and focus to be given to the attraction of new investment to Queensland.

Specific funding provided in the Budget includes—

an allocation of \$5.465m for representative offices established in

Tokyo, Hong Kong, Taipei and London to service Queensland's export and investment attraction priorities;

a provision of \$2.79m for export development, including significantly enhanced funding of \$2m for the Queensland Export Development Scheme which provides assistance to local export-ready firms;

an allocation of \$591,000 for investment promotion and investment attraction programs for targeted industries and markets; and

an allocation of \$1.427m for Brisbane-based international secretariats, including \$400,000 for the establishment of two new secretariats to service the emerging markets of South East Asia and Papua New Guinea/Oceania.

The initiatives which will be undertaken under this program during 1993-94 will underpin an extensive program of export development and investment attraction, aimed at development of a stronger international orientation in Queensland business, with specific focus on the growth economies of the Asia-Pacific region.

#### Information Policy Program

The Budget includes an allocation of \$2.031m for the Information Policy Program which, through the Information Policy Board, is committed to improving the application and management of the Government's information resources and to developing the information technology industry of Queensland.

The Government recognises that information is a vital resource of both the public and private sector, and that opportunities exist for Queensland to further enhance its economic potential by improving its access to and communication of information.

The Information Policy Board seeks to exploit these opportunities by—

developing an information strategic plan which provides a whole-of-Government focus to the management of information;

issuing policies, standards and guidelines aimed at removing barriers to the management of information;

collaborating with the information technology industry to ensure that products and services are developed to address the priorities of the Government and to facilitate the development of the industry's own potential; and

providing professional development and other education programs on the management of information technology.

Since inception, considerable whole-of-Government savings have been achieved as a result of the board's activities.

#### Legislation Services Program

The Budget includes funding of \$4.942m for the Legislation Services Program, which reflects the operations of the Office of the Queensland Parliamentary Counsel. This Budget includes a significant enhancement in funding to enable the office to manage the Government's legislative reform agenda.

Honourable members should note that in recent years the Office of the Parliamentary Counsel has initiated a range of improvements to operational practices to enhance the efficiency and effectiveness of legislative services. A major initiative in this regard is the office's computerisation program which has resulted in significant whole-of-Government cost savings in the printing of legislation.

The additional resources provided in this Budget will enable the office to further improve the efficiency and effectiveness of legislative services.

#### Electoral and Administrative Review Program

The Budget provides funding of \$373,000 for the Electoral and Administrative Review Commission in its final year of operation. As the House would be aware, the commission presented its final three reports on 30 August and 1 September. It has also completed its annual reports for 1992-93 and 1993-94 and is now in the process of being disbanded.

Since commencing operations in March 1990, EARC has reported on all of the review projects identified in the Fitzgerald report and set out in the Electoral and Administrative Review Act 1989 which did not fall within the responsibility of the Public Sector Management Commission or the Litigation Reform Commission. Its most recent reports were on its reviews of appeals from administrative decisions, consolidation of the Queensland Constitution, and protection and enhancement of individuals' rights and freedoms.

In total, the commission presented 23 reports in the course of its three and a half year history. It has proved to be a remarkably productive vehicle for important electoral and administrative reforms which will long benefit the people of Queensland. The commissioners and their staff are to be

congratulated on their achievements.  
Public Sector Management Program

The continuing improvement of public sector efficiency and effectiveness is an important aspect of macro-economic reform, and the Government recognises the key role played by the Public Sector Management Commission in this process. For the 1993-94 financial year, an allocation of \$7.926m is provided to enable the commission to continue with its review activities, and to implement a range of reforms which are designed to give Queensland the most streamlined and advanced public sector in Australia.

A major role of the commission in this regard is to complete the comprehensive program of departmental reviews commenced in April 1990. Honourable members should note that the commission had completed, with two exceptions, its program of departmental reviews before the last State election.

Since that time, the commission has finalised its review of the Queensland Police Service in April 1993, and is currently in the process of finalising its review of both the Administrative Services Department and the Bureau of Emergency Services. By the end of this month, the commission will have finalised its reviews of all Queensland Government departments.

The commission's other priorities for the year will be to—

- finalise a major review of the Queensland Corrective Services Commission by the end of this calendar year in accordance with the commission's legislation;

- undertake a range of smaller review type exercises, including the Queensland Small Business Corporation and some functional reviews;

- continue with the review of existing human resource and public sector management standards and policies in the interests of equity and best management practice;

- develop a professional stream within the Senior Executive Service and promote executive development;

- undertake a major review of grievance processes and the appeal system; and

- review approximately 65 equal employment opportunity annual reports and management plans.

Training and executive development will also be given priority in 1993-94, and an allocation of \$689,000 has been made for the

activities of the Queensland Public Sector Training Council.

Parliamentary Commissioner for Administrative Investigations

I would now like to turn my attention to the office of the Parliamentary Commissioner for Administrative Investigations. The principal functions of the commissioner, or ombudsman, are to—

- investigate administrative actions taken by, in, or on behalf of any department or authority to which the Parliamentary Commissioner Act 1974 applies; and

- perform the external review function provided for in the freedom of information legislation.

The number of applications for external review under the Freedom of Information Act has been greater than anticipated with 120 received during the year, and the general workload is such that the Government has recognised these demands in the 1993-94 Budget by increasing funding by 9.7 per cent to \$2.414m.

Queensland Audit Office

The Auditor-General has the important responsibility of ensuring that financial reporting by the various entities within the Queensland public sector provides a true and fair view of activities in terms of established accountability requirements. As part of the audit process, the Auditor-General provides this House with independent and objective reports and, in addition, provides auditees with advice on ways to improve financial control and the value obtained from available resources.

During 1992-93, the Government gave consideration to the recommendations of EARC's review of public sector auditing in Queensland, and the Government's response to this review was tabled in this House last November, culminating in significant amendments to the Financial Administration and Audit Act earlier this year.

The legislative amendments provided for the creation of the Queensland Audit Office, which was established on 1 May 1993. As an independent unit of the Queensland public sector, this office replaced the former Department of the Auditor-General.

In addition, provision was made in the Act to extend the Auditor-General's mandate to cover all public sector entities, including controlled entities, and to provide the Auditor-General with the right to review the adequacy of performance management systems.

A budget of \$10.811m is provided for the Queensland Audit Office, representing an increase of 10.2 per cent on the comparable 1992-93 allocation. Included in the budget are special provisions of-

\$737,000 for information technology projects, including the adoption of an internationally recognised risk and computer based audit methodology; and

\$383,000 for enhanced staffing and facilities to enable the Auditor-General to implement reforms to the organisation, management and operations of the office.

In framing the budget for the Queensland Audit Office, the Treasurer has consulted with the Parliamentary Committee of Public Accounts, as he is now required to do under the Financial Administration and Audit Act. The Government's commitment to ensuring that the Auditor-General has adequate resources to undertake the vital role which I have already acknowledged is clearly demonstrated in this Budget.

In conclusion, I would like to express my appreciation to all of the staff of the department and competent bodies, especially the Director-General of my department, Mr Eric Finger, and the other senior officers, in particular the executive directors of the Department of the Premier, Economic and Trade Development. In addition, the work carried out by the directors-general, the other constituent bodies, the Parliamentary Counsel, the Auditor-General and so on reflects very well, I believe, on the Queensland public service.

This review of my portfolio's expenditure Estimates gives a clear picture of our priorities. They are aimed at enhancing our enviable record of economic growth while, at the same time, ensuring the highest standards of accountability and efficiency. It is an ambitious program, and one of which the Government is justifiably proud. I commend to the House the budget for my portfolio.

**Mr BORBIDGE** (Surfers Paradise—Leader of the Opposition) (11.21 a.m.): Today, I want to talk about leadership. I want to speak about a Government which has now been in power for 1 740 days. I want to speak about a Government which, on each and every one of those 1 740 days, has seen 45 Queenslanders thrown on the end of a growing unemployment queue. The tragedy of Queensland under Labor and the tragedy of Queensland under this Premier is that yesterday, 45 Queenslanders became

unemployed. Today, it will be 45 more, and tomorrow the story will be the same.

In examining the Estimates for the Premier's Department, it is appropriate that the House examine the State's economic direction and the role of the Premier and his department at a time when Queensland has the highest number of jobless in its history and at a time when the State is showing every sign of lurching down the same path as failed interstate economies. It is time that this House had a close look at what is happening in what is supposed to be the engine room of State economic activity—the Premier's Department.

This Government has had four years to put its stamp on the economic development direction of this State, and it has failed to do so. And no greater example of that has occurred over the past couple of days than the announcement that Queensland appears to have lost the spaceport project. The loss of that project will become a potent symbol of the Goss Government's disinterest in jobs and economic development. It will stand as a monument to indifference and the "So what?" attitude of the Goss Government towards major job creating development projects. It shows the distinct lack of leadership in this State. It was the same attitude which saw the massive China Steel project lost to Gladstone and to Queensland; the same attitude that has led to uncertainty over the sale of the Gladstone Power Station; and the same attitude which has seen private capital investment in this State grinding to a halt.

Jobs do not come to those who wait, those who sit back or those who pin their hopes on a artificial \$3 billion Capital Works Program—a Capital Works Program which, by the Treasurer's and the Premier's own estimation, has cost over \$10 billion but which, according to the Australian Bureau of Statistics, has created only a handful of part-time jobs. Work and jobs come to Governments that are prepared to work for them; Governments that are prepared to get out there on the international stage and say, "We want that project. We will get it"; Governments that have leaders who are prepared to lead; and leaders who grasp the nettle and make a decision, even though those decisions sometimes will not meet with unanimous public approval.

Rarely, if ever, will members find that I will agree with the Prime Minister. But the Prime Minister's analysis of the Queensland Premier is hard to fault. Recently, the Prime Minister told a Brisbane journalist that Queensland has a Premier who is too scared to make a

decision just in case his popularity may drop below 70 per cent. Unfortunately, the results of indecision and inaction are beginning to show.

On Sunday, we are one year into the second term of this Government, and we are still to see its agenda, its plan and the colour of its money. We just see more of the same public relations—the fairy floss government which became a trademark of its first three-year term. The tragedy of this was borne out last Thursday. There is no greater indication of the adhocery and public relations inspired decision making than that which occurred a week or so ago when the Premier announced his intention, and then subsequently Cabinet's intention, to acquire the Starcke land holdings. In the space of a weekend—and I use this to illustrate how this Government runs—based on some apparent concerns expressed in the media, the Premier had formulated his plan to buy the land and convert it to a national park. Then, in the true Labor spin-doctoring fashion, they rolled out the story to the waiting media. There was no mention of it in the Budget presented only a couple of days before the Cabinet decision, and no mention of it from the Minister as he walked into the Cabinet room. But then, of course, we could not have a decision without an inquiry—another trademark of this Government.

So now we have the inquiry—the inevitable inquiry into the reasons why the National Party allowed Mr Quaid to freehold a portion of land in the mid-1970s. The inquiry will go nowhere, but it will give the Premier another platform to return Queenslanders' minds to the 1970s and get their minds off what is happening in the 1990s and the record unemployment levels.

**Mr Bennett** interjected.

**Mr BORBIDGE:** If the Premier and the honourable member who interjects need evidence to prove that an inquiry into this matter will be a complete waste of time, they should examine two pieces of independent legal advice tabled in this place earlier in the week by the member for Burnett, one from a QC, the other from the Solicitor-General, both of whom support the actions taken by the previous Cabinet in its 1989 decision.

If the Premier had acted with anywhere near the determination with respect to the Cape York spaceport as he is doing in his inept and misguided attempt to secure the Starcke holdings, then we may well have seen a launch from Cape York by now. This is, in essence, the vacuum in leadership which now exists—a leadership focus which has been

dominated by social engineering and public sector change at the expense of real development and jobs.

What clearer indication could we have of the Premier's methodology of governing by sniffing the breeze rather than on commitment, planning and decision than his pirouetting and tap-dancing over Mabo? When I released successive versions of the Commonwealth's draft Mabo legislation in July, revealing the extent of the threat to existing titles—particularly to mining titles—the Premier would not tell the people of Queensland what he intended. Behind the scenes—which is where the Premier invariably operates on all issues of significance to Queensland whenever there is no clear-cut media or political advantage—he mocked the position adopted by the Opposition. He said that we had played the racist card; that we were rednecks. He said that the draft that I released was old and out of date, when he knew that the ink was barely dry on each of the documents put forward and that his own senior public servants—his own Cabinet Office—had been some of the primary draftsmen of position papers that he later, for political purposes, was forced to ridicule.

The Premier would not be publicly clear on his view about the compensation issue, while his own Cabinet Office was circulating documents showing that the Premier and the Queensland Government wanted miners to pay compensation. He could not bring himself to be honest with the mining industry over the impact of the Commonwealth misinterpretation of the Mabo judgement—in which he was a willing accomplice—whereby a mining lease was determined not to extinguish native title, in conflict with the majority decision of the high court, which said that any substantive lease extinguished native title.

When I said, in debate with the Commonwealth's Special Minister of State, that the Commonwealth's only option was to validate titles back to 1788, the Premier was scoffing, along with Mr Walker. Then, a few weeks later, he tap-dances and pirouettes, and all of a sudden we have to validate every title back to 1788. What do we see now? The Premier, Mr Walker and their fellow travellers, months down the track—after months of uncertainty generated by mining companies trying to finance abroad, when major projects in Queensland have been put on hold, after having sniffed the breeze, and having had the Queensland Opposition show them the way—are now saying that they are going to validate all titles back to 1788. So much for leadership, consistency and decisiveness!

Unfortunately for Queenslanders seeking full-time jobs, the effect of these indecisions is now hitting home. It was National Party policy to reintroduce the position of Co-ordinator General, and this is a vindication of that judgment. In the key area of Co-ordinator General, we saw the Budget blow out almost two and a half times, from an estimate of \$12.4m to \$29.7m. The Estimate for this financial year is \$20.4m, which is still a 66 per cent increase on the amount allocated last year.

It is not just a matter of dollars and cents. What Queensland needs is some economic leadership and direction. Economic direction is not being provided because of the pivotal role being played in Government in Queensland by the all-powerful Office of the Cabinet. This office, with its highly paid and heavily ALP-affiliated staff, calls the shots in respect of the entire Government policy framework. Scant regard has been given within that office to initiatives to promote and stimulate real private sector jobs. Its preoccupation with Labor's social goals is not surprising, given the highly political nature of its creation.

I reiterate that the Office of the Cabinet will be scrapped under a future coalition Government. So, too, will be one of the Government's other great achievements, the Public Sector Management Commission—an organisation which has wreaked havoc on each and every Government instrumentality it has visited. It is one of the greatest disasters in public sector administration in the history of Australia. I believe that when the memoirs of this Government are written, many of its fundamental problems—its overbureaucracy and its inability to process and to make decisions—will be traced back to the Public Sector Management Commission.

From the Health Department, through the Education Department to the Ambulance Service, the story has been the same—disaster after disaster. Never has so much money been spent, and never has there been such bureaucratic and ministerial incompetence. In many instances, the Government has not been prepared to let its incompetence rest at one or two reviews. Many Government instrumentalities are in the process of undergoing their third full-scale review. If this Government cannot find a better use for more than \$7m of taxpayers' funds, people can rest assured that a coalition Government can, and will.

I now turn to the area of parliamentary and Government services. This goes to the heart of this Premier's commitment to the

reform process. Last year in this debate, I raised the issue of resources available to the Opposition. Since that time, we have seen yet another report from EARC, which dealt with Government media and information, and which again recommended a substantial increase in staff numbers for the Opposition. The Commission recommended that the staff establishment of the opposition parties be maintained at 20 per cent of that of ministerial offices, and reflect parity with the salary profile of ministerial staff.

We now find that the Government is to grant itself an additional 10 staff in this area, taking its ministerial staff establishment to 193. The Opposition has a total allocation of 16 staff. Based on EARC's recommendations, we should have a staff establishment of 38—22 more than at present. At all times, we have tried to be reasonable in our approaches to the Premier on this issue. We offered a staged approach to any increases, saying that they should be phased in over a number of years, but so far and, in particular, in this Budget we have received nothing.

We have to put the past behind us. If the Premier and the Labor Party still have residual animosities over the way in which they were treated when they were in Opposition, then it is about time they had a rethink. The Labor Party has been in Government for three years and the National Party has been in Opposition for three years. We have had the Fitzgerald inquiry and three separate reports of the independent commission of inquiry. They all recommended that Oppositions be adequately and appropriately resourced

The Opposition has computer equipment that is now 10 years out of date. General levels of equipment for my staff and the staff of the Leader of the Liberal Party would not be endured by public servants anywhere else in the Queensland Public Service. We have a working environment for our staff who are public servants—I am not talking about members—which is in breach of the Workplace Health and Safety Act. However, this year, the Opposition has received an allocation of only \$16,000 to upgrade capital equipment—the cost of one collapsing photocopier. It is a disgrace, especially for a Premier and a Government who claim to be committed to the Fitzgerald process; a disgrace when one considers the luxury enjoyed by the sanctimonious Premier opposite in his department.

Apart from the staged \$10 million upgrade of the Premier's own Executive Building, the five-star lifts and luxury

appointments, we have seen an 86 per cent increase in the total budget of the Premier's department over the life of this Government—an 86 per cent increase, up by over \$33m to now come in at about \$73m. Salaries under Wayne Goss—he must be a great man to work for—have increased by 72 per cent. The 501 staff in the Premier's own department each earn on average \$51,000—\$13,000 more than when the Premier came into office. The Premier might like to explain that to the record 172 000 Queenslanders who cannot find a job. The simple fact is that there are now 113 more staff in the Premier's Department than there were in December 1989. No expense, no luxury has been spared when it comes to the Premier's own little patch. No expense, no luxury has been spared in Wayne's world.

**Mr Veivers:** About this place?

**Mr BORBIDGE:** We know the cutbacks that have been made to the Parliament. Unfortunately, they cannot even afford to pay staff to run the parliamentary cafeteria. When people look back on the record, when they look at the substance rather than the rhetoric, they will find a non-performing Premier. They will find a Premier who inherited a cupboard full of major economic projects that merely had to be opened; the ribbons only had to be cut. But we have lost project after project because of the Premier and his attitude. He lost China Steel, he lost the MFP to a swamp in Adelaide and he lost the Cape York spaceport. He knows very well that of the few projects that have come on stream, the work had commenced prior to his occupancy of the Premier's office.

The Premier knows that when compared with the past economic development record of the State of Queensland, his own record as Premier will be seen for what it is, that is, a litany of economic failure based on what looks good on the 6 o'clock news and on what is convenient. As Prime Minister Keating said, "To stay above 70 per cent in the opinion polls, you've got to look good, you've got to look pretty." It does not matter what is right and what is responsible. When it comes to matters of substance in this State, the Premier has failed to maintain the very good legacy that he inherited from previous Premiers.

**Ms POWER** (Mansfield) (11.40 a.m.): The Queensland Government is committed to a socially and economically just society where women have an equal place. A significant factor in the attainment of this aim is the achievement of economic equality for women. This can be achieved only through a planned

and concerted program of education and policy development. I am pleased to rise in support of the Premier's Estimates. It is this department, through the Office of the Cabinet and the Women's Policy Unit, which has overall responsibility for the introduction and continuation of programs to enhance the status of women in Queensland.

Over the last decade, the profile of Queensland women has changed significantly, reflecting, in particular, a greater participation in education and in the paid work force. The Government continues to respond to this changing profile in a variety of ways to ensure that women have equal participation in and share of the social, political, legal and economic life of Queensland. It is important that we understand the changes which have occurred for Queensland women. A gender analysis is an important study in being able to appreciate the reasons for the continuation of programs and services by this Government for women.

Monitoring the status of women in the social and economic life of Queensland is an essential component of the development and implementation of appropriate and realistic Government policies, programs and services. The Women's Policy Unit is to be congratulated for its 1993-94 budget statement which provides a statistical profile of the female population of Queensland. During this Estimates debate, I wish to highlight some of the statistics given in the budget statement to ensure that members of this House understand the changes that are occurring in society in relation to women. These changes play a significant role in the development and priority of programs for women in this State and should not be considered lightly, nor ignored. 50.2 per cent of Queensland's resident population is female. While male births at 51.4 per cent outstrip female births at 48.6 per cent, the picture changes over the age groups and the percentage differential is substantial in the over-eighties category in which women make up 65 per cent of the population and men make up only 35 per cent.

The distribution of women throughout the State is also an important consideration. The proportion of females in the younger age groups is relatively constant throughout the State. In the older groups, however, the proportion of females is relatively low in the three western statistical divisions of the State, while the proportion is particularly high in the Brisbane statistical division. Even among working-age women, the proportion of females

in the west of the State is lower than it is in other areas.

Queensland has the largest population of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people in Australia. At the time the 1991 census was taken, there were 70 070 Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people in Queensland. Women comprise 50.3 per cent of that total population and 2.5 per cent of all Queensland women. It is important to note that the population pyramid for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people has a broader base and a narrower peak than has the population pyramid for non-Aboriginal people. This is indicative of the higher birth rate and shorter life expectancy of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander population.

Of Queensland's population, 16.9 per cent of women were born overseas and 8 per cent were born in non-English speaking countries, compared with 15.3 per cent in the rest of Australia. The highest proportion of overseas-born women were from European countries, 55 per cent, followed by the Oceanic region, 22 per cent, and Asia, 14 per cent. In Queensland, the highest proportions of women of non-English speaking backgrounds were born in Germany, followed by Italy, the Netherlands and the Philippines. Generally, the proportion of women in the population from non-English speaking backgrounds ranges from 43 per cent to 51 per cent. The notable exception to this is Filipino women who constitute 76 per cent of their total population in Queensland.

According to the May 1993 ABS figures, couple families formed the majority of living arrangements in Queensland. However, the traditional family formation of a couple with a male in the labour force and a female not in the labour force has reduced considerably since 1986 and now represents only 23 per cent of all Queensland families. Single-parent families with dependants have increased in number, but have remained constant at 8 per cent as a proportion of all families. The majority of single parents are women, and that rates at 85 per cent.

Educational qualifications and skills developed through training are important indicators of the socioeconomic circumstances of Queensland women. Over the last decade, significantly more girls than boys have remained at school in the post compulsory years. While the greater retention rates for girls appear to be a significant advance in the education of girls, their relevance to the future and economic status of women needs to be examined more closely.

Studies suggest that the increased retention rates for girls can largely be explained in terms of limited employment and training opportunities for young women. Further, measures of retention rates do not provide information about the different educational experiences of girls compared to boys—for example, the subject choice is still largely determined along traditional lines. Generally, women have a lower level of educational attainment than do men. 70.6 per cent of females have no post-school qualification compared to 56.4 per cent of males. However, females hold more diplomas and certificates than do men. Holders of bachelor degrees or higher account for 6.6 per cent of males and 5.5 per cent of females. Similarly, 21.7 per cent of males have a trade certificate compared to 4.8 per cent of women.

The most recently available data regarding training opportunity relates to the 12-month period to July 1989. At that time, a marginally higher percentage of females than male wage and salary earners reported receiving some form of training. The major category of training was on-the-job training which is reported to be undertaken by 71.8 per cent of females compared to 69.2 per cent of males in Queensland. Access to employment and the pattern of such employment is a significant factor in the economic security and status of women throughout Queensland. In May 1993, Queensland women constituted 41.3 per cent and Queensland males constituted 58.6 per cent of the total Queensland labour force.

Over the decade from May 1983, the participation rate of Queensland females increased significantly from 42.9 per cent to 51.7 per cent, which is an increase of 8.8 per cent, as opposed to the decline in the male participation rate from 75.9 per cent to 74.9 per cent in the same period. Married females were the most significant group to increase their participation rate, which rose 12.9 per cent from 40.1 per cent to 53 per cent during that period. The trend in participation rates for females reflects the family responsibilities of women and their earlier retirement age than males.

Women continue to earn less than men. Access to an income both to meet immediate needs and as security for the future is an important consideration in relation to the social and economic status of women. Income security in this context not only includes direct access to funds but also relates to the availability of capital items, such as housing.

This outline of the status of women in the Queensland community highlights the importance of the Women's Policy Unit. The gender analysis it has provided displays the significant role it has played in the reform processes of this Government. Since 1989, the State Government has implemented a comprehensive reform strategy that is aimed at addressing the needs of Queensland women and at ensuring an equal place for them in society. A wide range of programs has focused on: ensuring that women's issues are considered across all Government policies; providing specific women's services where necessary and appropriate; consulting with women; involving women in decision making; and recognising the needs of specific groups of Queensland women.

The 1993-94 State Budget contains a range of initiatives which consolidate the Government's commitment to improving the status of women. A quick glance at key initiatives will show their relevance to the social and economic profile of Queensland women which I outlined earlier.

Those key initiatives include a \$2.33m boost to funding to implement the Government's policy on the prevention of violence against women; almost \$10m for continuing initiatives, such as programs for the prevention of domestic violence and sexual assault, safety for women and girls and sexual harassment programs; more than \$8m for women's health programs and services, in addition to specific funding for sexual assault health services; about \$500,000 to support specific activities across a number of departments, aimed at achieving economic equality for women, including programs for women through TAFE/TEQ, development of a policy for public sector workers with family responsibilities and research grants under a women in business and industry program; more than \$9m for child-care services throughout Queensland, including at least 2 200 new places; about \$350,000 for activities which recognise and support the particular role of women in rural enterprise; all Government departments to undertake a gender analysis of their client groups and client services and to seek greater representation of women on boards; and \$1.17m in funding for the Women's Policy Unit, Women's Infolink and the Queensland Women's Consultative Council.

The 1993-94 Budget reflects the Government's commitment to consolidating the significant achievements to date for women through a number of initiatives, as well

as individual departments directing base funds towards women-specific strategies.

As mentioned earlier, an additional \$2.33m has been allocated for initiatives towards the implementation of the policy on the prevention of violence against women. That represents an increase of 24 per cent and includes \$1.15m to enable significant and innovative improvements to the number, quality and range of existing rape crisis and sexual assault services, resulting in improved access for rural and isolated women and women from diverse cultural backgrounds; \$976,000 to expand domestic violence services to improve access for rural and isolated women, women from diverse cultural backgrounds and children from violent homes; and \$200,000 to ensure that women who have been raped or sexually assaulted have reasonable and timely access to support and information during their involvement in the criminal justice process.

In total, almost \$10m is provided for ongoing activities towards implementing the policy on the prevention of violence against women across a range of Government departments. The Government acknowledges the significance of economic equality in raising the status of women in Queensland. Towards that end, a whole-of-Government framework aimed at ensuring economic equality for women is being developed. Activities related to women and economic equality will be undertaken by various departments during 1993-94.

The situation for women in Queensland has changed since the Goss Labor Government was elected in 1989 on a platform of reform. The Budget continues the steady progress of reform for women in this State. It may not meet all of the needs of women on this one day. It may not address all of the policy issues of the day, but it is a genuine improvement on what was offered by the conservative Governments during their term of office. The Budget initiatives outlined in the women's policy documents show an understanding of the problems faced by women throughout the State and make a concerted effort to address them in a real and meaningful way. I support the Estimates.

**Mrs SHELDON** (Caloundra—Leader of the Liberal Party) (11.54 a.m.): The Premier's Department has undergone some fundamental changes since the Labor Party came to power in December 1989—of that there can be no doubt. I note that the Premier is not here for me to address to him any questions that I might have.

**Mr T. B. Sullivan:** He can only take so much.

**Mrs SHELDON:** He takes the honourable member. He deserves a badge for that. But, unfortunately for Queensland, the changes have not been for the better government of this State. They have, in common with almost every change to departmental structure by this Government, been for the worst.

This Government has done to the Premier's Department what it has done to every other department. It has overburdened it with pen-pushing bureaucrats and cut back on its efficiency. The Premier seems unable to stand on his own. He now seems to have more advisers than does Bill Clinton on a bad day. The Office of the Cabinet has blown out from a handful of staff to more than 80. There are plenty of suits who offer reams of advice but provide nothing of any concrete worth for the people of Queensland. And with all that advice, the State Government still presides over a bureaucratic blow-out which has provided plenty of clerical desk jobs but nowhere near enough doctors, nurses, teachers and police out on the front line.

Instead, the State Government, through the Premier's Department, created the Public Sector Management Commission. That commission has the distinction of being the body that has wrecked the efficiencies of almost every single Government department. So there is something of which the Premier can be proud—the invention of the PSMC, which operates under his department and which has proved to be spectacularly unsuccessful. It has been an extremely expensive waste of time and money and has probably cost the Queensland taxpayers tens of millions of dollars through lost productivity because of its disruptive influence on the State's public service.

In this Budget, the Public Sector Management Commission has a total net expenditure increase of 13.5 per cent—more good money after bad for that flop of an organisation. Last year, the total Premier's Department budget blew out by \$18m. I know that a large proportion of that was due to the Premier's election pork-barrelling in providing bikeways funding which, for some strange reason, he shoved under the Co-ordinator General's control for a year. A very strange use for the Co-ordinator General's Office—managing a bikeways program when it should be encouraging business and industry.

Let us look at the Premier's Department in light of the bikeways program, which should never have been included in there, anyway. In

common with many of its fellow departments, the Premier's Department has suffered a funding blow-out over the past couple of years. Whereas the Ministers for Health and Education can try to point at extra nurses and teachers—even if we know that they are fudging the figures—the Premier has no such luxury. The fact of the matter is that funding for the Premier's Department, after the removal of the bikeways, has grown by \$7.8m, or 13.7 per cent, between the 1992-93 Budget and the 1993-94 Budget.

That means that expenditure in the Premier's Department has grown almost six times the rate of inflation this year alone—six times the rate of inflation, and for what? Just what is the justification for such an extraordinary increase in expenditure for that department? And just what does the Premier's Department do for the people of Queensland? Does it provide any real service? Well, there is certainly not much evidence of that. The Premier's Department does not provide any improvement in the health system. It does not provide any more schools or any more teachers in those schools. It provides no more police for the people of Queensland. It does not provide for one more kilometre of road. Even its Trade and Investment Development Division, which accounts for 17 per cent of the department's annual budget, has had little to crow about over the past year.

It is a department that provides advice for the Premier. It includes the massively overstaffed Office of the Cabinet, which is packed with Labor minders, who spend their entire days trying to figure out new ways to manipulate the media. There are lots of young Labor suits looking for ways to ingratiate themselves with Wayne the guru but achieving little of any worth for the people of Queensland. In fact, in the coming year, wages and salaries incurred in the Information Policy Program will jump by 15.5 per cent. That is more money for the Labor manipulators and less value for the Queensland taxpayers.

As I have raised in this House over the past few days, not only has the Premier presided over blow-outs in his own department; he has also presided over a blow-out in the State Government's unforeseen expenditure. That unforeseen expenditure was documented by the Treasurer in his annual statement, which was tabled on the day of the Budget, in an obvious attempt to have it hidden beneath a flood of new Budget information. The document showed a total increase in the Consolidated Fund blow-out listed as unforeseen expenditure of \$177m,

from \$133.5m in 1991-92 to \$310.9m in 1992-93. That blow-out was attributed by the Treasurer as being significant because of the implementation of post-Budget election commitments. That is quite outrageous. An amount of \$177m was spent on the Labor election campaign. That was taxpayers' money, and taxpayers were given no choice in the matter. Of that amount, a total of \$18.5m was spent through the Department of the Premier, Economic and Trade Development.

The biggest election slug carried by the Premier's Department was \$11.6m from the Consolidated Fund for the grant to the bikeways project board, whose task it was to supervise the construction of bikeways throughout the State under the Safe Bikeways Program. That was part of the Labor Party's election-time job creation scheme. The weighty task of administering those bikeways was allocated to the Office of the Co-ordinator General. I refer members to the program goal of that office, published on page 78 of Budget Paper No. 3. The goal of the Office of the Co-ordinator General is to "make sustainable development happen in Queensland". Most Queenslanders thought that the Office of the Co-ordinator General was vital to the promotion of industry, development and investment in this State. In general, Queenslanders believe that the office is a shop-front where potential investors are shown the advantages of our great State and where they are given every assistance to cut through red tape and get on with the task of creating jobs and sustainable development. But apparently the people are wrong.

Under this Government, the Office of the Co-ordinator General has been spending 41 per cent of its budget building bikeways. It shows the parlous State of the Queensland economy when the most substantial item being addressed by the Office of the Co-ordinator General is the construction of bikeways. It is with relief that I note that the Co-ordinator General has lost control of the bikeways program in this Budget. But is that because the office is moving on to something more substantial? Has it a substantial agenda for new mining, downstream processing or business development? That does not appear to be true when one considers the Budget documents. Under the Labor Government's big "L" Budget, the Office of the Co-ordinator General will move on to coordinate the sale of a second-hand 12-year-old power station to Comalco by 31 December. Of course, that sale is subject to the concern about the Mabo legislation and the claims over those areas.

**Mr Veivers:** It might never happen.

**Mrs SHELDON:** Exactly. The member for Southport is correct. It might never happen. The sale of that power station is the basis of investment in this State for the coming year. If it does not proceed, it will blow a huge hole in the Budget, particularly in the Budget surplus and the figures cited in the Budget documents for business investment and for plant and equipment. In itself, that simple transaction will not create the type of development envisaged in the charter of the Office of the Co-ordinator General. It is nothing of the sort. But in the process, a successful sale will enable the Treasurer to prop up his shonky private investment figures in the 1993 Budget.

Elsewhere in the budget for the Department of the Premier, Economic and Trade Development, there are interesting statistics on the bureaucratic expenditure in proportions matched only by Labor candidates. In the financial statement of the Office of the Cabinet—which was tabled by the Premier only this morning, yet we are supposed to be addressing it in this debate, only an hour later—

**Mr W. K. Goss:** This is about next year. That's about the previous year.

**Mrs SHELDON:** I noted some incredible blow-outs in useless expenditure.

**Mr W. K. Goss:** Look to the future, not to the past.

**Mrs SHELDON:** Comparisons should be made, would the Premier not agree? We are supposed to have considered that financial statement in detail, yet we received it only an hour ago. That is a nonsense.

**Mr W. K. Goss:** You have had the Estimates for a couple of weeks.

**Mrs SHELDON:** Yes, but it is interesting that the documents were tabled only this morning. In the financial statement of the Office of the Cabinet, I noted some incredible blow-outs in useless expenditure on the perks and trappings of office. These are the fat cats of the Labor Government spending up big at the taxpayers' expense. In motor vehicle costs, members will note an incredible increase of 411 per cent. The cost of fat cat telecommunications increased by 375 per cent. By comparison, I noted a drop in personnel development allocations by 44 per cent. Presumably, all of the fat cats have been missing out on their personnel development classes because they have been too busy driving around in their limos phoning people from their car phones.

In conclusion, I state that the Premier's Department has become a policy monolith

which provides little of any real value to the average Queenslanders. This department, under the Premier, will suck out almost \$65m from the Budget this year. The people of Queensland have the right to deserve better value for money from Government.

**Mr BARTON** (Waterford) (12.05 p.m.): I rise to support the Budget Estimates for the Premier's Department. I will concentrate principally on the Office of the Co-ordinator General, which was established in Budget year 1992-93. Historically, there was a Co-ordinator-General's Department, but it was allowed to lapse in the past decade by the National Party. That department was established in 1938 by one of the great Labor Party Governments, the Forgan-Smith Government. The establishment of the Office of the Co-ordinator General puts back into place in a more effective and modern manner a body that does a great deal of work to ensure that this State achieves proper economic development in the interests of the public.

The office is part of the Premier's Department and reports directly to the Premier. It is an important aspect of Government. It represents this Government's high priority in ensuring that major development projects are supported and that they come to fruition. When major projects go ahead, job opportunities are increased and the wealth and living standards of Queenslanders are also increased. Many of those projects will add value to the goods produced by the primary production sector. Of course, Australia is one of the world's great primary producers but until now we have not done enough to ensure that we achieve the added value gained from manufacturing primary products to final product state.

The Office of the Co-ordinator General now includes the former Economic Development Division of the Premier's Department. The office is a small, lean, mean, efficient organisation with a budget of \$20.456m. As has been pointed out by the Premier, that is an increase of \$7.982m over the 1992-93 budget allocation. Direct comparisons are difficult, as the office now has a different structure than that which operated previously. Last financial year, the office did exceed its budget. Of course, that was pointed out in a very negative way by the Leader of the Opposition and by the Deputy Leader of the Coalition during her very short contribution to this debate. It is tragic that the members who bleat continually about not being given enough time to debate issues always sit down before their allocated time has

lapsed. The tragedy is compounded because for half of the time that those members are on their feet, they are complaining that they have not been given enough time!

The Estimates for last year were exceeded, but I think that we have to examine precisely why that occurred. It is not good enough to simply say that the budget blew out. We have to consider what happened in practice. The additional expenditure was associated with the Safe Bikeways Program, which was transferred during the year to the Office of the Co-ordinator General from the Department of Transport. That program involved an amount of \$11.63m. The Deputy Leader of the Coalition complained about that matter to the extent of claiming that the bikeways should never have been approved. That is what she said in this Chamber. I would like to hear the response to that suggestion of the Mayor of Logan, the Chairman of the Albert Shire Council—

**Mrs Bird:** Pioneer.

**Mr BARTON:**—Alderman Jim Soorley of the Brisbane City Council, the Chairman of the Pioneer Shire Council and many other local authorities around the State that have received allocations under that program. I can assure the Leader of the Opposition—and I would assure the Deputy Leader of the Coalition, if she was in the Chamber—that those local authorities love those projects. The members of the public who make use of the bikeways that have been established to date also enjoy them. They are extremely important projects. That is one of the main areas responsible for the blow-out.

Another area responsible for the blow-out is the expenditure of around \$3.5m on the legal and other financial costs associated with the proposed sale of the Gladstone Power Station to Comalco. That is a very important transaction that needs to be finalised in the interests of Queenslanders. It will mean that the expansion of the Boyne Island smelter can go ahead and that the future of the Weipa mine is assured. It means also ensuring that we get the new alumina plant at either Bowen or Weipa in the near future. Of course, there was a payment of \$2m in full and final settlement of the dispute between SEQEB and the former Brisbane Exposition and South Bank Redevelopment Authority concerning outstanding payments for electricity supply.

Of course, that budget blew out. However, the Deputy Leader of the Coalition complains that the bikeways should not have appeared in the Co-ordinator General's

budget. A project worth in excess of \$11m is the sort of project that needed the good offices of the Co-ordinator General to pull the various local authorities and State Government departments together to ensure that that very productive and very important project was completed.

This year, budget growth for the office has increased in real terms by \$7.982m. That includes the ongoing costs that are associated with the proposed sale of the Gladstone Power Station and the future developments that hinge on that sale. It includes the Government's contribution of \$3m to the magnesium metals pilot project. Again, that is a crucial project for Queensland. The budget growth includes the costs associated with new initiatives such as the Carpentaria/Mount Isa Province Minerals Study and the Gateway Ports industrial land proposal. From my involvement with the Brisbane City Council before coming here, I am aware of how important it is to ensure that we get that industrial land near the Gateway Bridge—near the port and the airport—developed in a proper manner so that we attract business interests to this State which will locate at that serviced industrial land. Included also in that growth are the increased labour costs and new project funding associated with the formal establishment of that new office. Those increases are offset by a reduced level of funding required for land use studies in the Cape York and Gladstone areas.

The staff in the department is projected to decrease from 52 in 1992-93 to 44 this year. The staff are project management oriented, with 37 of them directly involved in that area and seven others involved in project facilitation and administration. In other words, the people who are there are at the sharp end of the boat doing the work, not riding at the blunt end. This is an office about doing things, about supporting projects and about achieving results; it is not a bureaucratic, administration-based office.

Recently, we have heard the Opposition claim that there is a lack of support for business in this State. The Office of the Co-ordinator General provides a further example of the Government's commitment to and support for business. It supports the private sector directly in terms of most of these projects that are being considered and being put together. The \$20.456m should not be seen as a cost to the taxpayer; it should be seen as an investment in the future of this State to help those companies to ensure that those projects are realised. This is an investment by the Government to achieve

development, create jobs, increase value adding in industries and add wealth to the community, as well.

What is the general role of the office? The office has responsibility for the attraction to and facilitation of major projects for the State. In addition, the office services inquiries and requests from companies, industry groups and other organisations which are interested in economic development in Queensland. The office is the first point of contact for the private sector—for companies—wishing to undertake projects in this State, including private firms looking to invest in public infrastructure. The office maintains direct links with State Government departments, statutory authorities, local authorities, the Commonwealth Government's major projects facilitation activities and a range of other Federal Government agencies.

The Office of the Co-ordinator General has had a direct involvement in the delivery of projects which are now either under construction, committed for construction or have received the necessary approvals, with a total investment of just over \$1 billion. When operational, these projects will provide an additional 1 330 direct jobs, with many more indirect jobs as a result of the multiplier effect. Big projects create a lot more employment in the crucial first couple of years when they are under construction. That will boost employment levels in the construction industry.

The office has on its books 60 projects which are not as advanced as others, but which are expected to be brought to a conclusion in the near future. Those projects have the potential for additional investment in the vicinity of \$2.5 billion, with the potential to create over 3 000 direct jobs.

I ask honourable members to look closely at the annual report of the Department of the Premier, Economic and Trade Development as it relates to the Office of the Co-ordinator General. It provides a great deal of detail on those projects. Initiatives include more than \$2.5m for major land use studies, with \$2.234m being allocated to progress the Cape York Peninsula Land Use Strategy and \$350,000 to finalise studies into the long-term industrial potential of the Gladstone region. They are real initiatives.

Members should note the large number of mining projects and tourist development projects that are listed in that report. There are a large number of projects in the vicinity of \$1 billion which will create jobs and work for the private sector in this State.

**Mr T. B. Sullivan:** Mr Borbidge is whingeing and moaning about nothing happening. He is way off the mark.

**Mr BARTON:** He is way off the mark, as usual. If he read the material that was available, he would be much better informed and understand that a great deal is being done.

Many of these projects are tourist developments. However, it is not always appreciated that tourism is a form of export. Tourist projects bring foreign currency to Australia just as effectively as if we were selling primary products or manufactured goods overseas. Overseas tourist facilities are our competitors. It is the same as if we were trying to sell produce into overseas markets.

All too often, we see the tourist industry as being domestic based. We must put a lot more emphasis on the fact that it is the export dollars that are bringing positive foreign exchange to Queensland. We must be much more appreciative of that fact.

We have one of the best tourism industries in the world. We have to maintain and advance that position. The projects that are being worked on by the Office of the Co-ordinator General will assist that.

Australia is one of the world's most efficient and cost-effective mining countries. With these major projects, Queensland certainly is efficient. The new mining projects which are being encouraged by the Office of the Co-ordinator General will help to enhance that position, as will the value adding that comes in.

**Mr FitzGerald:** What about that strike they caused?

**Mr BARTON:** I take the interjection about strikes, because some comments were made about them earlier. I point out that the coal mining industry at present has one of the lowest dispute records that it has ever had.

**Mr FitzGerald:** What was the last one about?

**Mr BARTON:** Occasionally we have a little break-out. However, if honourable members compare the number of strikes now with those that occurred in the past, they will realise that both management and the Coal Mining Union are doing a good job. In terms of change, the Coal Mining Union is one of the most responsible and forward thinking unions in this country.

This morning, the Leader of the Opposition commented that we have lost certain projects. The Committee needs to

understand that, during a world downturn, China Steel just did not stack up. Large investment bodies make those decisions about investment. Despite the best efforts of the Premier and this Government to encourage them to invest patient capital, they could not justify those investments in the current climate. Even the Japanese steel industry, which used to be the world's best until recently, is going through a very rough time.

In terms of industrial relations and Space Transportation Systems—there was an in principle agreement with the trade union movement of this State for an innovative industrial relations agreement. But that has gone overseas because of technical details in that it needs to be closer to the equator. There were also difficult financial problems. If members care to speak to Mike Ahern, Don Boyd and Aubrey Benn, who are involved with that project, they will tell them the reason that they had to make those decisions. They are certainly not critical of this Government.

As to the MFP—it is not going anywhere in Adelaide. Perhaps we were better off not to get that project.

Time expired.

**Mr LINGARD** (Beaudesert—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (12.20 p.m.): Today, we consider the Department of the Premier, Economic and Trade Development—a department remodelled since December 1989 to accord with the academic theories of the Labor Party and its advisers; a department which, I believe, reflects the academia of Griffith University and all those seconded to write the policies of the ALP. The department reflects that the ALP has obviously turned towards big government, big media and, clearly, towards big business. Under this Government, it is a department which is supporting a new breed of academics, social workers, teachers and reformist legal people. This Government is clearly not representing the worker like the old ALP did. Clearly, it cannot represent the worker when it has supported high unemployment, high inflation and lower living standards.

I believe that the department really has a split personality. On one side, we have the Office of the Cabinet and, on the other side, we have a department which comprises an Office of the Co-ordinator General, a Trade and Investment Development Division, a Public Sector Management Commission and a hotchpotch of administrative functions. Instead of creating a unified department to advise the Premier, we see that in this Budget

we have a multi-headed hydra all competing with one another; all trying to outdo each other; and all contributing to the shambles into which I believe the public service of Queensland has degenerated.

Let us look firstly at the Office of the Cabinet, created specifically to give Kevin Rudd \$150,000 a year to provide employment for card-carrying members of the ALP; an office which costs \$7.5m to run; an office which has tried to rule the public service by fear; and an office which has clearly failed. The relationship between the Office of the Cabinet and the Premier's private staff is at an all-time low. Kevin Rudd's personal reputation is at a low, especially amongst the Ministers themselves. Clearly, if a Federal election were held tomorrow, members would find Kevin Rudd nominating for Griffith and returning to Canberra, as he wishes to do.

According to the Budget papers, there are 72 full-time employees of the Office of the Cabinet. The telephone directory shows that there are many more. But if we believe what is in the Budget papers, each one of those ALP stooges costs us, the taxpayers of Queensland, \$100,000 a year.

**Mr Connor:** Each?

**Mr LINGARD:** I repeat: \$100,000 each this year. Queenslanders would not mind paying that money if every Queenslander had a job and the economy was booming. They would not mind if the public service was working at maximum efficiency. They would not mind if decisions were being made rapidly and effectively. But none of this is happening.

As the Leader of the Opposition outlined, major projects of importance to Queensland are being lost overseas. We have lost the spaceport project and other developments. We have lost the China Steel project, which never got off the ground in the first place. We have seen with decisions such as those on land rights—Mabo—and prostitution that the Office of the Cabinet cannot handle these problems and has ensured that anybody else who could is being kept in the background.

We have seen a Premier and a Government that continually hides behind the CJC. We have seen that happen in the Bingham/Mackenroth/Goss affair. We saw it in the Heiner/Coyne/Warner affair. We have seen abuse by officers of the CJC towards anyone who wishes to stand up against it. We saw that this week after the articles in the weekend press. I also have examples of how the police themselves believe that they are certainly being victimised by the CJC.

This morning, the Attorney-General outlined the role of a JP and a JP—Qualified. Let me tell members what has just happened with some of the police in Logan. A search warrant was issued by the CJC through a JP at North Quay. That search warrant seeks a description of the property being sought. The CJC has just put in the words "certain property". In the space where the complaint is supposed to be outlined, all that is included is "criminal offence". A JP from North Quay signed that search warrant, which allowed the CJC to go into property owned by police. If a police officer did that, and any JP signed a search warrant that simply said "certain property" or "criminal offence", they would be victimised. The Government has lost control of the CJC. The CJC is virtually working uncontrolled. It is about time that this Government brought back that control.

The Office of the Cabinet is an expensive luxury that the ALP may think it can afford but which Queenslanders certainly cannot. The Opposition does not believe in creating \$100,000-a-year jobs for scores of party hacks and will have no compunction in abolishing that office after the next State election.

I turn now to the office of the Co-ordinator General.

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

**The CHAIRMAN:** I warn the member for Chermside for interjecting.

**Mr LINGARD:** The Office of the Co-ordinator General was established in March 1993. It was part of the Opposition's policy at the last State election. However, once again, the Premier cannot quite get it right, because whereas we wanted a Co-ordinator General's office in its own right, all the Premier has done is set up someone in charge of an office which is about to undergo a major restructuring only six months after being created. Not only does the Premier's Department have to endure countless reviews, evidently so will the Office of the Co-ordinator General.

Whilst I have considerable respect for many of the people who work in that office—and they would certainly have nothing to fear from any change of Government—I do note that, in the Estimates this year, the 44 staff will cost the Queensland taxpayer \$20.5m. That is an average of \$500,000 for every person employed in that office. I remember the problems that the Premier had concerning expensive four-wheel-drive vehicles being given to his staff two years ago. I repeat: an average of \$500,000 for every person employed in that office. This Budget

must raise the question of just what Queenslanders are getting for the establishment of the Office of the Co-ordinator General.

When we look at what that office has undertaken, we find that much of it was private sector driven and would have occurred whether or not the office existed. Some of the projects that the office is continuing, for example the Cape York Peninsula study, seem to be becoming sagas reminiscent of *Blue Hills*. What the Opposition wants is for that office not only to fast track projects and to set itself strict time limits within which to complete all Government input into any particular venture but also to ensure that Queensland gets more than its fair share of every development project that is considered in Australia.

The Trade and Investment Development Division of the Premier's Department is supposed to increase the export of Queensland's goods and services and attract more foreign investment. Remember those Goss advertisements of 1989 criticising foreign investment and asking what was in it for Queenslanders? But what do we find? There has been no change whatsoever in foreign investment policy in Queensland. Instead, we find that it now takes 10 times as many public servants to make decisions in relation to foreign investment as it used to. The number of foreign investment proposals which have been rejected since the Labor Government came to power is no different from what had been rejected under previous conservative administrations. The number of trade shows and overseas trips that officers in that division have undertaken undoubtedly has given them a superb view of the international scene. However, it has done nothing to improve the economy of Queensland, reduce the unemployment rate or attract large amounts of foreign investment into the manufacturing sector.

I turn now to discuss the Corporate Services Division of the department. As we all know, corporate services has been the major growth area in every department in the Queensland public service since the Goss Government came to power. The corporate services division in a department is the area in which everybody, from the head of the division down to the person who staples pieces of paper together, gets to be called "manager". All these so-called managers cost us over \$70,000 each per annum. For every person actually performing a function in the Premier's Department, there is one person in the Corporate Services Division to look after him or

her. The division spends an inordinate amount of time reviewing functional plans and systems, and implementing new plans and systems or reviews.

"Review" seems to be its middle name. It talks about providing high quality, value-added services and best practice professional standards. These are, undoubtedly, the "in" words and phrases of a Labor administration. It is unfortunate that the rhetoric and the reality are poles apart. I personally know of one case involving the sacking of a former public servant over two years ago, which the Ombudsman has been trying to resolve. He has received no cooperation whatsoever from the human resource management section of the division. He has commented in writing that the section would appear to be deliberately going out of its way to be unhelpful and obstructionist.

The whole problem with the Premier's Department is that there is a Director-General, a head of the Office of the Co-ordinator General, a head of the economic and trade development area and a Kevin Rudd all tripping over each other in trying to advise the Premier. When one throws in a Premier who is dithering, no wonder nothing is happening in this State.

I turn now with great relish to the Public Sector Management Commission, the academic toy of Peter Coaldrake, a man who no longer has any future in academia following the disaster that he has wrought upon the Queensland public service; a man personally responsible for ruining the careers of numerous public servants. It will be interesting to see what his legal position is when the protective shield of the Act under which he operates has been removed. I can assure Mr Coaldrake that his future lies in the hands of many people who will not forgive him easily for carrying out this blind vendetta.

The Public Sector Management Commission will cost us \$1m more this year than it did last year, even though it will have 28 fewer staff. At present, many of the PSMC reports are being put away and are not being brought out into the light of day. One of those reports was a report on the registrars of high schools. As we all know, once this report hits the light of day, we are going to have a complete spill of administrators and registrars in Queensland high schools. We are going to see exactly the same situation as has happened with high school principals. We will see costly spills—the costly removal of people from the service and then costly interview

systems as these registrars are reappointed to high schools.

The 60-odd people who are working in the commission this year will cost us, on average, \$135,000 each. All of those people are supposedly employed to achieve a more effective and efficient public service, and to ensure that employment is based on the principles of merit and equity. Anyone who has had anything to do with the Education Department would know that people are completely and utterly discontented with the PSMC. Peter Coaldrake tried to take his public service views into the Education Department, and it was just impossible to do what he tried to do. Of course, it caused absolute discontent within the Education Department.

The public service of Queensland is in total disarray. Morale is non-existent, although I am told that isolated pockets of morale are still valiantly trying to survive. The principles of Westminster Government have been thrown out the door and an apolitical public service has been totally destroyed. This is the legacy of Peter Coaldrake, one of the great academic self-abusers of all time. His name will live in infamy throughout the history of the public service. According to the Budget, \$130,000 has been allocated to each member of the commission to ensure the principles of merit and equity. Unfortunately, the principles are obviously very transparent as everybody would appear to know who is going to be appointed to every position in the public service months before they are advertised.

Merit and equity in the commission revolve around membership of the ALP, and what particular mates people want to appoint to positions. This year, the Public Sector Management Commission will spend \$8m conducting further endless reviews of the public service, but to no avail. As I have said before, morale and efficiency will sink even lower.

The Premier's Department has spent over \$10m upgrading its accommodation in a building which has always been considered to be more than perfectly adequate. It spends money on wood-panelled lifts and luxury accommodation for its senior bureaucrats. Its budget, which now exceeds \$70m, has yet to provide any benefits to the Queensland economy and the future employment prospects for Queensland's youth. Staff numbers of the Premier's Department, including the Office of the Cabinet, have doubled since December 1989, but there is nothing to show for employing hundreds more in this particular area of the public service.

The Premier can find the money to look after himself and his favourites, but he ignores the recommendations of EARC to fund extra positions in the Opposition's office. EARC recommended that the Opposition should have 22 more staff than are presently employed. A strong Opposition is the mainstay of democracy. A strong Opposition, adequately resourced, ensures that a Government functions well and honestly. Yet we were able to prove that the Minister for Primary Industries has extra personnel, and the Premier has extra personnel in his office.

Time expired.

**Mr BRISKEY** (Cleveland) (12.36 p.m.): Once again this year, the Queensland public will be able to see exactly how the Government will spend its money because, once again, all Ministers will place before the people of Queensland their full Estimates for the coming year for scrutiny. Every year for the past four years since the Goss Labor Government has been in power, all Ministers have provided the Parliament with comprehensive information concerning their budgets.

This, of course, never happened under the previous National Party Government. Out of the 1989 Budget, the last Budget of the previous National Party Government—and the last Budget that the National Party will bring down in this place—the following Estimates were put before the Parliament: Industry, Small Business and Technology; Legislative and Executive Services; Mines and Energy and Northern and Regional Development; Tourism and Environment; and Conservation and Forestry. In other words, in 1989, only four Estimates were able to be placed under any scrutiny whatsoever by the Opposition and, therefore, by the Queensland public.

In 1989, the situation was a little better. That year, eight Estimates were debated. In 1987, there were also eight Estimates debated. But in 1986, once again, there were only four Estimates debated: Executive and Legislative; Transport; Water Resources and Maritime Services; and Welfare Services, Youth and Ethnic Affairs. Honourable members can therefore see that in 1986 and 1989, very few of the Estimates were debated. In fact, only four out of 18 Estimates were debated. Why? Honourable members would not be surprised to hear that both those years were election years, and the previous National Party Government did not want the people of Queensland to scrutinise how it was spending money from the public purse.

So it can be seen that there was no openness, there was no accountability and, especially during election years, the previous National Party Government hid from the people of Queensland the great bulk of how it planned to spend the money from the public purse. Not only did the previous National Party Government only allow Budget Estimates debates on a few limited portfolio areas; of the ones on which it did allow debate, very limited information was provided. The previous National Party Government's Budget statements were set out in line item form.

Now, every member in this place, and, importantly, every member of the general public, is able to see the type of important programs that will be undertaken during the year by this Government. Before the Goss Labor Government came to power, there was no detail whatsoever of the programs that the previous Government was implementing. There were no detailed program statements and, hence, not only has this Government provided important vital information to the public of Queensland by debating every Estimate of every department, but also it provides detailed information about the actual programs which each department will be undertaking during the year. We should never return to the dark old days when there was no accountability, when very few Estimates were debated, and when even fewer Estimates were debated during election years.

I would like to spend some time now speaking about the work done by the Electoral and Administrative Review Commission. There can be absolutely no doubt about the Goss Labor Government's commitment over the years to the full implementation of the reforms which were proposed in the Fitzgerald inquiry. There has been 100 per cent support for the implementation of electoral and administrative review. Now that its work is complete, the Electoral and Administrative Review Commission is to be wound up. EARC itself recommended that it be wound up, and a unanimous recommendation by the parliamentary committee agreed with this action. In its three and a half year history, EARC has presented 22 reports on topics as varied as public sector auditing and Government media and information services.

As one of the two major structures forged from the Fitzgerald process, EARC has made a singular and lasting contribution to the processes of reform in Queensland. Its contribution began with its first report on the declaration of the interests of members of Parliament which was presented in August 1990. Recently, EARC presented its final three

reports—Review of Appeals from Administrative Decisions, Consolidation and Review of the Queensland Constitution, and the Review of Preservation and Enhancement of Individuals' Rights and Freedoms. Of all the reports that EARC has presented, probably its most well-known report is Queensland Legislative Assembly Electoral System, which was presented in November 1990. As Commissioner Fitzgerald observed in his report in 1989—

“A fundamental tenet of the established system of parliamentary democracy is that public opinion is given effect by regular, free, fair elections following open debate.”

There is no doubt that Queensland's malapportioned electoral system was one of the most visible and significant features of the corruption which existed in this State prior to 1989.

The Electoral Districts Act 1991, which was recommended by EARC and implemented by the Goss Labor Government, provided the mechanism for the redistribution of the State's electoral districts by EARC. The Act abolished the zonal electoral system and introduced a one vote, one value system with minor weightage in large, remote electorates. The redistribution was completed on 29 November 1991. The Electoral Act 1992 was passed on 19 May 1992. The Act provided for the establishment of an independent electoral commission; the registration of political parties; the conduct and administration of Legislative Assembly elections; procedures for petitions and disputes; and the keeping of electoral rolls. A further EARC recommendation, which was also implemented by the Goss Labor Government, was the joint Queensland/Commonwealth electoral roll. This joint arrangement was signed by Queensland and the Commonwealth Government on 4 November 1991.

EARC's recommendations on electoral redistribution and the subsequent passage of the Electoral Districts Act in 1991 represented not only the practical expression of the end of the gerrymander, but also one of the most enduring symbols of the progress of reform in Queensland. Other EARC recommendations with respect to electoral matters that were implemented by the Goss Labor Government are the Local Authorities (1991 Elections) Act 1990 and the amendments to the Local Government Act 1936, which established the mechanisms and procedures for the conduct of local authority elections. Further, the Local Government Act Amendment Act 1992 was

passed on 6 May 1992. The Act created the office of the Local Government Commissioner, thereby establishing an independent process for ongoing reviews of local authority external boundaries and other local government matters.

While the death of the gerrymander is often seen as the most obvious, direct link between the work of EARC and the recommendations made by Tony Fitzgerald, it must always be remembered that fair electoral boundaries alone do not guarantee that the interests of parliamentary democracy are fully served. It is important to reflect on the fact that EARC has also made recommendations on a series of reforms which underpin the electoral system and strengthen the integrity of the administrative structure of our State. These include the Whistleblowers (Interim Protection) and Miscellaneous Amendments Act 1990, which amended the Electoral and Administrative Review Act 1989 and the Criminal Justice Act 1989 to make it an offence to victimise any person who has given evidence to or had assisted EARC or the CJC.

A register of interests of members of the Queensland Legislative Assembly was established in December 1990. The Judicial Review Act 1991 was also passed, and it supplements common law provisions for the judicial review of administrative decisions. In addition, it has conferred the right to obtain reasons for administrative decisions. The Legislative Standards Act 1992 was also passed by this Goss Labor Government. This Act established an independent Office of the Parliamentary Counsel, and includes a list of fundamental legislative principles to protect personal rights and liberties against which all new legislation should be checked.

The Peaceful Assembly Act 1992 was passed on 17 June 1992. The Act provides a general right of peaceful assembly in a public place, subject only to such lawful restrictions as are necessary and reasonable in the interests of public order, public safety, or the protection of the rights and freedoms of others. The Freedom of Information Act was passed on 5 August 1992. This Act confers a right by members of the community to documents held by the Government, subject to certain conditions and exceptions. Members of the community now have the right to ensure that documents held by the Government relating to their personal affairs are not incomplete, incorrect, out of date, or misleading. The Act commenced operation on 19 November 1992 for State Government agencies, and on 19 May 1993 for local government authorities.

The Audit Legislation Act 1993 was introduced in response to EARC recommendations in relation to public sector financial management reform. The Act extends the Auditor-General's powers, creates an independent Audit Office, and gives the Auditor-General power to investigate the adequacy of performance management systems in public agencies. The legislation also encourages the Auditor-General to report more frequently and extensively to Parliament.

The Audit and Parliamentary Committees Legislation Miscellaneous Amendments Act 1992 was also introduced. This Act removes restrictions on the Public Accounts Committee and Public Works Committee which helps to ensure their independence from Executive influence. The provisions to remove the ministerial veto and the secrecy provisions was recommended in EARC's Review of Public Sector Auditing in Queensland. Also as a result of EARC's recommendations, the Government has recommended changes to administrative arrangements for non-Government members with respect to the resource needs of these members, and, as well, there have been amendments to the Members' Salaries, Allowances and Services Handbook. All of the reforms I have mentioned have been implemented after recommendations were made by EARC and the parliamentary committee. Each has become an established feature of the political and administrative landscape of this State. The Goss Labor Government has been vigorous in its implementation of EARC's reforms, and that enthusiasm will continue until each of the commission's reports has been fully dealt with.

Although EARC has been wound up, the parliamentary committee still has much work to do. I look forward to the committee's responses to each of the reports that it has before it. Honourable members should be pleased by the work that EARC has done on behalf of the people of Queensland over the last three and a half years. I offer my thanks for its contributions to the implementation of the post-Fitzgerald reform agenda. As EARC is soon to wind up, I offer my thanks to the outgoing Chairman of EARC, David Solomon, and his predecessor, Tom Sherman, for their hard work and dedication. I would like to also thank the staff of EARC and all those members of the Queensland public who have taken the opportunity to have their say on how this State should be administered. Finally, I take this opportunity to thank members of the parliamentary committee that is presently looking at EARC's reports and also the

parliamentary committee which was in existence during the last Parliament.

Of course, the Parliamentary Committee for Electoral and Administrative Review still has quite a bit of work to do. It is presently deliberating on EARC's report on the Review of Parliamentary Committees, Investigation of Public Registration of Political Donations, Public Funding of Election Campaigns and Related Issues, and the Review of Independence of the Attorney-General. Soon, it will look at the report on the review of Government media units and information services. The committee also has at its disposal an additional research officer to assist with its present workload. The provision of that additional person is another indication of how important the Government believes the work of EARC is.

It was once said that man's capacity for justice makes democracy possible, but man's inclination to injustice makes democracy necessary. Through its professionalism and its commitment to lasting reform, EARC has shown that it has played an indispensable role in the revitalisation of parliamentary democracy in this State.

Time expired.

**Mr SANTORO** (Clayfield—Deputy Leader of the Liberal Party) (12.51 p.m.): I join this debate today to talk about one particular aspect of the Goss Labor Government's activities, namely, its dealings and its attempted manipulation of the Queensland media. I am particularly pleased to follow the honourable member Cleveland, because I want to take a slightly different perspective on the issues that he raised. It is an area of Government activity and administration that the Government prefers not to say too much about or have anyone else say much about. However, there is certainly plenty to talk about—so much so that, in late April of this year, the Electoral and Administrative Review Commission presented to this Parliament a report titled "A Report on the Review of Government Media and Information Services".

That report has plenty to say about the Government's approach to media and the way in which it disseminates information to the media and the public of Queensland. The report itself is 273 pages long and contains at least that number of additional pages in the form of appendices, submissions to the inquiry, charts, tables and the like. The report does not make pretty reading for the Government. In fact, it is a damning indictment of the Goss Government's attempt

to manipulate the media and to influence the type of news that reaches the citizens of this State and the Government's ruthless abuse of Queensland taxpayers' money to fund promotional campaigns and market research efforts, which aim to enhance the image of the Goss Labor Government.

I will come back to the specific findings of that report shortly, but first it is instructive to recall what the Premier and other members of the Labor Party in this Government said when they were in Opposition about the issue of media manipulation and Government advertising. Those statements, when juxtaposed to the findings of the EARC report, clearly brand the Premier and the Government as utter hypocrites, who, in Opposition, said one thing, and now, in Government, do totally the opposite and are abusive of anyone who seeks to stand in their way.

On Monday, 3 October 1988, the then Opposition Finance spokesman, Mr De Lacy, said in the now defunct *Sun* newspaper—

"The average Queenslanders was reeling under the impact of government-induced cost of living increases while the government spent millions on 'useless, self-indulgent' advertising. That was the claim today from Opposition finance spokesman Keith De Lacy.

. . . the government had launched an unprecedented assault on the hip pockets of ordinary Queenslanders.

'At the same time the government is flooding the airwaves and newspapers with advertising which is unsolicited and completely unproductive—unless the government is proposing an advertising-led recovery', Mr De Lacy said."

In the same newspaper on 13 July—

**Dr Watson:** Keith De Lacy said there would be no new taxes.

**Mr SANTORO:** Precisely. In the same newspaper on 13 July, the then Opposition Leader, Mr Goss, said—

"The State Government was promoting itself through expensive advertising campaigns at the expense of elderly and disabled people.

Queensland had missed out on \$3 million in services last financial year because of 'misplaced spending priorities', Mr Goss said.

He said the State Government spent at least \$12 million a year on advertising and public relations, much of it promoting

the public profiles of Premier Mike Ahern and his Cabinet.

'But the government can't find one-tenth of that amount—\$1.2 million—to meet its funding commitments under an important community program for the elderly and disabled', Mr Goss said."

That was the concern expressed by the then Opposition Leader about the misuse of public funds. And on 24 November 1988, the then Opposition Leader made what was defined as a last-ditch effort to have the then Premier, Mike Ahern, honour a promise—and this is very important to the honourable member who preceded me in the debate—made in the Parliament to release the details of the Government's publicly funded advertising bill. The article stated further—

"Opposition Leader Wayne Goss said today the National party was using the public purse as a bottomless pit for its advertising.

He made a last-ditch challenge to Premier Mike Ahern to honour a promise made in Parliament to release details of the government's publicly-funded advertising bill.

Mr Goss said if the total cost of the government's advertising efforts were examined it would show taxpayers were footing a bill of almost \$20 million.

Mr Goss said the nationals spent \$12 million in public funds on outside advertising agencies and consultants in the last financial year that details were disclosed.

'That was in addition to the Premier's Department public relations unit', he said."

Over the past few weeks, we have heard a lot about the Premier's public relations unit.

I could go on quoting from dozens and dozens of additional media reports, which have the Premier and other senior members of the Government carrying on in the same manner. But how times have changed! The EARC report to which I referred earlier found that the Goss Government greatly restricted the disclosure of official information, favoured certain media outlets in its distribution and the timing of the distribution of media releases, selectively favoured certain media outlets and journalists and is, at times, selective in the provision of briefings and media conferences, and that many of its publicity campaigns are politicised and much of the market research

conducted by Government agencies is politicised.

EARC found that this Government had drummed up a \$36.6m publicity and promotional bill in the 12 months covered by the report and that that was only a conservative estimate because of the difficulty in obtaining information from the Government. That is perhaps the most disgraceful revelation of the report—that the Government has tried to cover up the extent of its expenditure and media manipulations. I do not hear the honourable member who preceded me in the debate say now that it is an accountable and open Government.

The report found that the State Government and many of its departments had refused to provide essential information to EARC during its review of Government media and information services. In particular, the report found Premier Wayne Goss and his department to be the parties most guilty of covering up information. The report referred directly to the Premier's Department. Honourable members should listen to this. In its report, EARC found—

"It appeared to the Commission that neither the Premier's Department nor the individual departments were able or willing to present the costs associated with their media and information services."

**Mr FitzGerald:** Shame on them. It's damning.

**Mr SANTORO:** It is a shame and it is damning. As a last resort, the commission was forced to use its powers under 3.2 of the Act to request Treasury to identify costs incurred by the various departments. Where are the interjections from Government members? The information that the commission finally received from the Treasury showed the Government had spent an outrageous \$36.6m on public relations and promotional information programs in 1991-92.

In addition to the lack of information provided by the Government during the review, the commission also revealed some major discrepancies in the costs provided by the departments, varying from \$20,000 to as much as \$3.5m. The report concluded that the Queensland Government had not only been biased, selective and unfair in its dealings with the Queensland media but it had also blatantly tried to hide selected information. On top of that, immediately after the report of EARC was handed down, the Government again thumbed its nose at EARC and continued to ignore its recommendations.

A week after the release of the report, the Government flew journalists to Fraser Island for the day to launch a draft management report. I stress that it was a draft management report. That was nothing other than a ridiculous publicity stunt, for what was only a draft report.

As I said before, only a week prior to that stunt, the Goss Government was heavily criticised by the EARC review for the \$36.6m publicity and promotional bill that it had drummed up and was able to justify in the 12 months prior to the report. The report specifically made reference to the Government's expenditure on self-promotion and called for the Labor Party to be accountable to the public for money spent on entertaining the media. The commission noted that the Auditor-General should conduct an investigation into the amount of public money being spent by the Government on transporting and entertaining journalists.

Sitting suspended from 1 to 2.30 p.m.

**Mr SANTORO:** Before the lunch break, I was concluding my remarks about the EARC report, which, among many things, called for the Labor Party to be accountable to the public for money spent entertaining the media. I told the House that the commission noted that the Auditor-General should conduct an investigation into the amount of public money being spent on transporting and entertaining journalists by the Government. The report went on to recommend that the Government should recover the cost of transporting journalists on Government aircraft. Despite the report and its recommendation, Environment Minister Molly Robson played host to a number of Queensland journalists on the beaches of Fraser Island to chat about a draft report. Once again, the State Government completely disregarded EARC's findings and treated that independent body with little more than disdain.

So we had a damning report on the activities of the Premier and the Government which is more damning than any other report brought down in the last four years in this place. That report was by an independent authority, EARC, which comes under the umbrella of responsibility of the Premier. What has been the response to date by the Premier and his Government? Absolutely nothing! The Premier may think that, if he says nothing, this issue will simply go away. I have news for him: it will not, and we will keep at him and his Government. We in the Opposition intend to keep him accountable to the public of

Queensland. We look forward to seeing the implementation of the report's recommendations, which include—

increased disclosure of official information;

equal distribution of all Government media releases to media outlets and MLAs;

the availability of press conferences and media briefings to all media outlets;

an increase of Opposition media staff to 20 per cent of that of Ministerial offices;

the de-politicisation of government publicity campaigns; and

the de-politicisation of market research by Government agencies.

Of course, the report also recommended the full reporting to Parliament of the State Government's expenditure on advertising, market research and other information services. That recommendation was very much along the lines that the Premier when in Opposition called upon the former Government to implement.

I challenge the Government to implement these recommendations and not to hide behind the pathetic excuse that the Parliamentary Committee for Electoral and Administrative Review is still to look into these matters. Certain things that come before this Parliament which need to be considered by other bodies—including the Parliamentary Committee for Electoral and Administrative Review—simply make good sense and are morally right. They should be implemented forthwith. Yet, from time to time, when it suits the convenience of this Premier and this Government, they will hide behind the smokescreen that, in this case, the Parliamentary Committee for Electoral and Administrative Review provides.

The Leader of the Opposition commenced the contribution from this side of Chamber by saying that this debate is all about leadership and that more than ever in this State there is a need for not only strong leadership but also a sense of decency to come forward. I suggest to the Premier that implementing the recommendations of this report, particularly in the light of the damning findings that it made, would show leadership and would show, for once, a sense of decency. It is ironic to hear expressions of appreciation for EARC from Government members. I suspect that in reality Government members, including and particularly the Premier, are really quite happy that EARC has been wound up. The Government does not

like independent bodies such as EARC and the Criminal Justice Commission, because those bodies are independent and fearless. They touch up all sides of this place, including and particularly the Government. When it is the Government's turn to cop a bit, it certainly does not like it. It would prefer that those bodies did not exist so that the unfettered power of Government could be exercised with gay abandon.

The EARC report that I have just been discussing certainly did not endear that commission to the Labor Party. It must be wishing that the same sunset clause applied to the CJC so that that body could be wound up, as well. I concur with the comments of Government members in one respect, and I refer to their expressions of appreciation for the professional staff of EARC and for the two chairmen who guided the commission through its four-year life. I want to pay a specific tribute to somebody who is no longer with us, and that is the late Marie Watson Blake. She was a part-time commissioner for EARC. She played a very distinguished and stabilising role in the work of the commission. I had the pleasure to represent Mrs Blake when I represented the electorate of Merthyr, within which New Farm was included. I always found her to be a lady of immense grace who had a tremendous sense of fairness and great political insight. Those characteristics made her very well qualified to serve as a member of EARC.

I turn now to a matter to which the Premier may like to respond in his reply. Two reports from the Electoral and Administrative Review Commission have been presented today. One is for the year ending 1993, and the other is for the year ending 1994. There may be a reason for the lateness of the delivery of the fourth annual report, but I think that it is almost unprecedented—certainly in the time that I have been here—to have two reports arrive at the same time.

**Mr FitzGerald:** One is for the end of September.

**Mr SANTORO:** I take that interjection. The Premier may wish to confirm that. It just looked a bit funny to have—

**Mr FitzGerald:** It's only for July, August, September.

**Mr SANTORO:** I take the interjection from the Leader of Opposition Business, and I am grateful to him for that information. I think that I have made my point. We want this Government to be open. We want it to be accountable. We want it to be decent.

**Government members:** We are.

**Mr SANTORO:** I take all of those interjections. Government members did not make any interjections when I was going through the very specific findings of EARC. Demonstrating a total lack of courage and conviction, they refused to make interjections. I am happy to take all interjections on board. Government members clearly display themselves as hypocrites—

**Mr T. B. SULLIVAN:** I rise to a point of order. The member is wrong. I was warned for interjecting when he refused to take an interjection. He cannot have it both ways.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! There is no point of order. The member will resume his seat. I consider that to be a frivolous point of order. I will warn the next member who takes a point of order of that nature.

**Mr SANTORO:** *Hansard* will show that what the honourable member has just said is simply not true. I again challenge the Government to do the decent thing in relation to the media report that was brought down by EARC, which demonstrates clearly that the Premier and his Government are not at all fair dinkum when they talk about accountability and openness in Government.

**Mr J. H. SULLIVAN** (Caboolture) (2.38 p.m.): We have just heard vintage Santoro—

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! I remind the honourable member that he should refer to members in this Chamber by their correct titles.

**Mr J. H. SULLIVAN:** I accept what you say, Mr Chairman. We have just heard a vintage speech from the member for Clayfield—the type of speech to which we refer in the corridors of this place as “vintage Santoro” because there was no real fact or relevance in it. The only difference between that speech and the usual speech from the member for Clayfield is that he actually said something decent at the end of it. I agree entirely with the comments that he made in respect of Mrs Watson Blake, a woman whom I first knew by reputation in the late sixties and early seventies when I worked in the travel industry. She was very well respected in that industry as well as for the work that she did with the Electoral and Administrative Review Commission.

The member for Clayfield did not mention unions during his speech, which was unusual. There was no union bashing today. However, it is good to have the member for Clayfield

back on track after the dismal display that he give last evening.

**Mr Beattie:** The *Courier-Mail* does not think much of him. Read out what the *Courier-Mail* thinks about him.

**Mr J. H. SULLIVAN:** I do not think that we need to read Mr Morley's comments into the record. They are well known throughout Queensland already. The member for Chermside tells me that Mr Morley often gets things wrong; so I guess that is fair. However, in this instance, Mr Morley has shown extremely good insight into the character of a number of members of this place.

**Mr Santoro:** You spend a lot of time on me, all you guys on the other side. Keep on doing it. I'm flattered by the references.

**Mr J. H. SULLIVAN:** We are merely pandering to the honourable member's ego in the vain hope that he will topple his current leader. My colleague the member for Cleveland has already covered the area of the Electoral and Administrative Review Commission quite well. However, I wish to add a couple of points relating to the work of that commission and some other commissions in Queensland. This morning on the Henshaw program, the Police Union representative, Sergeant O'Gorman, said in respect of the CJC and police inquiries that Queensland is at the leading edge of dealing with inquiries into or complaints against actions of police. He gained that view at a recent police conference which he attended. So, too, with EARC is Queensland at the leading edge.

The 1992 EARC annual report indicated that quite clearly by stating—

"The work of the Commission is generating interstate and international interest."

All honourable members can take some pride in the fact that the Electoral and Administrative Review Commission in Queensland has been used as a provider of information both interstate and internationally. In particular, its reports were made available to the African National Congress and the Convention on Democracy in South Africa in the process that they are working towards at the moment post-apartheid South Africa. We should be thankful for that.

Mr Santoro mentioned Mr Sherman, Mr Solomon and Mrs Watson Blake. It would also be remiss of us if we did not express our appreciation to Commissioners Davies, Hall, Hughes and Hunter, who have carried out some fine work for the Electoral and Administrative Review Commission.

Mr Santoro said that he thought the Government would be happy to see the end of the Electoral and Administrative Review Commission. What did he want us to do? Mr Fitzgerald gave that proposed commission a finite task to perform. It performed that finite task, and it is time to move on. That is quite appropriate and a matter about which the Government is neither displeased nor happy. We have continued to finance the commission beyond the period when it thought it might have finished that work to allow it to complete the work. There is no more work to do, so there is no more need for us to continue to fund it.

As I said—Mr Santoro might have another idea—the commissioners have finished their job; why keep them on the payroll? I did not wish to speak about the Electoral and Administrative Review Commission or Mr Santoro. However, having followed him in this debate, I found it difficult not to make some comments.

I turn to the Office of the Parliamentary Counsel, for which this Budget provides just under \$5m. I have contact with Mr Leahy, the Parliamentary Counsel, and his department in a role that I play on one of the committees of this place. The work that they do is not often thought about by members of this place as we go about our job of debating legislation. The Office of the Parliamentary Counsel, of course, was the subject of one of the Electoral and Administrative Review Commission reports.

As a consequence of that report, Queensland has again hit the leading edge in this country with the enactment of the Legislative Standards Act in 1992. Recently, I made a speech to a conference in Melbourne on the fundamental legislative principles that are contained in that Act. One of the results of that Legislative Standards Act was that the Parliamentary Counsel's Office became an independent statutory body. It left its base within the Premier's Department and became an independent statutory body, although it still relies on the Premier's Department for a number of matters. The Office of the Parliamentary Counsel, with Mr Leahy as Parliamentary Counsel, is available not only to Ministers and departments but also to Opposition members and the committees of this place. Opposition members have tended to use the services of the Office of the Parliamentary Counsel to draft amendments that they wish to make to Government Bills in Parliament. As well, the office is available to draft private members' Bills.

When the Legislative Standards Act was passed, one of the functions that the Office of the Parliamentary Counsel was given was to monitor the adherence to the fundamental legislative principles contained in that Act. This is in an interim period when we are awaiting the results of a further Electoral and Administrative Review Commission report on parliamentary committees that has been tabled and one from the PEARC committee that has not yet been tabled. I wondered how they may have been going in that process.

One of the fundamental legislative principles is that legislation must be drafted with due regard to the traditions and customs of Aboriginal and Islander people. This legislation introduces a completely new area in this State, and it is at the leading edge of what is occurring nationally, and probably internationally.

I came across an article in the February volume of the *Alternative Law Journal* written by Bruce White and Joanna Sutherland. Bruce White is an assistant to the rainforest Aboriginal network in Townsville, and he gave an outline of some dealings that the Aboriginal people had in this regard with the Office of the Parliamentary Counsel to ensure that Aboriginal traditions and culture are not trampled by legislation introduced by the Government. It is interesting to note his final comment on the matter. Having indicated that they had a good response from the Office of the Parliamentary Counsel, his final comments were—

“In this international year of the world’s indigenous people, it looks as if it may be a promising year in Queensland as the Government examines new local government legislation and new coastal protection legislation, the Queensland Land Act and implementation of the Nature Conservation Act. All individuals will benefit from these Fitzgerald and EARC reforms, but it seems as if the Queensland Government may have a head start in forging the beginnings of a new partnership with Queensland’s indigenous people.”

That is a commendable thing in this State, which has for a long time never treated its indigenous people with much respect, and certainly no sense of partnership. I am very pleased to be able to say that the Office of the Parliamentary Counsel, by playing its role in monitoring the fundamental legislative principles, has been able to get that sort of compliment from the Aboriginal people themselves.

A number of the issues that the Office of the Parliamentary Counsel deals with are very important to us as legislators, and none more so than the plain English drafting policy that has been implemented recently. I refer honourable members to page 3 of the annual report, which has an example of plain English drafting. The comparison between old style drafting and plain English drafting should be considered by honourable members. As a result of that policy being introduced in this place by the Attorney-General, Mr Wells, and the implementation of the policy by the Office of the Parliamentary Counsel, legislation is suddenly becoming something that we can all use. When I say “all”, I am not referring only to members of this place; I refer to the people of Queensland. They will be able to read a piece of legislation and understand what the Government’s intentions are without having to hire a solicitor.

The computerisation of the Office of the Parliamentary Counsel was mentioned by the Premier. This has been one of the great achievements of the Office of the Parliamentary Counsel in recent years. A perusal of the annual report reveals that only in the Commonwealth jurisdiction are more pages of legislation produced than here in Queensland. Basically, that means that the Office of the Parliamentary Counsel is indeed a busy office. This has meant some workload changes to the Office of the Parliamentary Counsel. Accordingly, at the moment it has an establishment of 49 staff. I understand that this Budget allows for some permanent positions to replace people who are working part time.

The workload of that office is going to be continuous as it moves towards something that will be a welcome tool for all of us in Parliament and probably for all users of legislation throughout the State. I refer to a database of Queensland legislation, so that hard copies of a particular item can be generated at the same time as it is viewed electronically. As the Premier said, some of the work of the Office of the Parliamentary Counsel has to be viewed in a whole-of-Government approach. Some of the additional burdens and costs that have been assumed by the Office of the Parliamentary Counsel relieve some of the pressure on Goprint.

Recently, the Office of the Parliamentary Counsel has introduced a particular publication in which I have some interest, that is, the subordinate legislation series, which is a compilation of those statutory instruments that are drafted by the Office of the Parliamentary

Counsel and are generally known as being legislative in character. However, I have one quibble with that publication that I have had for some time. With the Statutory Instruments Act of 1982, we created a class of subordinate instruments called exempt instruments. These are legislative in character but are not drafted by the Office of the Parliamentary Counsel. They are drafted in the departments and so could possibly contain some style deficiencies. However, they are not included in the subordinate legislation series. I would continue to urge that all statutory instruments produced in this State are included in that subordinate legislation series. I realise that this could create some additional work for the Office of the Parliamentary Counsel. However, I know that it has an advisory role in distributing guidelines for departments that do their own statutory instruments—

Time expired.

**Mr FITZGERALD** (Lockyer) (2.54 p.m.): I hope that this is the last debate that we have of this type in this Chamber on the Estimates of the Premier. The member for Cleveland made the point that members are able to scrutinise every line of the program statements and the Estimates of the department. I think it is a joke. Members stand up in this place one after another making points about what they have deduced from the Budget papers. Then members have to refer to the annual reports to get the full story.

Some of the entries in the program statements simply have a line with a figure at the end. No meaning of the entry is provided, so we have to look at the annual reports. Eight annual reports from the Premier's Department landed on members' desks this morning during question time. Members who intend to speak during the debate have other things to do besides reading annual reports to find out some information on any particular matter.

The member for Cleveland said that members are scrutinising all the Budget papers. That is the greatest misuse of that word that I have ever heard. I could ask the Premier about any one-line entry in the program statements, but I am sure that he does not have all that information at his fingertips—and nor would I expect him to. During his 20-minute reply, he cannot possibly address all matters raised by members. I hope that when EARC hands down its reports—and I do not want to pre-empt any of those reports—this will be the last debate of this type that will occur in this Chamber. However, members will still need to raise general issues.

I realise that it would be boring for a Minister to sit here all the time and have to listen to some of the tripe that is said here at times. I hope that the Premier does not consider my contribution as tripe.

**Mr W. K. Goss:** I've been sitting here waiting for this speech.

**Mr FITZGERALD:** I know that he has, because he has been talking during the speeches made by most other members. Obviously, the Premier must have been waiting for a speech such as this.

I really want to talk about EARC and the way that it has recognised the important role of Parliament. A lot has been said about the EARC process that has taken place. I speak particularly of EARC, because this is the last time that members will see that particular line in the Budget. EARC had an allocation for this financial year of \$373,000. EARC will wind up at the end of this month. I understand that there are only two staff left. One will shut the door and the other will ensure that the furniture is delivered back to the correct offices. I believe that EARC has been a successful operation. I shall read into *Hansard* what Budget Paper No. 3 states as the program goal for EARC. It states—

“To provide reports to the Legislative Assembly and the Premier with a view to achieving and maintaining efficiency in the operation of the Parliament”—

that is the No. 1 issue—

“and honesty, impartiality and efficiency in elections and the public administration of the State and in Local Authority administration.”

The No. 1 point was maintaining efficiency in the operation of Parliament. EARC provided us with 23 reports during its existence, plus the annual reports each year, including the two that members received today. Those reports contain some pertinent comments.

In its fifth annual report, which is for this year, in which it is winding up, EARC makes some comments about what Fitzgerald recommended for the Parliament. One of the points made in the Fitzgerald report is—

“. . . provision of non-government members with resources . . . and information.”

EARC's recommended action is—

“Information and Resource Needs of Non-Government Members Report”—

which was provided by EARC in December 1991. In another section of the annual report the EARC Act is referred to, in particular section 2.10 (a) (ii) relating to "the operation of the Parliament". EARC says that it has played its part in that regard. If this Government really wants the Parliament to work correctly, I believe that it should set up the committee system that has been recommended—or a committee system that will be recommended, I presume, by the parliamentary committee, or a system to scrutinise the Legislature and the Executive Government.

The history of Parliament began with a struggle between the people and the Crown. It then became a struggle between the Parliament and the Executive. I assure the people of Queensland that that struggle still continues. The people have a right to question the Executive. The Executive raised its taxes through the Parliament. It spends the people's money. People rely on members of Parliament to scrutinise how and when that money is spent and determine whether it has been spent correctly. Unless people support the Parliament, its whole purpose for existence will be defeated. I suspect at times—and there is certainly some evidence to prove this—that that this Government does not wish to face the full scrutiny of the process that has been recommended.

I note that EARC recommended in the Review of Information and Resources Needs of Non-Government Members of the Queensland Legislative Assembly that many of those recommendations have to some degree been implemented. I refer to the office equipment required for non-Government members. Of course, the definition of "non-Government members" is a member who is not a member of the Executive. I know that some Government backbenchers—and this was also the case when the National Party was in Government—think that they are members of the Executive Government. We are members of Parliament, but there is a clear separation. I wish that all members—those who were here during the time of the National Party Government and those who are members of the present Parliament—would recognise that a backbencher sits on the back bench and members of the Executive sit on the front benches, and they are to be questioned by every member of Parliament. While they may be the lackeys or the backsides on seats who are required to see that legislation is passed, they have a duty and a responsibility as members of Parliament to act as members of Parliament. If there is one point that I would

like to make in Parliament, it is that I would like to see that emphasised more and more.

There has definitely been an improvement in the resources that are made available to members, and I think that we should recognise that. Members are not going to get everything that it is recommended they should receive, particularly in the short term—and I understand that—but extra facilities are required for non-Government members in their electorate offices. A glaring example of where nothing at all has been done is in the office of the Opposition. That structure has been left wilting on the vine. The Leader of the Opposition has spoken on this matter before. Government members talk about history, but years ago backbenchers had no electorate secretaries—they had nothing. We have now built up an efficient machine in our electorate offices to service our electorates. The report recommended that each member of Parliament receive an extra \$10,000 so that Opposition members and Government backbenchers could not only employ extra staff but also improve their efficiency with regard to research and other matters.

The fact that this Government has done absolutely nothing with regard to the Opposition offices is a glaring anomaly. The recommendation was that the staff establishment of the Opposition offices should be maintained at 20 per cent of the level of the staff establishment of ministerial offices. We know that nothing at all has been done in that regard, while the Government offices get fatter and fatter. The Leader of the Opposition gave the numbers of Government staff, and on those figures I think there should be an extra 22 staff in the combined Opposition offices. The Leader of the Opposition was kind enough to say that he would not put that in as an ambit claim. He believed that that number of staff should be worked up to gradually. I can assure honourable members that the Opposition does need that many staff. Government members say, "Why are they needed?" They know the amount of legislation that comes before the Parliament that has to be scrutinised by the Opposition.

The annual report of the Office of the Parliamentary Counsel that was delivered a few hours ago sets out the combined number of pages of Acts and subordinate legislation for the various States and the Commonwealth in 1992, which are as follows: 9 396 for the Commonwealth; 5 532 for Queensland; the next highest State, which is Victoria, at 4 899; 4 813 for New South Wales; and then just over 1 000 for the other States and Territories.

In other words, according to Appendix 4 on page 29 of the 1992-93 annual report of the Office of the Parliamentary Counsel, Queensland tops the States in the number of pages of Acts and subordinate legislation. Something has to be done in order to enable the Opposition to scrutinise that amount of legislation and subordinate legislation that is put before this House.

Of course, according to the Government, the answer is to set up a committee system. However, committees are dominated by Government members. Committees have a role to play, but I impress upon this House and upon the people of Queensland that the best scrutiny of Government is performed by a fully effective Opposition. We know that Government members realise that, because during question time they have tried to neutralise some of the effective members of the Opposition who have been causing the Government some problems. The best way to do that is to starve those Opposition members of funds.

What did this Government do about FOI? It said that members of Parliament will have to pay for it the same as everyone else and that there would not be any quota, allowance, or extra funds for FOI. I suggest that members could be provided with a special fund out of which they could apply for and obtain information. If the Leader of the Opposition wants to find out anything, he has, like any John Citizen, to pay \$30 for it. Is that really an indication that this Government has its heart in freedom of information? I believe that the Government is hypocritical—there is no other way of putting it—when it says that it wants open and accountable government.

The 1992-93 annual report of the Office of the Cabinet contains one very interesting section. It is good to know the amount of time that is put into each of the items that are put forward, and the different types of submissions that are made to Cabinet. The report states that 16 oral submissions were made to the 46 meetings of Cabinet, which is important. I was rather bemused to learn that this Government instituted a policy of a seven-day waiting period for all submissions, so that Cabinet members would have sufficient time to look at an important submission. We know what happened in relation to Starcke Pastoral Holdings. On radio one morning, the Minister for Lands stated that the Government had no intention of buying any land. He was defending the position that the Premier had some time earlier dictated that the Government would adopt. A couple of hours later, it was revealed that the Government

would introduce legislation so that it could negotiate the purchase of Starcke Pastoral Holdings. The Minister was on radio that morning defending the position that the Premier had decided upon a couple of weeks earlier. I do not know whether he had not read what was in his Cabinet bag, or whether the Premier made an oral submission, but the result was that it was all over and done with. Government members talk about "the proper process of Cabinet". However, the public have to rely on what they hear the Minister say on radio and compare that with the statements of the Premier a couple of weeks earlier. To hear the Premier make an announcement straight after a Cabinet meeting that completely overturns a previous decision indicates that the submission was not in the Cabinet bag or, if it was, the Premier has a real problem with the Minister for Lands.

I would like at this stage to pay tribute to the staff of EARC, who worked so very, very, hard over many years. Of course, I pay tribute to Marie Watson Blake for what she did in the work of EARC.

Time expired.

**Mr VAUGHAN** (Nudgee) (3.08 p.m.): The State Budget shows clearly that we in Queensland are indeed fortunate to live in what is the most prosperous State in Australia and the State with the most potential. It is predicted that in 1993-94 Queensland's economy will again outperform the rest of Australia, with State economic growth of 3.8 per cent compared with a national growth of 2.75 per cent. To be able to maintain economic growth, and the prosperity that comes with it, we have to ensure that the goods and services we produce and export remain competitive. We have to continue to develop our export industries and attract more foreign investment into the State. That is where the Trade and Investment Development Program plays such an important role. As the Premier has indicated, an amount of \$13.558m has been allocated to this program for 1993-94. This is an increase of nearly \$2m over the previous year. Staff numbers for the program will increase by 8 to 74. Staff increases will occur in the new secretariats, the investment promotion section and the trade support area.

Not only will the program continue to provide high-quality support to the State's exporting industries according to needs and priorities, it will also concentrate on attracting new investment into the State. The increase in funding will be used to expand the Queensland export development scheme

which was established last financial year to provide funding for overseas market research, product and packaging redesign and modification, and export skills development. The scheme will also be involved in engaging assistance from foreign specialists. An export manager will also be employed. This year, \$2m will be provided—an increase of \$1.936m—to assist Queensland firms that are ready to enter the export markets. Since the scheme was introduced, 50 businesses have received assistance. These businesses are expected to generate \$34m worth of new exports over the next three years. Increased funding of \$1.427m will also be used to establish Brisbane-based secretariats for South East Asia, which is one of the world's fastest-growing regions, and Papua New Guinea/Oceania.

The Asia-Pacific region does, of course, have enormous export and investment potential for Queensland, and it is important that the State's manufacturers and producers be given every assistance to access this market. Papua New Guinea is already an important export market, particularly for north Queensland. The Pacific islands' geographic proximity makes them also natural markets for Queensland. Because the Government's trade strategies for North Asia have been so successful, peak industry bodies have requested that similar attention be given to the South East Asia area. \$400,000 has been allocated for the establishment of two new secretariats to service the developing markets of South East Asia and Papua New Guinea/Oceania. Experience has shown that Brisbane-based secretariats are more cost-effective—and this is most important these days—and efficient than establishing new overseas offices.

To facilitate communication and establish closer relationships, the secretariats will be staffed by officers who speak the languages and understand the business and cultural practices of the relevant region. At present, secretariats for China, Japan, Korea and Indonesia are in place and operating most effectively. An amount of \$591,000 has been allocated for investment promotion and investment attraction programs for targeted industries and markets. A new senior position in the investment promotion section will be created along with two new administrative/trade support positions.

Foreign investment is vital to Queensland's economic development and the expansion of its industrial base. Its value to the State is clearly exhibited by industries, such as the large coalmines in central

Queensland, the Queensland Alumina refinery, the Weipa bauxite mining operation and the Mount Isa mines, just to mention only a few of the larger industries in this State, and numerous other smaller industries whose exports are worth billions of dollars to the State's economy. The expansion of the investment promotion section is necessary as it has only four officers responsible for foreign investment attraction whereas New South Wales has 61.

The new senior position will address tourism infrastructure development and the attraction of regional headquarters to the State. The two new trade support positions are necessary to enable the Trade and Investment Development Division service its growing number of clients. For the record, in the first three months of this year the division handled 7 900 telephone calls and responded to over 1 500 facsimiles. The division was established with no dedicated administrative support staff, and as a result professional officers spent considerable time on routine administrative paperwork. As a result of an internal audit review, it was found that there was a need for trade support and administrative staff.

In 1992-93, the Trade and Investment Development Division handled almost 4 000 export and investment inquiries of substance. The division assisted over 3 000 clients resulting in \$122m worth of additional exports achieved or under negotiation, with additional potential exports of \$283m projected over the next 12 months.

The Japan Secretariat, which consists of three staff, assisted 300 clients, generating exports achieved or under negotiation of \$3.5m and projected sales of \$6.5m over the next year. The China Secretariat, which also has three staff, handled 200 inquiries, assisting Queensland businesses to win new export contracts of over \$8.5m with a further \$2.5m under negotiation. The Korea Secretariat, which has only two staff, is a vital link between Queensland business and the Korean market. It assisted almost 300 clients and facilitated new exports of over \$3.5m with 30 contracts currently under negotiation and expected to generate a further \$3m. The Indonesia Secretariat, which also has only two staff, handled over 600 trade inquiries and facilitated exports worth \$14m for Queensland business, with further projected sales of \$27m. This is having an important effect on Queensland/Indonesia trade.

The successful operation of these secretariats speaks for itself and is indicative

of what we can expect with the establishment of the two new secretariats mentioned earlier. In addition, the division processed over 740 investment inquiries resulting in over \$50m worth of new investments in the State. Additional investments of approximately \$97m are expected to be generated over the next year. These investments benefited primary industry processing, paperboard packaging and information technology. Of course, we all know how important it is to be able to improve our secondary processing of this State's primary industries.

In 1992-93, the Trade and Investment Development Division achieved greater coordination and collaboration in trade-related activities among the public and private sectors. It represented Queensland at over 100 trade shows and investment seminars and coordinated and/or managed more than 75 major outbound trade missions and trade and investment-related events. In addition, the division worked with Commonwealth trade and investment-related agencies to ensure that Queensland's position on issues was considered. It also managed sister-State relationships with Japan, China and Indonesia, leading to improved economic and cultural ties.

To further service Queensland's export and investment attraction priorities, representative offices are established in Tokyo, Hong Kong, Taipei and London. The sum of \$5.456m has been allocated in the Budget to fund the operations of these offices. I am pleased to say that over the past five years I have had the pleasure of visiting all of these offices and was able to see at first hand the valuable work the people in these offices do for our State. I first visited the Tokyo office with a parliamentary delegation in 1988 and had the opportunity, as Minister for Resource Industries, to pay a second visit in 1990.

I would like to take this opportunity to acknowledge the assistance given to me on both of those occasions, but particularly on the last occasion, by the director, Mr John Kenny, and by Mr Harry Onji. Their knowledge, together with the facilities of our Tokyo office, contributed significantly to the success of my visit to Japan and Korea. At this point, I take this opportunity to say how much I would like to go back to Korea because it was a very interesting visit. I was able to take a close look at some of the manufactured products, and I can assure honourable members that those products are of a very high quality. This is why it is so important—

**An Opposition member:** Any change in the bathhouse structure?

**Mr VAUGHAN:** I must say that I was accompanied on my first visit to Tokyo by some very nice people, and we shared some great experiences.

**An Opposition member:** And what are fishing rods like?

**Mr VAUGHAN:** I understand that they make very good fishing rods in Korea. They make a collapsible type, which is great at catching fish. In 1991, I visited the United Kingdom. Again, the London office was instrumental in ensuring that my itinerary went according to plan. On that occasion, we did not have an Agent-General in the Queensland office. The former Agent-General, the late John Brown, had passed away. I take this opportunity to say what great assistance the late John Brown was to me many years ago, when my daughter, who was overseas, had some difficulties.

I had the pleasure of knowing Mr Brown from as far back as 1960, when I first met him. At that time, he was the manager at the Golden Circle cannery. I did not have the opportunity to meet Mr Ray Anderson, the current Agent-General, as he had only recently been appointed and had not yet taken up his duties. I met Elizabeth Mills and Lynda Rubie-Mayne. I also had the pleasure of being driven around London by one of the most competent persons whom I have ever come across, Mr Robin Hales, who had been with the Queensland office for 23 years. I understand that his father occupied that position before him.

Last year, as the Minister for Employment, Training and Industrial Relations, I visited Hong Kong and Taiwan. I was impressed with our representations in both of those places. I had the pleasure of meeting Cecilia Young in Hong Kong and Ronald Wang in Taiwan. I point out that Taiwan is our fourth-largest export market.

If we are to improve our trade relationships with the countries in which those offices are located, in the areas served and to be served by the respective secretariats, we must have good communications with the businesses in those countries and in those areas. I believe the funds that have been allocated to the Trade and Investment Development Program to be money very well spent.

As I said, to be able to maintain our economic growth and the prosperity that comes with it, we must ensure that the goods

and services that we produce and export remain competitive. It is also important that we are able to continue to export those goods and services and to increase those exports. Those offices and the secretariats that will be established will serve that purpose.

For the record, I wanted to refer to the State's foreign exports last financial year. However, time is running out. I put on the record that, from July 1992 until May this year—the latest data available—our exports were \$10.7 billion. That figure speaks for itself. That is an 8.1 per cent increase in the 11 months over the previous year, 1991-92. In 1992-93, there was a strong growth in all of the three major export categories. Manufactured exports increased by 14.8 per cent. In spite of the drought and the adverse conditions in rural areas, rural exports increased by 14.1 per cent. Crude minerals exports increased by 5.9 per cent. Those figures speak for themselves and prove beyond doubt that the money that is being spent in that area is money very well spent.

Time expired.

**Mr BEANLAND** (Indooroopilly) (3.23 p.m.): I welcome the chance to take part in the debate on the Estimates for the Premier's Department. I want to deal with two specific responsibilities of the Premier: Commonwealth/State relations—and the rights of this State in particular—and the role of the Premier in economic development. One of the most vital of all of the responsibilities of the Premier is to protect the rights and interests of this State and its people within the Commonwealth of Australia. Today, those rights are under more determined and more serious threat than ever, yet the Premier has been singularly negligent in protecting those rights.

The threat to Queensland's rights comes from the republican stance pursued by the Prime Minister and his publicly funded Republic Advisory Committee. The Prime Minister has abandoned the minimalist position that he took at the outset of the debate that he started. He now wants to bring about the most sweeping constitutional, political, economic and social change in the history of our Federation. This week, His Excellency the Governor-General of Australia—a Labor appointee, a former Labor leader and a Queensland—publicly and clearly warned of the dangers inherent in the course that Mr Keating and his committee are following. In doing so, the Governor-General destroyed forever the nonsense that the Prime Minister is spreading about our current

system of government and the constitutional monarchy.

His Excellency also gave a most ringing endorsement of our current system in the following terms—and I quote from the transcript of his interview, shown on *Four Corners* last Monday—

"I will risk my arm by going further as Governor-General, and say this: the present system works well. It allows us to have stable government in this country because the Head of State is aware of the restraints under which he must function. If we move away from that and there is no restraint, then my apprehension is that we could go through periods—intense periods sometimes—of quite unstable government."

His Excellency not only expressed reservations about the need for a change at all, but also warned of the dangers in the more sweeping proposals that the Prime Minister and the republican adherents are now pushing for. He rightly pointed out that a popularly elected president would be more likely to resort to reserve powers in the Constitution, such as closing Parliaments and sacking Governments, and the result would be a high degree of political turbulence in our political processes.

We all owe a debt of gratitude to the Governor-General for pointing out the dangers and the divisions inherent in the Keating agenda for an Australian republic. He has stressed that the current system works well, and he has warned that the alternatives have a potential for disaster. The relevance of that for the States—and for Queensland in particular—was graphically highlighted in an article in the *Melbourne Herald* of 7 September this year, written by the Clerk of the Commonwealth Senate, Mr Harry Evans. Mr Evans said that Australia was sliding to despotism and highly centralised powers—centralised in the Federal Cabinet and bureaucracy in Canberra.

He warned that the debate over the republic risks giving Australia a Federal Government with very dangerous powers. Two quotes from the article illustrate that clearly—

"The High Court has reinforced this concentration of powers in the hands of the central ministry . . . the virtual rewriting of the federal distribution of power in the Tasmanian Dams case is just one of the many High Court decisions which have helped put us in the camp of Ministerial absolutism."

Dealing specifically with the republican debate, Mr Evans said—

“The ‘reform’ platform of the radical republicans includes abolition of the states, abolition or curbing of the Senate, and an easier method of changing the Constitution.

Such proposal would turn the country into a highly centralised state in which the entire government apparatus is dominated by the ministry of the day.”

The comments by the Governor-General and the warnings from the distinguished Clerk of the Senate should sound alarm bells in the Premier’s office, charged as it is with the proper maintenance of the rights of this State and the relationship of the State with the Commonwealth. Twice this year, we have seen substantial evidence of the contempt in which this State and this State Government are held by the Keating Government in Canberra. Firstly, the composition of the Keating Ministry was an insult to Queensland. In a Ministry of about 30, Queensland has two Ministers, one of whom is a junior subminister. Even South Australia did better. Secondly, I refer to the manner in which this State’s financial interests were totally ignored at the Premiers Conference. The belated pleas of the Premier and the Treasurer were treated most offhandedly by a Government dominated by Sydney and Melbourne.

Despite those warning signals and the general deterioration in proper relations between the State and the Commonwealth, the Premier has been his usual indecisive self on the republican issue—just as he has been over Mabo. In the meantime, the Turnbull committee, and the Prime Minister’s advisers, have been working away on proposals which will erode the rights of this State, bring about a radical change in the division of powers between the Commonwealth and the States, centralise even more power in Canberra, and neuter the checks and balances already in place, such as the Senate, and the constitutional monarchy.

The warnings from the Governor-General could not be clearer. The current system works well, and many of the proposed changes have real potential for instability. The Clerk of the Senate, amongst others, has backed up those warnings very specifically by pointing to the change in the division of power, which is the real republican agenda. The time has come for the Premier to treat that issue with the same seriousness and commitment with which the Governor-General treats it. No-one knows where the Premier really stands. One

day, he says that change is not a priority. The next day, he makes a silly, cosmetic change at the State level just to appear reformist.

**Mr Borbidge:** We hardly got the definite position this morning.

**Mr BEANLAND:** We certainly did not get it today. The Premier waffled on, as usual. He will not address the consequences of the current debate and the proposed changes for this State and for this Parliament. Let there be no doubt about it, the real Keating agenda is to use the abolition of the monarchy to extend the power of the Federal Ministry and bureaucracy, to obliterate the checks and balances that the Governor-General has so eloquently, even courageously, highlighted. Tomorrow, in Scotland, the Prime Minister will meet the Queen. He does so without any mandate from the people or the Parliament to make Australia a republic, or even to seek to do so.

When the republican issue was raised during the election campaign, Mr Keating said repeatedly that it was not an issue in the campaign. Having been pushed over the finish line by the goods and services tax, he now claims a “mandate” to push his republican agenda. It is a false and phoney mandate, and the great majority of Australians know it. When he returns to Australia and the stacked Turnbull committee presents him with the report that he wants, the real push will be on. This Government and this Premier will be totally ill-prepared for the debate ahead. The erosion of State powers—fiscal powers, legal powers, constitutional powers and so on—will escalate under the Keating republican plan, yet this State is doing nothing to ensure that the interests and rights of Queenslanders and Queensland are protected.

I call on the Premier to make a clear statement at the earliest possible opportunity—and not the waffle, as the Leader of the Opposition said, that we got from him this morning—on the attitude of this Government to the erosion of State sovereignty, State powers and State finances, which the republican push will make inevitable.

The Premier and the Treasurer talk about standing up for Queensland. Their big chance is coming, and they will not be able to waffle around the vital issues any longer because the Keating agenda will put the real focus on the division of power between the Commonwealth and the States, the sovereign rights of this State and the basic rights of Queenslanders. The people of Queensland have shown time and time again that they expect their State Government and State

leaders to stand up for the rights of this State, and they have dealt ruthlessly with leaders and parties which have failed to do so. That is why Labor was reduced to a cricket team without the 12th man in 1974.

The Premier must stop trying to have an each-way bet on the republican issue. Changing the head of State is just a part of the agenda. The real agenda is to forever radically change the distribution of power and authority in Australia to the detriment of States such as Queensland and to remove the checks and balances about which the Governor-General gave us such a timely reminder on Monday of this week. Unless the Premier and the Government get off the fence and stand up for Queensland, the poll in this week's *Time* magazine will be nothing compared with what it will be in six months' time. This Government is already on the skids because of its mismanagement of vital areas such as health, law and justice and education. When the people add a failure to stand up for the rights of this State to the Federal Government's sorry record, the Goss Government will be history.

The Premier also holds the title of Minister for Economic and Trade Development. He must therefore be held accountable for the fact that Queensland today no longer leads Australia in private sector growth—the real measure of lasting economic activity. I have here a feature article from the *Australian Financial Review* of this Wednesday headed "Why Queensland Is Not a Boom Economy". Fact by fact, point by point, that article blows to pieces the Premier's claim and the Treasurer's claim that Queensland is leading Australia in private sector growth. In fact, as the article proves, Queensland is now trailing Australia in business investment, generally accepted as the key indicator of underlying real business activity.

The article proves that the growth which is occurring is generated almost solely by public sector spending—which is so evident in this Budget—and housing and consumer spending brought about by the growth in the State's population—a growth which began long before the current Government was first elected four years ago. Against forecasts of a 3.1 per cent increase in business investment in 1992-93, there was actually a 5.5 per cent decline. One wonders just how inaccurate the forecasts in this Budget are if that is any guide! In spending on plant and equipment—another important indicator—Queensland last year recorded a 10.2 per cent fall after an even greater fall of 12.2

percent the previous financial year. In the last year, national spending on plant and equipment fell by less than half of 1 per cent, but it was 20 times worse in Queensland. In the current year, even the Government's own Budget papers predict that private investment, including dwellings and business investment, will contribute nil to the overall growth—a growth of 3.8 per cent—being brought about entirely by increased Government spending and private consumption as a direct result of our population increase.

If one considers the employment area, the quicksand foundations on which the "growth" of Queensland is based are stark reality. In the year to May 1993, the finance, property and business services sector actually lost 13 400 jobs—something that would never occur if the economy was "booming", as the Premier claims. Big losses were also recorded in agriculture and mining. That is why last week Queensland recorded its worst ever unemployment figures, and the position is going to get worse with the adverse impact on tourism of the Federal Budget and the slow-down in housing construction which even this Budget concedes will occur.

The question to be asked is: what is the Minister for Economic and Trade Development doing about the very sorry state of the Queensland private sector? The basic answer is simple: nowhere near enough. The Budget papers reveal spending this year of \$7.4m on the Cabinet Office—the most bloated bureaucratic structure in this State. The Premier once said that the Cabinet Office was created to cut red tape and give business a boost. The very opposite has occurred, as many Ministers privately concede. The Cabinet Office is the Premier's FBI. It keeps Ministers and officials in check, and it reports on anyone diverting from the Government line. The House will recall that the Cabinet Office prepared the infamous rail line closure hit list. That demonstrates just how out of touch with the real Queensland that office is. It is little wonder that the Deputy Premier cannot hide his contempt for the Cabinet Office.

I will tell the Premier why the private sector is not growing. The private sector is fed up with the red tape and the regulation and controls which this Government not only has failed to remove but also has actually made even more cumbersome. Budget Paper No. 3 states on page 46—

"The Office has continued to meet the Government's legislative program"—

and that refers to the Legislation Services Program run by the Office of the

Parliamentary Counsel. Budget Paper No. 3 continues—

“In 1992, 5532 pages of legislation were produced. This was above the previous year’s levels for both Acts and subordinate legislation and is the highest in total for any State in Australia. In the period 1 January 1993 to 30 June 1993, 2523 pages of legislation were produced.”

More red tape than ever; that is what we are getting from this Government.

In just six months since the election of the Richard Court-led Liberal/National Government in Western Australia, that State’s economy has started to boom, and it is a private sector-led boom. Even in Victoria, the economic outlook has begun to improve under the Jeff Kennett Government. When the South Australian Labor Government is tossed out in a few months’ time, that State will start to improve, as well. In each case, the growth is private sector-led and is accompanied by smaller, not bigger, government. That is why this great State is starting to lose the strong advantage that it has held. The Premier has given up on providing real incentives for the private sector, as he once promised, and has fallen back on the tried and failed Labor strategy of more government and more public spending. No amount of creative accounting and budgeting can hide the fact that real private sector growth in Queensland has slowed down alarmingly.

The Premier, as leader of the Government and Minister for Economic and Trade Development, must wake up to reality, forget the media photo opportunities and get on with strong, substantial government in which the private sector will have confidence. A good way to start would be to axe the costly bureaucratic Cabinet Office and the swag of committees, task forces, studies and academic experts dragging this great State down.

The Estimates of the Department of the Premier, Economic and Trade Development give no-one confidence that this Government has learnt the lessons of Victoria, South Australia and Western Australia under Labor. Big, big spending government is not the way to achieve real economic growth. I fear that the chickens are coming home to roost much faster than anyone believed possible. That is why our State’s unemployment is the worst ever, and that is why the real measures of private sector growth have us trailing, not leading, the rest of Australia.

**Mr ROBERTSON** (Sunnybank) (3.38 p.m.): It is a pleasure to be given the opportunity to contribute to the Estimates debate on the Department of the Premier and Economic and Trade Development. I want to use the time that is available to me to concentrate on those issues pertaining specifically to economic and trade development, and in particular to concentrate on that part of the budget as it relates to the China secretariat and the Queensland Government offices in Taiwan and Hong Kong. It is these services that are particularly relevant to my electorate of Sunnybank.

Both Hong Kong and Taiwan are major sources of business migrants and investors to Queensland. Many of them have settled in my electorate of Sunnybank. The 1992-93 report of the Department of the Premier and Economic and Trade Development estimates that 60 per cent of all business migrants who move to Queensland are of Taiwanese origin. Of course, a large percentage of those new Australians have made their homes on south side of Brisbane and in Sunnybank and surrounding suburbs. The 1993-94 Budget provides for expenditure of some \$13.06m for trade and investment development—an increase of over \$2m on the previous year. The goal of this program is to increase the export of Queensland goods and services and attract more foreign investment into targeted sectors of the Queensland economy.

The success of this program can be seen in how the Queensland Government offices in both Taiwan and Hong Kong have performed over the past year. Indeed, in terms of the speech made by the member for Beaudesert earlier today—alleging as he did a lack of performance—I think it is important to actually consider the facts rather than just mouth platitudes about trade and investment.

The annual report of the Department of the Premier, Economic and Trade Developments reveals that the offices in both Taiwan and Hong Kong continue to perform essential roles in promoting investment and business opportunities in Queensland. Importantly, it demonstrates that things are happening in Queensland.

For example, I will highlight the performance of the Queensland Trade and Investment Office at Taipei in Taiwan. The annual report reveals that, in 1991-92, that office facilitated Queensland exports to Taiwan worth approximately \$4m, with prospects for a further \$16m. In 1992-93, that estimate of further investment was well short of the mark, with export facilitation increasing

twelve-fold to \$49m, including a \$13.5m contract to a Queensland consultancy firm. The prospects for this current financial year are estimated at \$45.3m. The Taipei office also handled over 420 export and 100 investment-related inquiries in the past year. As well, it assisted in attracting new investment to Queensland from Taiwan of \$3m, with projects worth approximately \$250m under consideration.

Importantly, during 1992-93, the Minister for Employment, Vocational Education, Training and Industrial Relations, the Minister for Transport and Minister Assisting the Premier on Economic Trade and Development and the Minister for Minerals and Energy all visited Taiwan. I believe that these visits are essential in order to further develop economic relations between Queensland and other countries. It was during the visit by the Minister for Transport to Taiwan in May this year that the Taiwan office in Taipei was officially opened.

Annual reports over the past couple of years have highlighted the performance of the Hong Kong office. For example, in 1991-92, the Hong Kong office facilitated \$2m worth of exports and prospects for a further \$14m. In 1992-93, this office facilitated \$8m in exports, and negotiations for a further \$31.9m are in the pipeline. That office also facilitated a further \$2.5m worth of new investment in Queensland.

These figures demonstrate how important and how successful those two trading markets are to Australia. During the period 1990-91 to 1992-93, we have seen a virtual explosion of trade with those two trading partners. Through the efforts of those two offices, we can now boast that exports to Taiwan increased between 1990-91 and 1992-93 by 42 per cent and that exports to Hong Kong over the same period increased by 53 per cent. Opposition members who stand up in this place and make accusations about the Premier's Department not performing on trade clearly have not done their homework and looked at the record performance in growth in trade with those two major trading partners over the three years that the Goss Labor Government has been in power.

To give honourable members an indication of the relations that now exist between the likes of Taiwan and Queensland—recently at Parliament House I attended a lunch of the Taiwan Australian Business Association. It is important to place on record what that association had to say about Queensland-Taiwanese economic

relations. I refer to the Taiwan Australian Business Association fact sheet which was distributed at that function and which highlights the fact that Taiwan is now Queensland's fourth-largest export market, with almost \$450m worth of local products sold between 1991 and 1992. Of specific interest with respect to that figure is that Taiwan displaced the United Kingdom from that fourth position. Taiwan is now Australia's fifth-largest trading partner. Queensland exports to Taiwan totalled \$439m in 1991-92, representing 17 per cent of total Australian exports to that market.

Taiwan is the world's sixth-largest investor, and the second largest in the Asia/Pacific region. During 1992-93, exports from Queensland to Hong Kong increased by 50 per cent. Taiwan, Hong Kong and Macau provided more than 60 per cent of Australia's business migrants, with 86 per cent of all applicants being Asian in origin. Those people arrived in Australia with an average of \$850,000. As a result, business migrants injected more than \$1.5 billion into the Australian economy in 1989-90.

It is important to note that the launch of the Taiwan Australian Business Association represents a vote of confidence in Queensland and in this Government. This organisation states as its objective—and I quote from the speech given by the chairman, Mr Jim Sheu—

“We believe that only by pulling the best human and capital resources together between the Australian and Taiwanese business communities are we able to reinvent a new Australian business culture; one that adapts to the outward looking 1990's and takes full advantage of the economic miracles which are taking place in the Asia Pacific region.”

The fact that the Taiwan Australian Business Association has been established in Queensland is a recognition of the success of the China secretariat. I ask the Premier to pass on my appreciation and congratulations to Loftus Harris and his staff for a job well done over the last 12 months.

Business organisations such as the Taiwan Australian Business Association complement cultural and welfare organisations such as the Taiwan Friendship Association, whose offices are located in Sunnybank. With the indulgence of the Chairman, can I take this opportunity to congratulate Mrs Michelle Huang on her recent election as chairman of the Taiwan Friendship Association and

express my appreciation for the fine work and dedication of retiring chairman, Mr Tony Chang. Mr Chairman, you would appreciate what work volunteers such as Mrs Huang and Mr Chang carry out in terms of leading a cultural and social organisation such as the Taiwan Friendship Association. Both of those people have come to Australia as businesspeople. Mr Chang is the owner and manager of the Formosa Computer Company. I know that Mrs Huang still has business investments back in Taiwan. But the fact that they are prepared to spend a lot of their own free time for the betterment of Taiwanese migrants who have settled in Australia is something that is admirable and deserves recognition.

One of the reasons why Taiwan has become such an important trading partner for Queensland is that so many Taiwanese people now call Queensland home. Investment from Taiwan into Queensland has mostly been undertaken through the growing Taiwanese community in Brisbane. Since it was opened, the Queensland Government's Taiwan office has been involved in approximately \$US10m worth of projects ranging from orchid farms to seafood processing. With the establishment of direct air links from Brisbane to Taiwan in 1992, the impact on tourism, trade and industry has been significant. There are now three direct flights per week between Brisbane and Taiwan.

I would like to place on record my appreciation for the assistance provided by the China secretariat over the past year. As I have said, there is a large population of Taiwanese Australians in my electorate. Often they will come to my electorate office prior to friends, relatives or business associates visiting Australia. They ask me to provide them with some type of assistance in terms of information about Queensland—business opportunities, markets, industries and so on.

I have found that, by contacting the China Secretariat, they have been more than prepared to send me information in Mandarin—very well packaged, I might add—on the record of performance in the Queensland economy, what is happening economically and politically, and what opportunities exist. I acknowledge the use of the directory that is distributed by the Minister for Small Business, highlighting the range of investment opportunities that exist. Documents such as that are very useful to pass on to those who, in an informal way, sell Queensland and the business opportunities that exist here. I believe that a bouquet

should be given to the China Secretariat for the work that it has been doing in that regard.

The increase in the Budget allocation for trade and investment development should be supported by members on both sides of this Chamber. It is clear from the statistics that I have outlined today that the goals of the department are clearly being met and are delivering benefits to all Queenslanders via the development of export markets.

**Mr STEPHAN** (Gympie) (3.52 p.m.): The member for Lockyer alluded to change. I guess that he was talking about the difference between making a speech and debating a topic. Discussions have been held about the possibility of debating Estimates rather than making speeches about them. I believe that would be a step in the right direction. If members can obtain additional information through Ministers being able to answer their questions during the debate, rather than simply replying at the end of the debate, that would be to the advantage of all members and to the State as a whole.

The member for Nudgee spoke about the increase in the value of primary industries exports. When the going gets tough in the rural sector, producers have the ability to persevere and soldier on. One can imagine what they could do if they received some encouragement.

**Mr Vaughan:** Some of the rural areas are not as badly affected as others. Some are doing very well.

**Mr STEPHAN:** I realise that. But there are not too many of them who are doing very well. The major industries on which we have been relying have big stockpiles of produce and a depressed market. They need encouragement to continue producing.

Queensland is suffering from a lack of service delivery. This is apparent in many departments and areas. From speaking to nurses, teachers, people in primary industries and primary producers, one learns that the level of service delivery had decreased. This is a pity, particularly when one considers what could be achieved in those sectors. Simply by altering the method of service delivery, we could have a great future ahead of us. We must strive towards that goal.

Queensland is also suffering from a lack of major projects. Some members have mentioned a few of the projects that Queensland has missed out on. The loss of those major projects will undoubtedly make a big difference to our economy and will affect

the confidence of people who want to invest in Queensland.

In the past couple of years, private sector employment opportunities have decreased by 7 per cent, whereas employment opportunities in the public sector have increased by 12 per cent. I draw the attention of members to comments made by the Treasurer, Keith De Lacy, in 1990. He said—

“Stimulation of the economy from the public sector does not work and is not the way this Government will run the State.”

But that is not what this Treasurer has put in place. He said also—

“In the long term they will lead the State into trouble.”

We are heading in that direction. But I hope that we will turn the corner.

Mr Casey spoke about security of tenure for our native forests. He said, “Now we have a policy.” I certainly hope that we do have a policy, and I hope that Mr Casey knows where he is going with that policy. After making that comment, he proceeded to talk about the harvesting of pine timber from plantations in Maryborough. That has nothing to do with the security of our native forests, which is a matter of concern throughout Queensland. It did not give me any indication that there has been a change in policy, or even that Mr Casey has a policy to put in place.

**Mr Livingstone:** He most probably inherited the policies that you had in Government.

**Mr STEPHAN:** This Government has closed about 200 000 hectares of forests in the past couple of years. The value of the timber in those forests and the value of the harvesting programs has been lost to this State. This Government believes that, if it closes a forest, that forest will become more vigorous. But the result is exactly the opposite. Harvesting creates young tree growth. That is where the vigour and productivity of a healthy forest begin. The Government is underlining my fears that it does not have a policy on the security of tenure of native forests.

I turn now to Mabo. I have no problem with the decision made in relation to that particular family in the Torres Strait. It had access to that land and that part of the island for 100, 200 or 300 years. I have no problem with that. But I do have a problem with what has gone on since then as a result of some of the claims that have been lodged. I am not sure whether this Government is doing very much to rein that in, or whether it is leaving the matter to drift along.

**Mr Livingstone:** What should we do?

**Mr STEPHAN:** The Government should have a distinct policy on this issue so that it can advise the people of Queensland and others about it.

A recent newspaper article stated—

“A Mabo style claim on Fraser Island and The Great Sandy Straits almost resulted in the loss of a million dollar business from Rainbow Beach

. . .

The claim has put a freeze on the release of land in the area and could spell big problems for development in general on the Cooloola Coast.

Sandy Strait Yacht Charters has been negotiating with the State Government . . . for a sea bed lease enabling the company to establish a permanent base on Inskip Peninsula and expand operations.

Owner . . . was told by the Lands Department . . . that a freeze had been put on all leases in the area because of the claim, and it could be another 10 years before the issue was settled . . . ”

**Mr Pitt:** That's the problem. What's the solution?

**Mr STEPHAN:** The solution is to make it clear that that sort of claim is not available to the Aborigines or Torres Strait Islanders unless they have had continuing access to that land, which is what the Mabo family had. It has had continuing access to land in that area. Unless they have had continuous access to the land, they are not eligible to make claims for any of it. The areas that Aborigines have had continuous access to would, by now, be fairly clearly identified. However, when the Government receives claims for areas such as the Great Sandy Straits and Carnarvon, to which we know quite well Aboriginal people have not had continuous access and ownership, it should be reasonably clear what land the Government should and should not be negotiating on.

**A Government member** interjected.

**Mr STEPHAN:** The member is just trying to delay me. I turn now to the Building Services Authority, which has proved to be a white elephant. I would like to let it be known that I am concerned, and a number of subbies in my electorate are concerned, about their ability and desire to make applications to that authority for a licence. I would like to know the percentage of the subbies in this State who are now registered or licensed with the

authority. I know that the Government is trying to put pressure on the subbies to take the step and become licensed—and some are licensed and some are not—but it is certainly not something upon which the Government could hang its hat or of which it could be very proud.

I turn now to the Committee of Subordinate Legislation, which was referred to by the member for Caboolture. I believe that the Subordinate Legislation Committee is one of the unsung heroes of the committee system in this Parliament, and has been since its inception 20 years ago. The number of times that Ministers have been shielded from legal actions, shall we say, because of the lateness in tabling regulations, or the tabling of regulations after they have come into effect, is quite substantial. I say that in an apolitical way; I am not trying to make any political capital out of it. But if I had wanted to make political capital out of it, I could have done so quite a number of times in the last few years. I assure Government members that there have been opportunities to do that. But that is not the role of the Subordinate Legislation Committee.

**Mr Beattie:** You don't believe that.

**Mr STEPHAN:** I do believe that. The Subordinate Legislation Committee has been reasonably successful. I suggest that its role could be expanded to scrutinising legislation as it comes before this House and giving an indication not only to members but also to the general public as to what it contains, rather than relying on what the Ministers like to tell us it contains.

I would like to conclude with this final point. Mr Hamill referred to the leasing back of some of the railway lines. If ever there was a disastrous situation that caused a lot of fear, it is the way that this Government has handled the issue of the closure of railway lines throughout the State. Mr Burns, the task force chairman, said, "I do not want you to take any notice of whether or not it is viable. If we were looking at the viability of the railways lines, we would be closing every railway line in Queensland." He pointed out that it was not the viability of the railway lines that the Government was looking at. If the Government is not looking at that, why was this action—which has caused so much fear—taken in the first place? Mr Hamill has also made the comment that if the Government does not close all the railway lines, it will mean less money for road funding. My point is that if the Government is going to close railway lines, more money will need to

be spent on roads so that they are safe for the travelling public—

**Mr Beattie** interjected.

**Mr STEPHAN:** Because school children are being driven on the roads, it is important from the safety point of view that the roads are able to carry the tonnage that is required—

**Mr Vaughan** interjected.

**Mr STEPHAN:** I am sorry, but I cannot hear the interjection. The problem is that there has been a reduction in the funds in the Federal Budget for roadworks, so Mr Hamill is now talking about a reduction in the amount of money that will be available for roadworks in Queensland. That is not the right way to go. The Government's attitude in this regard certainly causes me concern. I certainly think that Queensland deserves better.

**Hon. W. K. GOSS** (Logan—Premier and Minister for Economic and Trade Development) (4.06 p.m.), in reply: I take this opportunity to thank members from both sides for their contributions to the debate on my portfolio's budget. As I said at the outset, unlike the previous practice, it has always been this Government's policy that all Ministers go through the Budget debate and provide the House with a comprehensive outline of the composition and purpose of the budget of their departments. Of course, the debate is an essential component of the Government's requirement to be accountable to the public and to the Parliament. It provides both sides of the House with an opportunity to discuss and question the financial plans and strategic direction of each department of the Government. I therefore welcome this opportunity to present an outline for the 1993-94 budget for my department, for the Parliamentary Commissioner for Administrative Investigations and the Auditor-General, and to respond to some of the issues raised.

I note that the last speaker, the member for Gympie, raised a number of issues. The main ones that I noted were the closure of forests, the Subordinate Legislation Committee and railway lines. Indeed, he was the only member who raised those aspects of the Department of Premier, Economic and Trade Development. If I can move back to the beginning of the speeches, the first was that of the Leader of the Opposition. He was critical of economic growth in Queensland, critical of the Mabo legislative process, critical of the Office of the Cabinet, critical of the Public Sector Management Commission, critical of me, critical of the Government's handling of the EARC report and critical of the

\$10m upgrade of the Executive Building, which was not only the subject of his speech last year but also commissioned by the previous Government prior to Labor's coming to office. So it was a fairly articulate cut-and-paste collection of his speeches over the last 12 months—sort of the best of Mr Borbidge for the last 12 months. Generally, the speech built itself towards a tirade level of fairly self-righteous indignation, the passion of which was only exceeded by the number of errors and misrepresentations in terms of analysis of the budget of my department. I cannot, in the limited time allotted, cover all of the errors, but for the benefit of members, I will try to deal with some of the major ones.

I will preface my remarks by making some valid points in relation to the economic growth of this State, which, according to just about every independent commentator, is surpassing that of most, if not all, other States in Australia. Examples of this are that in the last two years there have been 58 000 jobs created in Queensland, compared with a decline of 35 000 Australiawide. One notes that the Leader of the Opposition always takes the negative aspect and talks about unemployment, never about employment. Net State debt is declining under this Government from \$1.9 billion to nearly \$1 billion, with the beneficial effects that that has on finance in the private sector and the net debt interest liability of the State. The Budget provides for another record Capital Works Program, with the equivalent of over 43 000 jobs resulting directly from that; the continuing elements of the \$150m Jobs Plan; and the fact that Australians are voting with their feet in terms of moving to Queensland.

We have also, as a Government, assisted in the facilitation of and the provision of support infrastructure for a wide range of projects. Some of the larger ones include work with the private sector in respect of the Century mine, the South Blackwater coal mine expansion, the Kuranda Skyrail, the Green Island Resort off Cairns, the Curtis Island tourist resort near Gladstone, the Shute Harbour terminal, the Laguna Quays Resort, Rainbow Harbour near Cairns, and the Kirrama Resort.

It is claimed that the 1992-93 Budget blew out by two and a half times to \$29.8m. The increase in that particular office's budget reflects three major projects and initiatives that were funded in that year, namely, the Safe Bikeways Program, the costs associated with the sale of the Gladstone Power Station, and the payment of \$2m in settlement of a dispute between SEQEB and the former Expo

Authority—a dispute outstanding from the previous Government, which we inherited.

The Leader of the Opposition questioned why there was a 66 per cent increase in Budget this year from last year. If the Leader of the Opposition had taken the time to properly read and review the Budget papers, which he has now had for some weeks, or even if he had just listened to my speech this morning, he would have noted that the increase in the budget for the Office of the Co-ordinator General reflects major projects and initiatives that have been funded for this financial year, including the ongoing costs associated with the Gladstone Power Station sale, the Magnesium Metals pilot project, the Carpentaria/Mount Isa Mineral Province study, and a new project funding of \$500,000 associated with the formal establishment of the Office of Co-ordinator General. All of those were covered by me in my comments this morning.

There was a question as to why there has been an 86 per cent increase in funding and an increase in salaries of 72 per cent over the life of this Government. There was also a question as to why there are 501 staff members, allegedly an extra 113 since December 1989. The Leader of the Opposition should know and, I suspect, does know that the current Premiers Department is significantly different from the department that existed in 1989.

**Mr Borbidge:** It's bigger.

**Mr W. K. GOSS:** It certainly is, but the facts are knowingly ignored. This is what is so disappointing. The Leader of the Opposition knows that what he says is false, but he still says it. For example, he knows that there is a new trade, investment and development function which involves an expanded role rather than the various divided and separate trade-related functions of the previous Government. They have been brought together in my department, which, inevitably, has resulted in an increase. The Leader of the Opposition also complained about the level of resources for the office of the coalition. Since I was in Opposition, financial support for the office has increased from \$600,000 to \$1.221m, and staffing has increased from 9 to 16. Even with double the staff, the Opposition still puts in a consistently incompetent performance.

The Leader of the Opposition complained about the standard of office facilities. The reason why the Liberals, for example, have poor office facilities is that they are not prepared to move in with the Nationals. They

are not prepared to move into a floor of accommodation that has been provided to them. After the last State election, I offered them new premises, and they did not take up the offer because the opposition parties cannot even share an office together.

I turn now to the contribution made by the member for Mansfield. I thank her for her continuing interest in women's policy, in particular, and for her continued interest in certain aspects of the work that is being done by the Women's Policy Unit and Women's Infolink, such as the important services related to information and referral and the problems associated with violence as it affects women. The member also pointed out the need to be vigilant and continue with reforms in terms of the Government's programs as they relate to women. She also commented on the need for Governments throughout the country to address the rights of women to bring about some economic equality and economic justice.

I turn now to the comments made by the Deputy Leader of the Coalition—a person who calls herself the shadow Treasurer and who used only two-thirds of the allotted 15 minutes. Basically, her speech was a repetition of the remarks made earlier by the Leader of the Opposition.

The member for Waterford spoke about the work of the Office of the Co-ordinator General. The member is someone who has considerable experience in economic development in this State from the point of view of the Labor movement. He spoke about the need for work to progress in relation to the Gateway ports area and the importance, generally—both there and in other key areas of the State—of developed industrial land. He made specific reference to the Gladstone industrial development, which is an area he knows well. He referred also to a range of projects. In terms of a very fairly brave—or, rather, foolish—interjection about strikes, he would probably be the last person in this Parliament who, in terms of the record of unions in this country in recent times in relation to strikes, a member of the Opposition would want to take on.

The most remarkable feature of the contribution made by the member for Beaudesert was his criticism of any academic input into Government. Throughout his time in this place, the member for Beaudesert has certainly practised what he preaches by avoiding any academic or intellectual input into his contributions or work as a member of Parliament. I refer to one aspect of his

comments. He was concerned about the Office of Cabinet, the Public Sector Management Commission and other programs that have excessive salaries. He said that they were salaries of over \$100,000 per person and sometimes up to \$500,000 per person. As best I can make out, it would appear that the member for Beaudesert has merely divided the total net outlays per program as outlined in Budget Paper No. 3 by the full-time equivalent employees on staff at the end of the last financial year. The member should note that this is not a valid base for determining the average salary cost of each program, as "Program Outlays" include capital and other costs which are not labour-related. I suggest that the honourable member embark upon a course in basic accounting. I am thankful that he is not still responsible for teaching children in this State.

The member for Beaudesert expressed concern about a number of other matters. He referred to the problem of what he described as competition between the various constituent elements of the department. I assure him and other members that this is not so. The approach is very much one of cooperation which is coordinated by the director-general of the overall department. In terms of his criticism of the Office of Cabinet, which was also forthcoming from some other members, I point out that it is based on a model that has been successful elsewhere, and the particular model that we decided to follow was the one instituted by Mr Greiner in New South Wales in a Liberal/National Party Government.

Elsewhere in the speech by the member for Beaudesert there was a litany of false figures, consistent with his general approach to numeracy. If I heard him correctly—and I will check *Hansard* later—he referred to the need for the Government to "control the CJC". If I heard him correctly, it reflects an interesting approach on the part of the National Party to the Criminal Justice Commission. He also used a cutting from one of last year's speeches in relation to the Executive Building upgrade. The comments I made to the Leader of the Opposition in relation to that apply here also.

The member for Cleveland emphasised the accountability of the Estimates processes under this Government compared to that of previous Governments. As a member of the previous Labor Opposition, I was faced every year with invariably not having the Estimates of my shadow portfolio debated because the previous Government had a practice of picking four or five uncontroversial areas and allowing

members to debate those to death, while all the weak Ministers—of whom there were many—were sheltered and protected from any scrutiny whatsoever of their Estimates for years and years. The member for Cleveland also commented on the role of EARC over recent years. The record of the Government in terms of responding to the EARC agenda is, as the member so correctly described it, “100 per cent attitude” in terms of this Government’s commitment.

In turning to the comments made by the member for Clayfield, I can say that he made his usual contribution.

**An honourable member** interjected.

**Mr W. K. GOSS:** The member for Clayfield is otherwise known as the Bronwyn Bishop of the Queensland Liberal Party because he is a person who could get only one vote in his own caucus.

**Mr Santoro:** She is a top operator, and you know that.

**Mr W. K. GOSS:** She is certainly more successful than the member for Clayfield.

**Mr Santoro:** She got 500 people at the luncheon yesterday.

**Mr W. K. GOSS:** I am told that at least half of those people came to see Mr Sciacca and Mr Beattie.

**Honourable members** interjected.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order!

**Mr W. K. GOSS:** The members opposite seem determined to avoid my response to the member for Caboolture, and so does the member for Caboolture! The member for Caboolture effectively rebutted the superficial effort of the member who preceded him. He also dealt with the reforms of EARC and the processes whereby the inquiries in respect of complaints against the police have changed under this Government. He correctly described Queensland as being at the leading edge in terms of those reforms and correctly referred to the growing interest elsewhere in the country in what we are doing in this State.

The member for Lockyer spoke on a range of matters, particularly EARC—a subject in respect of which he has considerable knowledge and experience. Most members who have any knowledge of the work of the member for Lockyer would acknowledge the positive role that he has played in the parliamentary committee relating to that commission.

The next speaker, the member for Nudgee, spoke about the attraction of trade and investment back into Queensland, the

Queensland Export Development Scheme and the very good cooperation that now occurs between the public and private sector, underlining the point that, although it is important for Government to provide incentives and some pressure, to open doors and to conduct the programs that it does, those programs do not succeed in terms of the overall goals of the Government or the community for export promotion and investment attraction unless the private sector seizes the opportunity and plays its role.

The member for Indooroopilly spoke about the rights of Queensland and the republic. That was all very interesting. He also spoke about the Federal Ministry and seemed to make a point out of that. He spoke at some length about economic growth, relying heavily on a headline to an article on Queensland’s economy in a recent *Australian Financial Review*. I agree that it was a negative headline. However, if the honourable member had taken the trouble to read the article instead of looking only at the headline and the pictures, he would have seen that a number of elements in that article reflect the generally positive view of the economy held by most independent commentators.

Lastly, I turn to the speech by the member for Sunnybank. He spoke of migration to this State and to this country. He spoke in particular about the migration in more recent years of people from Asia and Taiwan to the south side of Brisbane. The member is well known for his interest in and work with the Taiwanese community generally and for his work in respect of the business and investment activities of that community. He is also well known for his understanding of the importance of trade promotion and investment in Taiwan and of the potential that Hong Kong has to provide substantial mutual benefit in terms of the growing commercial and trade relationship. He appropriately complimented the work of the Trade and Investment Development Division under the leadership of Mr Harris.

Over recent years, I have been very pleased with the generally positive response that I have had from members on both sides of the House to the assistance that they have received from the Trade and Investment Development Division. I have been pleased also about the generally favourable reports that I have received from the private sector in relation to the huge volume of work undertaken on its behalf by the Trade and Investment Development Division.

I thank all members for their contributions, for the questions, for the criticism and, generally, for assisting the Government in kicking off the Estimates debate with the debate on the Estimates for my portfolio. It has been instructive for all members who participated in the debate and for those who have had the opportunity to listen.

Progress reported.

#### **SPECIAL ADJOURNMENT**

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

“That the House, at its rising, do adjourn until Tuesday, 5 October 1993.”

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 4.26 p.m.