

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

TUESDAY, 26 AUGUST 1980

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

TUESDAY, 26 AUGUST 1980

Mr SPEAKER (Hon. S. J. Muller, Fassifern) read prayers and took the chair at 11 a.m.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 1)

Assent reported by Mr Speaker.

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT

TREASURER'S ANNUAL STATEMENT

Mr SPEAKER announced the receipt from the Auditor-General of his report on the Treasurer's Annual Statement for the year 1979-80.

Ordered to be printed.

REMOVAL OF NOTICE OF MOTION
FROM BUSINESS PAPER

Mr SPEAKER: Honourable members, on Thursday last the Notice of Motion standing on the Business Paper in the name of Mr Wright (General Business Notice of Motion No. 11) was moved by the Leader of the Opposition as an amendment to a motion moved without notice by the Leader of Opposition Business in the House dealing with Sessional Orders. This proposed amendment was defeated by 46 votes to 20.

Standing Order No. 76 states—

“A Question or Amendment shall not be proposed which is the same in substance as any Question which, during the same Session, has been resolved in the Affirmative or Negative.”

The 19th Edition of Erskine May states on page 368—

“A motion or an amendment may not be brought forward which is the same, in substance, as a question which has been decided in the affirmative or negative during the current session.”

In view of the fact that the Notice of Motion standing in the name of Mr Wright has already been decided in the negative, I have instructed the Clerk to expunge General Business Notice of Motion No. 11 from the Business Paper.

PAPERS

The following paper was laid on the table, and ordered to be printed:—

Report of the Commissioner of Land Tax on the operations of the Act during the year 1979-80.

The following papers were laid on the table:—

Orders in Council under—

State Development and Public Works Organization Act 1971-1979.

Forestry Act 1959-1979.

River Improvement Trust Act 1940-1977.

Irrigation Act 1922-1979.

Water Act 1926-1979.

Farm Water Supplies Assistance Act 1958-1979.

Supreme Court Act 1921-1979.

Harbours Act 1955-1980.

Land Act 1962-1978.

Fauna Conservation Act 1974-1979.

Regulations under—

Motor Vehicle Driving Instruction School Act 1969.

Motor Vehicle Control Act 1975.

Tow-truck Act 1973.

Traffic Act 1949-1977.

State Transport Act 1960-1972.

Building Societies Act 1886-1976.

Valuers Registration Act 1965-1979.

Valuation of Land Act 1944-1980.

DEATH OF MR P. J. R. TUCKER

MOTION OF CONDOLENCE

Hon. J. BJELKE-PETERSEN (Barambah—Premier) (11.7 a.m.), by leave, without notice: I move—

“1. That this House desires to place on record its appreciation of the services rendered to this State by the late Percy

John Robert Tucker, Esquire, a former member and Leader of the Opposition of the Parliament of Queensland.

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

Honourable members would have been saddened to hear of the recent passing of Mr. Percy Tucker, Mayor of Townsville, who spent many years of his life serving the community.

Born in Rockhampton in 1919, he passed his Scholarship examination by correspondence and went on to complete his secondary education at the Rockhampton High School. A draftsman by trade, he had a distinguished military record of 11 years' service with the 42nd Australian Infantry Battalion, including four years' war service in New Guinea and Bougainville. He attained the rank of captain.

In 1955 he moved to Townsville and, after showing a strong interest in politics, he was elected in 1960 to State Parliament as the representative of Townsville North. His performance as a member of the Legislative Assembly was recognised in 1966 when he was elected Deputy Leader of the parliamentary Labor Party. He held this position until becoming Leader of the parliamentary Labor Party in 1974. He left the parliamentary ranks in December 1974 and was soon immersed in the local politics of the North. His involvement bore fruit when he was elected mayor of Townsville and leader of Townsville's first ALP city council for more than 30 years.

In his capacity as mayor he made a major contribution to the progress of our State's second city in a number of ways, including the development of the now well-known Townsville Mall. Mr Tucker will be remembered as a man of conviction, who fought for his beliefs. Percy Tucker involved himself in many other areas of the community. He was patron of innumerable sporting clubs, and was particularly interested in light-gear fishing and orchid-growing.

Mr Tucker will best be remembered as one who believed in Queensland's future. Much of his life was spent in the promotion of this ideal.

Mr Tucker is survived by his wife, two sons and a daughter. I am sure all members regret the passing of Percy Tucker, a man who greatly contributed to the development of this State.

On behalf of the Government, and I am sure, all honourable members of this House, I wish to extend our condolences to the family of the late Percy Tucker.

Hon. L. R. EDWARDS (Ipswich—Deputy Premier and Treasurer) (11.10 a.m.): I join with the Premier in expressing, on behalf

of the Liberal Party, our deep regret at the passing of a former member of this House and a man who served the people of this State with great distinction.

As the Premier said, Perc Tucker was a man with a great fighting spirit, and this quality earned him the respect and admiration of people throughout his life. His name was synonymous with the City of Townsville, the city he loved and represented so vigorously and well.

He was a real "man of the people", and the grief and sense of loss which the people of Townsville have felt is an indication of the genuine affection in which Perc Tucker was held.

In an eloquent editorial last Friday, "The Townsville Daily Bulletin" described Perc Tucker as "gracious and obliging to an uncommon degree". It went on to say that his place as one of the city's most successful and beloved mayors was secure. No event was too small to be favoured by his mayoral attendance and no problem was too trifling for his attention and action.

Perc Tucker will be remembered by me as a forceful, friendly, unassuming open man with a tremendous capacity for hard work. Many monuments to Perc Tucker will remain, but as "The Townsville Daily Bulletin" put it: "There will be no greater monument to him than the enduring memories that reside in countless Townsville hearts."

He served his country, his State and his city with devotion and success.

He was a great family man and our thoughts go out to his wife and family in their time of grief. I second the Premier's motion.

Mr CASEY (Mackay—Leader of the Opposition) (11.12 a.m.): So far as condolence motions in this place are concerned, today is unusual because to most of us here Perc Tucker was a very, very real figure, someone we knew well, someone with whom we sat in this Parliament or someone with whom we became associated in one way or another since he became Mayor of Townsville. There is no question that the years of service that he gave to the people of the North and the people of Townsville stamped Percy Tucker as one of the great northerners of the post-war era in Queensland.

Through his own hard work, through his own ability, through his determination and his willingness to serve people, Perc Tucker rose to the top in both State and local government politics in Queensland. I first met Percy Tucker long before either of us came anywhere near this place, and long before either of us become closely associated with politics. I met Percy through the Army Reserve, in which he served for many years after returning from the war. When I returned from my national service training, on the first occasion I went to the Army Reserve unit I met and served under him. Even at that stage his leadership qualities were very obvious to each and every one of us.

Later it was my pleasure to serve with him as a fellow officer in that 42nd Battalion. There I found a tremendous spirit of mateship, comradeship and loyalty that personified the character of Percy Tucker. We shared quite a number of memorable moments together.

Despite his having been born in Rockhampton, another city, and despite the love that he had for so many other things, when he moved to Townsville in 1955 Percy completely devoted himself to the people of Townsville. Those of us who served with him here in this Chamber during the 14 years that he was a member would well remember from his speeches and his questions his sheer love for his people of Townsville. That came through on every occasion on which Percy spoke in this House, particularly concerning matters that related to the North. His desire to see the North fulfil the development dream of so many other northerners was one that Percy Tucker projected at all times.

He served in a very honourable capacity in this House, for eight years as Deputy Leader of the Opposition in very trying and heavy times in politics. That would not be an easy load to carry, as so many other senior members of the Parliament would well know. He then became Leader of the Opposition and, unfortunately, was in that position for only a period of something like six months when the tide of politics, through no fault of his own, completely turned against Percy. Unfortunately he lost his seat in this Chamber. However, even then members will remember well the manly and sportsmanlike way in which Percy bore his defeat. While that must have been a most distressing occurrence to him personally, and a great personal set-back, there was no bitterness or excuse about it. He looked around, knowing full well that he had the capacity to serve his people in Townsville in so many different ways. He chose—and was supported by them—to serve in the highest office in that city.

He continued in his determination to serve them, right till the very day he died. Prophetically, a television crew in North Queensland actually did film work of him that very morning, in the yard of his own home, when he clearly stated that he would go on serving the people of Townsville for as long as they desired him—and as long as he possibly could. Tragically, he was asked by the journalist interviewing him how his health was. He said, "It's very good, but who knows tomorrow?" "Tomorrow" he was dead.

Townsville's great loss in Percy's death was clearly demonstrated in the few days after his death by the spontaneous grief shown by its people. I suppose there would be no more fitting tribute to Percy than the mall in that great northern city. It is one of the best I have seen in my travels. It certainly stands out and will be a lasting tribute to Percy Tucker. The people of Townsville

immediately displayed that in their grief when spontaneously so many of them anonymously laid wreaths on the plaque that had been unveiled by Percy on the occasion when the mall was opened.

There was a lot of sadness in the funeral service for Percy last Saturday. Sadness was displayed by a full cross-section of the North, which I, too, know so well. So many people from every walk of life were there to express their feelings towards Percy Tucker the man; Percy Tucker, the one who had served them so well. None was more grieved than those to whom we are expressing our condolence in today's motion—the members of his own family—but none more bravely stood up to their worst moment of grief than they did. Bunny, his wife, his sons, Percy and Christopher, and his daughter, Cecily, were strengthened in the hour of their greatest grief by the very great feeling the people of Townsville were displaying towards her husband and their father.

One of the most fitting tributes that I have ever seen paid to any man was at the funeral, where the oration was not just delivered in the normal way by the presiding minister or some other dignitary. Five ministers from five different churches—five different officiating clergy, representing a full cross-section of Christianity in Townsville—each chose clearly and succinctly something from Percy Tucker's character, something from Percy Tucker's background, that hit the heart of each and every one of us there. It caused me to realise that, whilst at times we fire at one another across the Chamber—we do get stuck into each other from time to time on a purely political basis—the important thing about public office is to contribute. Those who do contribute are remembered, and they are remembered best not by a bridge, a mall, an oval or some other public utility that may have been named after them and is forgotten in a few years' time, but with love in the hearts and minds of those people with whom and for whom they served. The feelings, the emotion and the grief shown by the people of Townsville last Saturday was the greatest tribute that could be paid to Percy Tucker.

Mr JONES (Cairns) (11.21 a.m.): I join with the Premier, the Deputy Premier and the Leader of the Opposition in paying tribute to Perc Tucker. I was, I think, as close to him as any sitting member of this Assembly, and my friendship with him dated back to the days before I entered this Chamber. At that time, of course, our friendship was confined mainly to casual association. We were co-delegates at various conferences and conventions, and he was also a good mate of the former member for Cairns, Wattie Wallace.

When I became a member of the Legislative Assembly, Perc more or less took me under his wing and showed me the ropes and I became, in effect, a protege of his. I venture to suggest that he considered me a

mate of his, and I certainly held him in very high regard as a mentor, guide and friend.

He was originally a draftsman and attained a high position in the Titles Office before entering Parliament, and he was truly dedicated to public service. His contributions in that respect are well known and have been well stated by members who have preceded me in the debate. He was always prepared to stand up with courage and support the convictions that he held.

His great capacity for work was brought home to me in the days before we had such luxurious accommodation and before the number of air travel passes was increased. Probably we were the first members of Parliament to travel home to North Queensland at week-ends. Prior to that, members of Parliament could use only trains or ships to attend sittings of Parliament, so, because of great distances, they came to Brisbane for the session and returned home in the recesses. In my early days in this Chamber, only 12 air travel passes were available to us. Possibly because of our transportation background and Public Service background, we decided to leave Cairns or Townsville on Sunday's train and arrive in Brisbane at 6 a.m. on Tuesday, then fly back to the North on Friday night. The House sat on Fridays in those days, but we managed to have our week-ends with our families. By stretching our air travel passes over 24 weeks, we were just about able to cover the sittings of the House.

We worked on the train coming to Brisbane. Fortunately, we did not receive very many interruptions from other people travelling on the train and, as there were no telephones, we managed to get through a great deal of work. We were also room-mates in the old Lodge, which stood virtually where the front of this new building stands today. The rooms were as good as railway quarters. There were three of us in one room, Percy Tucker, Alex Inch and myself, and, as some of the older members of this Assembly will recall, as we walked across the lawn we were often described as the big "W". Percy Tucker was a big man, well over 6 feet tall, as was Alex Inch. With me walking between them, it was a case of the long and the short of it. That was one of the more humorous comments made about us in those days, as northerners coming across to do battle in the House.

I was also privileged to share office accommodation with Perc Tucker. In those days, there were 16 members in one committee room, trying to work out questions or speeches or holding interviews or telephone conversations. There was not always one telephone to each desk, either. I shared all those aspects of parliamentary life with him.

Later, of course, we travelled in Fokker Friendship and Viscount aircraft, which took four hours to reach North Queensland. At

the close of the day, we used to have a couple of shandies. Perc liked a good book and a good laugh. He liked good company, good music and good people, and he liked a beer, and travelling with him gave me the opportunity of seeing many facets of his character.

He was a straight shooter, and his word was his bond. He believed in the Aussie principle, and the North Queensland principle, that a man was as good as his word, and the affirmation was not always made with a handshake.

He saw service with distinction in the Army and he saw service as a duty. He had an air of correctness about him. His attitude was, as one of my wharfie friends aptly described it, that everything "had to be proper, like." His attitude was sometimes mistaken for aloofness. Some of his critics once dubbed him with the nickname "the duke". He bore that nickname with some pride and had a few laughs about it.

Perc Tucker had a desire for detail. He was neat in his approach to his work and his delivery. He had a certain manner about him and an air of respect.

He practised the art of politics very well. I believe that was an essential ingredient of his success. He had a very keen sense of humour. When the tributes were being paid to him, some by political enemies who had hurled abuse at him over a lengthy period, I thought to myself that he would have relished the situation that developed over the past few days. As a connoisseur of humour, he would have thrown his head back and laughed with gusto.

Perc Tucker was a formidable opponent and one who gave ground grudgingly. In the political sphere, he had a seat that was a cliff-hanger in every election. It was always decided on preferences. His worth was shown whenever someone telephoned him to find out how he was going. He simply laughed and said, "I'll be all right, mate. No problems at all." He could handle debates. He could handle his political enemies. He knew politics backwards.

Perc Tucker was also a great family man. He suffered when he lost his son Rodney, who died when he was a young boy. He broke his arm and died on the operating table under the anaesthetic.

I want to join with previous speakers in expressing sympathy to Bunny, Perc, Junior, Cecily, Chris and young Michael. His condition was the reason for Perc Tucker's particular approach to rubella. I wish to express my condolences to his brothers, sisters and relatives from my family, together with those of all his political friends.

Hon. M. D. HOOPER (Townsville West—Minister for Maritime Services and Tourism) (11.28 a.m.): I welcome this opportunity to support the Premier's motion and to pay a tribute to the late Percy Tucker, the former mayor of Townsville. Although it can be said

that he and I were political opponents, over the past decade we traversed the same path in trying to give the best service we could to the community of Townsville.

Prior to entering Parliament in 1974, I had been mayor of Townsville. I replaced the late Percy Tucker as member for Townsville West. Very soon afterwards, in 1976, Perc Tucker was elected mayor of Townsville in a three-way contest. He won by a narrow majority, but over the ensuing three years he cemented his place in the hearts of the majority of the residents of Townsville. The major highlight in his deeds and actions during that period was an incident that has been referred to in the media. Against his political philosophy, in an official capacity, he publicly welcomed a former Governor-General to Townsville.

In many ways, Perc Tucker endeared himself to the citizens of Townsville. He made no secret of the fact that he never severed his political affiliations, but he also made it quite clear that when he was required to make a decision concerning the future of Townsville and the progress of the city he did not adhere to any political party pressure from his own groups. He made publicly known the fact that any decision he arrived at in the Townsville City Council was made for the benefit of the whole of the community. His record was such that when the 1979 election was held he polled in excess of 60 per cent of the popular vote for the position of mayor. That percentage indicates that he had the support not only of those who follow the ALP philosophy but also of a large section of the business community in Townsville who realised the good job he was doing for the city. Further evidence of his popularity was forthcoming last Saturday after his untimely death, when a huge crowd attended the John Knox Presbyterian Church at Aitkenvale, Townsville, for the commemoration service. People of all religions, including the Bishop of North Queensland, came to pay tribute to him.

I extend my condolences to his widow, Isobel, commonly known to the family and the Townsville community as Bunny. She was a tower of strength to him. Whenever he performed an official duty anywhere Bunny was always by his side. I extend my deep sympathy to her and the family.

His passing is a great loss to the ALP organisation in Townsville. It will be very difficult to replace him with a man of similar calibre. The next mayor of Townsville, whoever he or she may be, will have a very hard act to follow.

Hon. R. J. HINZE (South Coast—Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Police) (11.31 a.m.): I join with previous speakers in extending condolences to Bunny and the other relatives of our late friend Perc Tucker. I am sure that we remember him well in the old Legislative Assembly Chamber as a very capable, strong, front-bench debater, and in the position of Deputy

Leader of the Opposition. Over that period he acquitted himself with all the dignity appropriate to this House. We will remember his clashes with Tom Aikens. He was always able to defend the things that he stood for.

I believe that Perc Tucker found his niche in life when he became Mayor of Townsville. While he held that office our friendship grew enormously. Earlier we were together on a parliamentary delegation to Japan, Singapore and elsewhere, when we became very firm friends. That stood both of us in good stead when he became Mayor of Townsville, and we were able to help each other. While the mall in Townsville was being built we spoke to one another quite often.

I rose to indicate very briefly my feelings to his family and to say that the whole of the State has lost a very good Queenslander, and local government has lost one of its champions.

Motion (Mr Bjelke-Petersen) agreed to, honourable members standing in silence.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

TROTTING INDUSTRY

Hon. L. R. EDWARDS (Ipswich—Deputy Premier and Treasurer) (11.34 a.m.): The present controversy in the trotting industry and the threatened boycott of the Albion Park trotting meeting next Saturday night originates from an inquiry by Queensland Trotting Board stewards into the running and handling of a horse named Bold Rainbow at Albion Park on the night of 28 June 1980.

The stewards' panel delivered its decision last Friday, 22 August, and that decision was that trotting driver, Mr George Elliott, be disqualified for a period of six months. The inquiry opened at Albion Park on 28 June and concluded in the Trotting Board office last Friday. The inquiry was protracted largely due to Mr Elliott's seeking an adjournment on seven occasions to introduce new evidence and new witnesses. The second last adjournment was due to Mr Elliott's ill health.

Having been found guilty, Mr Elliott has the right in accordance with Queensland Trotting Board rule No. 407 (1) of appeal to the Queensland Trotting Board within seven days of the finding. I wish to emphasise that the Trotting Board as the appeal committee cannot comment at this stage on this inquiry because the seven days for the lodging of an appeal by Mr Elliott have not yet elapsed. Mr Elliott has the further right, beyond that, in the event of the Trotting Board Appeal Committee's upholding the stewards' decision, of recourse to the Full Court. Honourable members will therefore note that Mr Elliott has rights to further legal action in regard to the events which led to his disqualification. This matter is therefore removed completely from any other issues affecting the stability of the trotting industry.

Let me refer now to these other issues. Some members of the industry have called for the boycotting of the trotting meeting at Albion Park next Saturday night on the basis of alleged improper practices. To date no specific details to substantiate such allegations have been made officially to the Trotting Board or to me. In this regard, I give a public assurance that any person who is prepared to forward to me specific details of irregularities or improper practices will be protected as to the disclosure of his identity and the cases will be thoroughly investigated.

On the question of the viability of the trotting industry generally and of the prize-money paid to owners and trainers, I have asked the Trotting Board to immediately have specific discussions with trotting clubs forthwith in regard to their prize-money levels.

Next, I believe the owners and trainers have a concern with respect to current procedure for the selection of fields, and I have asked the Trotting Board to immediately examine the cause of the concern and to institute corrective measures if they are seen to be necessary and to report back to me within two weeks of the outcome of these issues.

On the question of the retired chairman of stewards, Mr Jack Gregg, the board has advised me that he has ceased employment with it. He will be employed in future in a consultancy capacity only in such matters as country seminars or the training of stewards.

In view of the action I have already taken, that is, (1) to seek out and investigate any allegation of improper practice, (2) to ask the Trotting Board to discuss prize money levels with clubs, (3) to have the Trotting Board re-examine and correct if necessary selection procedures, I see no reason whatsoever for such action, and I give notice that the Government will take all action to ensure that any such move is aborted. Such action now would achieve nothing but hurt for the industry, and it must be avoided.

I advise honourable members that I have confidence in the ability and the integrity of the Queensland Trotting Board and its willingness to review specific procedures that cause concern in the industry. I ask all sections of the industry to let it so operate and to avoid confrontation that can only harm the sport and those who wish to enjoy it.

ALP MOVES TO DENIGRATE LIBERAL PARTY

Hon. L. R. EDWARDS (Ipswich—Deputy Premier and Treasurer) (11.37 a.m.): Over the past week, attempts have been made by the Labor Party to denigrate the Liberal Party in the State Parliament. These politically motivated stunts by the ALP by moving motions in this House on matters on

which the Liberal Party has a policy determination have not been supported by members of my party.

The reasons for this are quite obvious. The Labor Party's standing in the electorate is the lowest it has ever been. ALP members are a divided, leaderless group concerned for their survival and attempting to regain some slightly temporary political gain by their tactics. I do not object to political tactics at any time, but if the Labor Party thinks it is going to cause disruption in this Government a short time before the election, if it thinks it is going to get away with this attempt to mislead the community, it is sadly mistaken.

The Liberal Party has announced Liberal policy statements for the next election. This is our right and indeed our responsibility, and we will be judged on our performance and our policies, and we will accept that judgment. We shall continue to declare our policy as the election comes closer. But, Mr Speaker, we are a vital and equal part of this coalition Government, and we expect to share the credit for good decisions for the benefit of the people of Queensland, and we also have to accept sharing of responsibility for less popular decisions, some of which are not in accord with our policy. This, however, is the price of a coalition to which we have been in this Government a loyal and hard-working partner. The Labor Party can move any motion it wishes, and it can criticise me and my party as much as it desires for not voting with it, but whilst we are member of this coalition Government, we will be as loyal as we can be within the confines of the conscience of each member of my party.

The Labor Party has not let facts or truth interfere with its attempt to mislead the community. It has blatantly misrepresented our position. The Labor Party well knows that the Liberal policies I announced as leader are a program for action in Government after this year's elections. This is specifically stated in the policy statements. It is a fact known to the Labor Party and to the people of Queensland.

The Labor Party knows these were not policy initiatives for the final days of this Government, but announcements of policy by my party for consideration by the electorate, just as the National Party and the Labor Party have been announcing policies. The Labor Party knows that the Liberal Party has fought the battle for policies in Cabinet and the joint Government parties room, and on many occasions very successfully for the benefit of the Government and the people of Queensland.

Those are the facts—facts known to the Labor Party. But in typical Labor Party fashion, it has ignored those basic truths, and misrepresented the Liberal Party in a vain attempt at political posturing to bolster its ever-falling fortunes. Misrepresentation and stuntsmanship are the stock in trade of the Labor Party.

That the Labor Party moves have been nothing more than a political stunt, a sham, is obvious. The Labor Party knows that its move was doomed to failure before it started. It knows that the party numbers in this House are such that the only way enough votes could be gathered in this Parliament to carry these policies would be at the cost of destruction of this Government. The Liberal Party will not run any risk of giving the Labor Party even the slightest electoral bonus by taking its tainted bait and causing disruption to this Government.

The Labor Party knows that even if every Liberal back-bench member had voted with the Opposition last week, its motions would not have been carried. Seventeen Liberal back-benchers and 22 Labor members make a total of 39, two fewer than a majority. The members of the Labor Party are not only politically inept; they also cannot count.

So the Labor Party well knows that the only way its motions supporting Liberal policy could have been carried would have been at the cost of destroying this coalition Government: by Liberal Ministers crossing the floor and voting against their National Party ministerial colleague. The Labor Party knew that.

Even the Leader of the Opposition with his very slight knowledge of the traditions and conventions of government knows that every Minister is required to support a Government decision. Cabinet solidarity is a traditional and essential component of a democratic society, and the Liberal Party Ministers support that view even though the ALP and media critics would wish that division to occur and that tradition to be destroyed.

As sound as we believe our policies are, we are not about to destroy this coalition Government in the final days of this Parliament. Nor would the people of Queensland want us to rush into implementing those policies now if the price were to be the destruction of this coalition Government.

The members of the Labor Party must think we are as politically inept as they are, if they think we would take that course when we know that as a result of the public support for the Liberal Party, we will be able to implement those policies after the election. We will be able to do so without any assistance from the Labor Party.

The community knows that if Liberals crossed the floor, the Labor Party would use that to the political disadvantage of this Government. And whilst Liberal members have crossed the floor of this House a number of times during this Parliament, they have done so on issues they considered important and on issues where they felt that stand was advisable in the best public interest. The Labor Party knew all this but it persisted with the sham of its motions.

The Labor Party should be the last party to make jibes at Liberal members for not voting against the Government. Liberal

members have that right. They have used it, but used it responsibly and not indiscriminately, and thus proved their strength of character. But the Labor Party does not give its members that right at all. It shackles and binds its members to vote the party line no matter what. Where can the Opposition point to a Labor member who has voted against the party line and survived as a member of the Labor Party?

The policies to be implemented by us will be implemented in a planned, thorough and organised manner. They will not be implemented in the hurried, ad hoc manner the Labor Party sought to do last week. And since when has the Labor Party been interested in enhancing the reputation and standing of this Parliament?

If ever a party has shown that it cares not one jot for the institution of Parliament, it's the Labor Party in Queensland. One only has to recall the smears and innuendos, the ill-founded attacks against members of this Parliament and the constant disregard of the normal operation of the parliamentary system, to know what the ALP's attitude to Parliament really is.

I give notice to the Parliament that I shall continue to give policy statements on behalf of my party. I also give notice that I will have no part of political deals or stunts for purely political motives and expediency. Therefore, I will treat with the contempt it deserves any motion of the Labor Party moved for purely political reasons.

My party represents people, and in coalition we have contributed in a vital and equal manner. The Liberal Party will seek support from the electorate on its contribution to Government and its policies. Its preferences will be directed in one direction, to the National Party, and its total commitment is to the common opposition of the Labor Party.

SUPPLY

CONSTITUTION OF COMMITTEE

Hon. C. A. WHARTON (Burnett—Leader of the House), by leave, without notice: I move—

“That the House will, at its next sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.”

Motion agreed to.

WAYS AND MEANS

CONSTITUTION OF COMMITTEE

Hon. C. A. WHARTON (Burnett—Leader of the House), by leave, without notice: I move—

“That the House will, at its next sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the

Whole to consider of Ways and Means for raising the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.”

Motion agreed to.

SELECT COMMITTEE OF PRIVILEGES

Mr NEAL (Balonne) for **Mr WARNER** (Toowoomba South): I move—

“(1) That this House do appoint a Select Committee of Privileges;

“(2) That the committee consist of Messrs W. D. Hewitt, Jones, Lane, Neal, Powell, Wright and Warner;

“(3) That four members be a quorum at any meeting of the committee;

“(4) That the committee have and exercise such powers, duties and responsibilities as may, from time to time, generally or in any particular case, be determined by the House;

“(5) That, in the exercise of the aforesaid powers, duties and responsibilities, the committee have authority and power to send for persons, papers and records unless otherwise determined by the House in any particular case save however that a Minister of the Crown or an officer of the Public Service shall not be obliged to provide information, oral or written, which has been—

(a) certified by a Crown Law officer to be information which, if it were sought in a court, would be a proper matter in respect of which to claim Crown privilege; or

(b) certified by the responsible Minister, with the approval of the Ministers of the Crown in Cabinet assembled, to be information such that its disclosure would be against the public interest;

“(6) That the committee have leave to sit during any adjournment of the House notwithstanding that such adjournment exceeds seven days;

“(7) That the committee may sit during the sitting of the House;

“(8) That the committee, so far as is practicable and as it may do, function in a manner similar to that of a Committee of Privilege of the British House of Commons for the time being unless otherwise determined by the House in any particular case;

“(9) That the committee, in addition to sitting from time to time on or in relation to matters of privilege, may meet from time to time to discuss privilege generally, including acts or omissions constituting instances of breach of privilege, whether in Queensland or elsewhere, and to inform itself with respect to privilege in such manner as it thinks fit; and, without limiting the generality of the foregoing, may invite from and discuss with such persons or bodies as it thinks fit, submissions and views on or in relation to matters of privilege;

"(10) That the foregoing provisions of this motion, so far as they may be inconsistent with Standing Orders, have effect notwithstanding anything contained in the Standing Orders.

"(11) That the committee be authorised to give consideration to previous references from the House from the previous session prior to prorogation."

Motion agreed to.

PETITIONS

The Clerk announced the receipt of the following petitions—

PERMANENT POLICE STATION, COOLUM

From Mr Simpson (399 signatories) praying that the Parliament of Queensland will approve the construction of a permanent police station at Coolum.

LONG SERVICE LEAVE FOR BUILDING WORKERS

From Mr Campbell (77 signatories) praying that the Parliament of Queensland immediately introduce legislation to provide for long service leave for building workers based on their service.

TRAFFIC LIGHTS, OLD CLEVELAND ROAD

From Mr W. D. Hewitt (324 signatories) praying that the Parliament of Queensland will give urgent consideration to the installation of traffic lights at the "zebra" crossing on old Cleveland Road between Bruce Street and Wiles Street.

Petitions read and received.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr CASEY (Mackay—Leader of the Opposition) (11.48 p.m.), by leave: A few moments ago in this House we heard a great diatribe from the Liberal Leader, the Deputy Premier. It was probably one of the weakest and most pathetic displays that I have heard in a long, long time. It came from a man who this morning has really shown his true colours.

Mr GREENWOOD: I rise to a point of order. So far we have not heard anything about the personal explanation.

Mr SPEAKER: I call on the Leader of the Opposition to comply with the requirements of Standing Orders.

Mr CASEY: I am personally offended by some of the misleading remarks that the Deputy Premier put forward, especially coming from a man who has displayed—

Mr Akers: You are a great political sook.

Mr CASEY: Fancy the member for Pine Rivers calling anybody "a great political sook".

This morning's diatribe came from a man who says he will do certain things in the community but, when he is put to the test, he does nothing.

Mr PORTER: I rise to a point of order. I fail to understand how the honourable gentleman can be making a personal explanation when at no stage did the Deputy Premier mention the name of the Leader of the Opposition. How on earth can he be making a personal explanation about himself when the Deputy Premier's statement did not touch upon him personally? That is beyond me. I would be grateful for an explanation of the position.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! If the Leader of the Opposition has a point of order, I wish to hear it. If not, I will ask him to resume his seat.

Mr CASEY: Who has a point of order? Not me. I just want to continue with my speech.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The Leader of the Opposition must have a point to make.

Mr CASEY: People out in the community continue to say how Parliament should be restructured and how the time of Parliament should be more reasonably used.

Mr SCASSOLA: I rise to a point of order. My point is that the statement by the Leader of the Opposition can hardly be described as a personal explanation. With respect, Mr Speaker, he has had ample opportunity to make a personal explanation. There is nothing personal of any kind whatever in the statement by the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I will give the Leader of the Opposition one final opportunity to make a personal explanation.

Mr CASEY: The point raised refers to me personally. The Deputy Premier frequently referred in his remarks to the Opposition this, the Opposition that, and the Opposition something else. As Leader of the Opposition, I feel offended. As for the reaction of the Liberal members—the weak and pathetic display they have put on clearly shows their true colours. The Treasurer's comments could not be referred to as a ministerial statement.

Mr AUSTIN: I rise to a point of order. I have yet to hear the personal explanation. If the Leader of the Opposition is offended by the statement of the Deputy Premier, I am offended by his statement. I submit that he is not making a personal explanation. He is merely insulting everyone in this Chamber by flouting the Standing Orders of this Parliament.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I have heard the member's comments and ask him to resume his seat. I have also listened attentively to the Leader of the Opposition. The statement

he has made does not comply with the requirements laid down for a personal explanation. I ask him to resume his seat.

Mr CASEY (Mackay—Leader of the Opposition): I move—

“That the honourable member for Mackay be further heard.”

Question put; and the House divided—

AYES, 21

Blake	Shaw
Burns	Underwood
Casey	Vaughan
D'Arcy	Warburton
Fouras	Wilson
Hansen	Wright
Hooper, K. J.	Yewdale
Kruger	
Mackenroth	<i>Tellers:</i>
Milliner	Jones
Prest	Davis
Scott	

NOES, 46

Akers	Lane
Armstrong	Lee
Austin	Lester
Bird	Lickiss
Bishop	Lockwood
Bjelke-Petersen	McKechnie
Booth	Miller
Bourke	Moore
Campbell	Newbery
Edwards	Porter
Frawley	Powell
Gibbs, I. J.	Row
Glasson	Scassola
Greenwood	Simpson
Gunn	Stephan
Gygar	Sullivan
Hewitt, N. T. E.	Tenni
Hewitt, W. D.	Tomkins
Hinze	Wharton
Hooper, M. D.	White, P. N. D.
Innes	<i>Tellers:</i>
Kaus	Neal
Knox	Turner
Kyburz	

PAIR:

Gibbs, R. J. Hartwig

Resolved in the negative.

Mr AUSTIN: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. To indicate the Leader of the Opposition's ignorance of Standing Orders, I refer to Standing Order 117, which provides that your ruling may be dissented from only by a motion. The Leader of the Opposition showed a total lack of understanding of our Standing Orders. He flouted your ruling.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's point is taken.

QUESTIONS UPON NOTICE

1. INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS, STATE ELECTRICITY AUTHORITIES

Mr Casey asked the Minister for Mines and Energy—

As the manner of settlement of the underground electricity cable layers dispute clearly indicates that the stubborn, arrogant and antiquated industrial relations techniques of the various State electricity authorities have once again resulted in

severe and unnecessary hardships and economic loss for Queenslanders, will he undertake a thorough shake-up of the industrial relations sections of these authorities and instruct their managements to base their future negotiations with their employees on a platform of co-operation rather than continue the confrontations of the past?

Answer:—

No. The cable layers dispute, which involved 97 employees of the South East Queensland Electricity Board out of a total board work-force of approximately 4 000 persons and a total electricity industry work-force of approximately 10 000, did not involve other electricity authorities, as suggested by the Leader of the Opposition.

From the commencement of the dispute in April 1980 over the cessation of dirt money payments on polymeric-type cables, the board has endeavoured to solve the dispute through the avenues of the State Industrial Commission and through private negotiation with the Electrical Trades Union and the men involved.

Unfortunately, the union and its members during the currency of the dispute sought not to adhere to recommendations of the Industrial Commission, as was remarked upon by the Industrial Commission on 25 June 1980 when it said that it can only function to settle disputes if the parties accept its determinations. As the union had made it clear that it would not accept any such determination, the commission was unable to resolve the dispute even though the board was so prepared.

In fact, during the first six weeks of the dispute seven compulsory conferences were held and the commission recommended to the men and the union that there were ways to test the validity of the board's decision not to pay dirt money, but on each occasion the union and the men refused to accept any recommendation that involved a return to work.

In total, 12 compulsory conferences were held before the dispute was finally resolved. At all times the board sought to resolve the dispute through negotiation and through the Industrial Commission and acted in accordance with the requirement of the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act.

It cannot be stated that the desire of the board to seek resolution of the dispute through the Industrial Commission could be classed as stubborn, arrogant or antiquated industrial relations techniques. The union and the men involved chose to ignore recommendations of the Industrial Commission, thus negating the early chance of resolution of the dispute.

2 & 3. CRYSTAL CREEK

Dr Scott-Young asked the Minister for Lands, Forestry and Water Resources—

(1) What were the results of the investigations carried out by his officers to find the reason why Crystal Creek, in the Townsville electorate, changed its course and now represents a menace to all farms in the area?

(2) What action for the cure of this problem has been advised or undertaken by his officers?

Answer:—

(1 & 2) As indicated in correspondence to the honourable member in recent weeks, Crystal Creek at the location in question has been a problem for a long time. The Townsville City Council undertook certain works to protect the road access to its water supply intake works further up Crystal Creek in 1974. This work withstood annual flows until this year when it failed in the early floods. Coastal creeks similar to Crystal Creek, which are short and steep and subject to high-intensity rainfall, are difficult and very costly to control.

The Queensland Water Resources Commission is able to give advice to persons or organisations who wish to undertake remedial works, but does not have the responsibility or the finances to undertake this work.

Dr Scott-Young asked the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Police—

(1) Has the Townsville City Council approached his department for advice and help in the prevention of erosion of road and farm lands by Crystal Creek in the electorate of Townsville?

(2) If so, will he inform the House as to the advice given to the Townsville City Council so that this marked man-made erosion can be prevented from further damaging this whole valley?

Answer:—

(1 & 2) There has been no recent approach to the Department of Local Government by the Townsville City Council for advice and help in this matter. I have been advised, however, that the honourable member has approached the Queensland Water Resources Commission in the matter and a question addressed by him thereon to the Honourable the Minister for Lands, Forestry and Water Resources is to be answered today.

4. DOOR-TO-DOOR SALES BY CHILDREN

Mrs Kyburz asked the Minister for Justice and Attorney-General—

(1) What action has been taken to tighten the legislation concerning the use

of children by certain so-called charities who market products door to door?

(2) Has his department made any investigations concerning Mr Keith Ashton of an organisation called "Helping Hand"?

Answer:—

(1) The Collections Regulations provide that a charity shall not permit a person to make an appeal for support on behalf of that charity whereby that person does so in expectation of reward unless a written agreement has been entered into between the parties involved and I have approved that agreement.

The regulations further provide that no child under the age of 15 years shall act as a collector unless the written consent of one of the child's parents has first been obtained and, where that consent has been obtained, that child must be accompanied by an adult.

Furthermore, no collector shall, in connection with any appeal, visit any house before 9 a.m. or after 5 p.m. on any day.

Complaints that persons were operating outside this legislation have been investigated and a Bill is presently being prepared to amend the Collections Act to provide for an offence of collecting under the guise of operating directly or indirectly on behalf of charity.

For the information of the honourable member, street trading by male children 12 years and older is authorised by the Childrens Services Act 1965-1980, provided that trading is contained between the hours of 6 a.m. and 10 p.m. That Act is administered by my colleague the Honourable the Minister for Welfare.

(2) Earlier this year officers of my department investigated the operations of the Society of the Helping Hand Ltd, of which a Mr Keith Ashton is chairman of directors. They reported that the financial affairs of that organisation had been mismanaged.

Because of this mismanagement, on 23 July 1980 I revoked the sanction issued on 8 November 1978 authorising the society to raise funds by means of appeals to the public for support.

The matter was also referred to the Commissioner of Police for investigation and I understand that this investigation is continuing.

5. POWDERED INSTANT COFFEE

Mrs Kyburz asked the Minister for Health—

(1) Did his department recently survey different brands of powdered instant coffee?

(2) What were the findings of that survey?

(3) Did any brands of coffee contain any substance other than coffee?

Answer:—

(1) Yes.

(2) The standard for soluble coffee or instant coffee is that it should contain not less than 30 grams of anhydrous caffeine ($C_8H_{10}N_4O_2$) derived from coffee per kilogram, not more than 3 grams of residue insoluble in boiling water per kilogram nor a foreign substance. It may contain dimethyl polysiloxanes in amount not exceeding 10 milligrams per kilogram. Eighteen powdered instant coffees were examined and of these eight had excess insoluble residues from the coffee bean.

(3) No.

6. LOADING ON DISABILITY INSURANCE FOR WOMEN

Mrs Kyburz asked the Deputy Premier and Treasurer—

(1) Does the SGIO add a 50 per cent loading to disability insurance for women?

(2) On what basis is this loading added?

(3) As the claims cannot include any gynaecological problems, what are the precise illnesses from which women are supposed to suffer more than men?

(4) How old are the actuarial tables on which the 50 per cent loading is based?

Answer:—

(1) Yes, usually, but only in accordance with universal industry practice.

(2) The loading is based on information regarding claims and premiums relative to insurance covering illness and accident.

(3) SGIO(Q) experience indicates that the average duration of disability claims for illness and accident from women is longer than the duration in respect of claims from men. The nature or types of illness covered by claims show little variation between the sexes.

(4) Actuarial tables are based on current statistics which have been confirmed in the recently published reports of the Morbidity Committee of the Institute of Actuaries of Australia.

7. MANLY BOAT HARBOUR

Mr Shaw asked the Minister for Maritime Services and Tourism—

With reference to the Manly Boat Harbour—

(1) What compensation has been or will be paid to the Government by the Royal Queensland Yacht Squadron for the

40 public moorings being taken over and resold by this club and why were tenders not called for this project?

(2) Will the terms of this agreement with the Royal Queensland Yacht Squadron ensure that these facilities will not be exploited for financial gain by re-leasing or subleasing, and, if so, how?

(3) Will Manly Slipways, who submitted a tender for development which was rejected in spite of being recommended by the Port of Brisbane Authority, be made a generous offer similar to that made to the yacht club?

(4) When is it anticipated that the successful applicant, Clough and Clayton, will commence work on their marina?

Answer:—

(1) Approval has been given to the sale by the Crown of 167 mooring piles in Manly Boat Harbour for the sum of \$140,000 which mooring piles will be incorporated into a floating marina to be constructed by Royal Queensland Yacht Squadron Marina Pty Ltd, a company promoted by the Royal Queensland Yacht Squadron.

Tenders were not called because the only sensible means of land access to the floating marina is through the Royal Queensland Yacht Squadron lease. Furthermore, it is Government policy to assist non-profit organisations to provide facilities in conjunction with the Government's establishment of Crown boat harbours.

(2) Draft lease conditions concerning the operation of the marina will be submitted by the Port of Brisbane Authority and require approval by me as Minister. As indicated in my previous remarks, the Royal Queensland Yacht Squadron is a non-profit organisation which aims to provide facilities to members at the lowest practicable cost.

(3) No. The available land area does not permit the siting of another marina. It was possible to assist the Royal Queensland Yacht Squadron to make better use of the boat harbour because the squadron already occupied a suitable area to which a modest addition will provide what is required to complement the mooring facilities which it will provide under the new arrangement. Incidentally, I do not consider the offer to be over-generous. The Royal Queensland Yacht Squadron will be required to pay levies to the Government on the number of marina moorings constructed by it at the current rate of \$90 per annum, in addition to payment for the mooring piles and payment of lease rentals to the Port of Brisbane Authority.

(4) On completion of current negotiations regarding lease details.

8. USE OF METHYL BROMIDE BY RENTOKIL

Mr Shaw asked the Minister for Health—

(1) Is he aware that the pest eradication firm known as Rentokil is now carrying out pest eradication treatment, using the dangerous chemical methyl bromide, in suburban houses?

(2) What regulations control the use of this deadly chemical in residential areas?

(3) Why are the strict precautions deemed necessary to protect the public at the time when Parliament House and The Mansions were fumigated not required when this dangerous method is used in the midst of suburban houses?

(4) Why is the firm not required to at least notify all residents that it intends to use dangerous chemicals in the area and that accidental exposure could be fatal?

(5) As it appears that familiarity with the use of these chemicals is leading to a relaxation in safety precautions, will he take urgent action to ensure that strict safety procedures are adhered to and dangerous chemicals not used unnecessarily?

Answer:—

(1) Yes.

(2) The Poisons (Fumigation) Regulations, 1973.

(3) The regulations are enforced by the Director of Industrial Medicine.

(4) The regulations do not require residents of the area to be notified.

(5) There has not been any relaxation in safety precautions.

9. DRUG EDUCATION IN SCHOOLS

Mr Shaw asked the Minister for Education—

What new programs for drug education have been introduced into Queensland schools in the last three years?

Answer:—

In my answer to the honourable member, I shall refer to alcohol and drug education programs in order to emphasise that alcohol is the major drug used in our society.

Revised health education syllabuses, which are being progressively introduced into primary and secondary schools, contain units which attempt to deal with alcohol and other drugs. However, in Queensland schools it is planned that

alcohol and drug education should not be confined to health education, which is the prevailing fashion in other States.

My department, which is nationally recognised as being innovative in this area, believes that there is no single message about drugs which is applicable to all students. Programs which depend solely on information-giving introduce students to a wider range of drugs and the curiosity thereby generated can be dangerously counterproductive.

The responsible use of alcohol and other drugs appears to be more effectively inculcated in students when it is treated in a co-ordinated fashion in several subject areas, simultaneously and regularly, rather than in specific, one-shot lessons. Teachers are being progressively introduced to this concept of general personal and social skill development within the total curriculum, and I am pleased to say that the approach appears to have great potential.

My department is continually developing materials for use by teachers and students. I have forwarded a secondary school resource kit to the Parliamentary Library where it will be available for perusal by honourable members.

10. RAILWAY DEPARTMENT LOSSES

Mr Bourke asked the Minister for Transport—

(1) Did the recently announced loss for the Queensland Railways, absorb considerable profits from the transport of coal and other minerals?

(2) What were the estimated profits to the rail system from such cartage?

(3) What would be the loss to the Queensland taxpayer from railway operation if the profits from mineral cartage were excluded?

(4) Is it not true that losses on the railway systems of South Australia and Tasmania are borne by the Commonwealth Government?

(5) Is any special payment made by the Commonwealth Government to compensate Queensland for such preferential treatment of those two States?

(6) Has the Government any concrete plans to modernise the railways and give them a chance to compete fairly, with modern methods?

(7) Has the Queensland Government recently sought any Commonwealth funds to enable such modernisation on a rational basis beyond electrification of the metropolitan rail system?

Answer:—

(1) The announcement of the Honourable the Deputy Premier and Treasurer, to which I presume the honourable member is alluding, referred to the overall operating result of the Railway Department for the financial year ended 30 June 1980.

(2 & 3) It is not the practice to publish the profit, or otherwise, derived from the conveyance of individual commodities. In fact, in most instances, this information would not be readily ascertainable.

(4 & 5) The Tasmanian Railways and the South Australian freight services and country passenger services have been taken over by the Commonwealth Government and now form part of the Australian National Railway System.

(6) Within the limits of available finance, the Railway Department is prosecuting a continuing program aimed at improving operating efficiency. Additional locomotives and rolling-stock, including 20 air-conditioned carriages, are being acquired for main line services. Track upgrading is being carried out in a number of areas, and to facilitate train-working centralised traffic control is being progressively extended. The electrification of the Brisbane suburban system, due for completion in 1984, will be advanced a further stage with the extension of electrified services to Ipswich.

Following a study into the feasibility of electrifying main line services, a project has now been launched for the completion of the design work associated with the electrification of the section Blackwater-Gladstone-Brisbane.

As a result of the recent overseas study tour which I undertook with the Commissioner for Railways, a number of recommendations designed to further improve railway operating standards will shortly be presented to the Government for consideration.

(7) Yes, and as a result, an amount of approximately \$9m allocated by the Commonwealth Government is available for expenditure this year for the extension of the Acacia Ridge rail terminal and the installation of centralised traffic control between Caboolture and Gympie.

11. SUBSIDIES TO LOCAL AUTHORITIES FOR FURNISHINGS

Mr Bourke asked the Minister for Health—

(1) Is a subsidy paid to local authorities who provide furnishings for senior citizens' centres while subsidy is not similarly available for other organisations, such as service clubs, who might seek to provide such furnishings?

(2) Will he examine the situation with a view to rectifying this apparent anomaly?

Answer:—

(1) The State, in conjunction with the Commonwealth, provides financial assistance to approved community welfare organisations and/or local authorities in the establishment of senior citizens' centres under the provisions of the States Grants (Home Care) Act.

Cabinet decision No. 13400 of 18 August 1969 stipulated conditions under which subsidy would be paid. The capital cost of the project, including built-in or permanently affixed furniture, fixtures and fittings was included for subsidy purposes but the cost of free-standing furniture and curtains was excluded.

Cabinet further decided (decision No. 19843 of 17 December 1973), following an amendment to the States Grants (Home Care) Act which provided for the payment of subsidy by the Commonwealth only on contributions by the State or local authorities, that organisations be relieved of a proportion of the capital cost which they had previously borne and continue to be responsible for the supply of furniture and equipment on an unsubsidised basis.

(2) Community welfare organisations contribute only one-sixth of the capital cost of a project and, although they are responsible in addition for the supply of free-standing furniture and equipment, it is considered that these financial arrangements are equitable.

12. PENSIONER CONCESSIONS, NEW SOUTH WALES

Mr Bourke asked the Minister for Transport—

(1) Is he aware that there is a sign displayed at the ferry terminal ticket office at Circular Quay in Sydney stating that pensioner concessions are not available to pensioners from overseas or Queensland?

(2) What basis is there for the New South Wales transport authorities to permit this attitude, which is grossly offensive to anyone who considers himself an Australian?

(3) As this attitude is obviously a low attack on pensioners, will he initiate urgent discussion with his New South Wales counterpart to prevent any recurrence of this disgusting situation?

Answer:—

(1 to 3) No. It would not be proper for me to make representations on a matter which is the prerogative of a transport authority of another State. The question of a reciprocity in pensioner concessions as between Queensland and New

South Wales has been examined on many occasions, but it must be remembered that the Government of New South Wales operates urban transport services in Sydney whereas in Brisbane these are provided by the Brisbane City Council, and private operators with respect to bus services, and the Railway Department with respect to rail services.

I cannot comment on concessions for overseas pensioners, but I feel that no one would expect the taxpayers or rate-payers of any State or city to subsidise concessions to pensioners from overseas countries, particularly where an urban transport undertaking is already making a loss on its operations.

Queensland has always been of the view that pensioner concessions are part of social services and the cost of any concessions granted to non-residents of the State should be treated like every other social service benefit.

The Commonwealth Government point of view is to relate this type of transport concession to the basic issue of the rate of pension payable as the circumstances and conditions under which they were granted may no longer apply and the concessions could tend to be discriminatory and benefit some pensioners more than others.

In other words, transport concessions are not a very equitable means of giving additional benefits to pensioners. This view is consistent with the Queensland Government view that the cost and responsibility for assistance to non-resident pensioners should be accepted by the Commonwealth Government as part of its social services program for pensioners.

13. POLICE STRENGTH, TARA AREA

Mr Neal asked the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Police—

Will he again give consideration to increasing police strength in the Tara police area?

Answer:—

The present police strength does not, at this time, allow for increasing the strength of the Tara Police Division.

Considerable effort is being made to recruit and train personnel to bring the Police Force up to strength. The Priority Committee, comprising top officers of the Police Department, is continually monitoring police strengths in police divisions throughout the State.

The honourable member can be assured that the Priority Committee will give consideration to the Tara Police Division in line with police priorities.

14. ST. GEORGE-NOONDOO-DIRRRANBANDI-HEBEL ROAD

Mr Neal asked the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Police—

(1) What progress is being made on the upgrading of the St. George-Noondoo-Dirranbandi-Hebel road?

(2) What are the future plans and anticipated costs?

Answer:—

(1 & 2) The honourable member has, of course, always displayed a keen interest in the projects undertaken on this road. He will therefore be pleased to know that on the St. George-Dirranbandi section a 5.3 km section was recently completed at a cost of \$460,000. A scheme for preliminary works to cost \$200,000 on a 29 km deviation is to be released in the near future.

Commencement of construction of a further 9.9 km section in this financial year is dependent upon additional funds being available to the department.

On the Dirranbandi-Hebel section work is nearing completion on first stage construction of a 9.1 km section at a cost of \$290,000.

Progress on both roads in the future is very much dependent upon the level of road funding available but the overall aim is to have the road from St. George to Hebel constructed to an all-weather standard, major floods excepted, in a period of three to four years.

15. NURSING TRAINING AT COLLEGES OF ADVANCED EDUCATION

Mr Fouras asked the Minister for Education—

(1) Is he aware that New South Wales, Victoria, South Australia and Western Australia have initiated pilot schemes for tertiary nursing training at colleges of advanced education, as recommended by the Sax committee report of 1978?

(2) Why have the wishes of the Queensland nursing profession been ignored with the refusal to set up a pilot scheme in Queensland?

Answer:—

(1) Although pilot programs of basic nursing education and training are offered in some colleges of advanced education in some States, these all preceded the deliberations of the Sax committee. No pilot programs have been introduced, as the question asserts, as a consequence of the Sax committee recommendations.

(2) The relevant facts are as follows:

(a) In February 1977 State Cabinet considered possible future developments in basic nursing education and training

and agreed that Queensland should not embark on basic courses in colleges of advanced education while there was no agreement by the Commonwealth Government to long-term funding.

(b) In its 1978 guide-lines to the Tertiary Education Commission, the Commonwealth Government asked specifically that no expansion of existing courses in basic nursing education be supported.

(c) In its report of August 1978, the Sax committee recommended that beginning in 1983 there should be an intake of 75 into basic nursing courses in colleges of advanced education in Queensland.

(d) In its reaction to the Sax committee report, the Queensland Government in June 1979 endorsed for implementation in Queensland the proposals regarding the offering of basic nursing programs in colleges of advanced education, as soon as the Commonwealth Government, through its Tertiary Education Commission, makes available the necessary funds.

(e) In the event, the Commonwealth Government's recent response to the Sax committee report, following consideration of reactions from interested parties, including the nursing profession, stated that "basic nursing education would continue to be provided by a variety of arrangements with most nurses and all nurses aides being trained in hospital-based schools of nursing."

The Commonwealth Government's response went on to state, "The Government supports the continued evaluation of and experimentation with the existing pilot courses. It considers that the present levels of intake to these courses provide an adequate basis for comparative evaluation of college-based and hospital-based training."

(f) Meanwhile, courses in post-basic education and training of nurses have been conducted at the Queensland Institute of Technology since the beginning of 1978. A new post-basic course in community nursing is expected to commence in 1981.

16. USE OF CROWN LAND AT KANGAROO POINT

Mr Fouras asked the Minister for Lands, Forestry and Water Resources—

Will he release the feasibility report on future use of the Crown land previously occupied by Evans Deakin at Kangaroo Point so that it may be available for public scrutiny and discussion?

Answer:—

The Kangaroo Point redevelopment study, which has been commissioned by the Land Administration Commission from

Messrs Cardno & Davies Pty Ltd, is now to hand and is in the process of being examined. When any action resulting from the report is being considered full regard will be had to making the report available for public examination.

17. CHILD WELFARE FACILITIES

Mr Fouras asked the Minister for Welfare—

(1) Is he aware that the Commonwealth Grants Commission 45th Report, 1979, on special assistance for the States, shows that net per capita expenditure on child welfare in Queensland for 1978-79 was \$7.44 against an average expenditure in the five other States of \$10.02, some 25.7 per cent higher than in Queensland?

(2) When will the Queensland Government take action to improve Queensland's outdated and inadequate child welfare facilities?

Answer:—

(1) The figures quoted from the Commonwealth Grants Commission's report by the honourable member should be treated with caution. I do not believe that the inference he draws from that report can be validly made. I say this for several reasons. Firstly, the figures quoted, while derived from State Budget papers and Auditor-General's reports, are categorised by the commission for its particular purposes. In the footnote to the table quoted, in fact, the commission concedes the "difficulties in obtaining uniform classification". Secondly and as a general comment, this Government has always maintained a philosophy of minimum taxation. The report indicates clearly that Queenslanders are among the lowest taxed of all Australians. It is inevitable then that expenditures in this State will, as a general rule, be lower in per capita terms than elsewhere. This does not, however, imply that the levels of service provided are necessarily lower.

(2) I would have expected the honourable member to have been aware of the Government's announced decision to review the legislation and operations of the Department of Children's Services with a view to the establishment of a Department of Family Welfare. This review is presently being undertaken. The honourable member's statement that Queensland has outdated and inadequate child welfare facilities lacks substantiation.

18. COMPENSATION FOR BRUCELLOSIS REACTORS

Mr Gunn asked the Minister for Primary Industries—

(1) How often is there a review of compensation for brucellosis reactors?

(2) What is the present compensation for all types of positive reactors?

(3) How many slaughtering establishments in the West Moreton region are engaged in the slaughtering of reactors?

Answer:—

(1) Compensation values for TB and brucellosis reactors are reviewed every six months in the light of changes in farm gate market values of an average beast in each class of animal. They were changed on 1 December 1979, following an October 1979 review, reviewed but not changed in April last and are due to be reviewed next October.

(2) The present compensation values for brucellosis are as follows—

Bulls, dairy cows and registered stud beef cows (more than 2 teeth)	\$220
Other beef cows (more than 2 teeth)	\$152
Heifers (2-3 years of age)	\$128
Weaner heifers (no permanent teeth)	\$96
Calves	\$36
Reactor entire horses and breeding mares free of clinical signs of infection	\$100
Other horses	\$25

(3) Brucellosis reactors are slaughtered at only two abattoirs in Queensland, one at Kingaroy and the other at Bromelton. These are the only works with full-time meat inspection prepared to accept reactors. In addition, small numbers of reactors are slaughtered for pet food at knackeries at Albany Creek and Laidley.

19. REMEDIAL TEACHERS AND SPEECH THERAPISTS, BRISBANE VALLEY SCHOOLS

Mr Gunn asked the Minister for Education—

(1) Is he aware of the acute shortage of remedial teachers and speech therapists in the Brisbane Valley schools?

(2) What action is being taken to rectify this situation and when will children with speech and learning difficulties in this area receive a better service than they do now?

Answer:—

(1) The policy of the Department of Education is to locate one remedial or resource teacher in every class I and class II primary school and in selected class III primary schools. This policy is being implemented progressively and systematically on a Statewide basis as finance and resources permit. The extent of the remedial service offered by remedial teachers based at Toogoolawah and Esk compares favourably with services available to centres of similar size around the

State. Speech therapy services are available to children of the Brisbane Valley from speech therapists located at Ipswich.

(2) My department plans to increase the number of speech therapists and remedial teachers employed in 1981. The size of the increase will be determined by financial and staffing priorities later this year. It seems likely, however, that one additional speech therapist will be appointed to the Brisbane West region. As a consequence, services to Brisbane Valley children should be improved.

20. SCHOOL DENTAL SERVICES

Mr Gunn asked the Minister for Health—

With reference to my question in this Parliament last session relative to the school dental services in small country schools that have not seen the school dentist for up to two years, has the situation been rectified now?

Answer:—

An effective means of modifying the operation of mobile dental clinics to permit them to operate from standard electrical outlets in small schools has been established. Some mobile clinics already in service are now able to operate in this fashion and it is proposed that all new mobile clinics will have this capability. As a result, the number of schools receiving a less than satisfactory frequency of service is being progressively reduced. The rate of progress will, however, be influenced by available trained staff.

21. EXEMPTION OF FUEL DEPOTS FROM FLAMMABLE AND COMBUSTIBLE LIQUIDS REGULATIONS

Mr McKechnie asked the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Police—

(1) Can individual local authorities exempt existing fuel depots (including drum depots) from all provisions of the Flammable and Combustible Liquids Regulations, except regulations 40 to 46 and 81 to 92, provided the local authority is satisfied that the premises concerned do not constitute a risk to public safety?

(2) If a local authority exercises its right to exempt a fuel depot from some of the provisions of the regulations, can the local authority be held legally responsible if a disaster occurs as a result of the exemption?

Answer:—

(1) The Flammable and Combustible Liquids Regulations made pursuant to the provisions of the Local Government Act provide that a local authority may grant a licence for the storage of flammable and combustible liquids in respect of

premises lawfully in existence on the day the regulations came into force, that is, 1 July 1976, notwithstanding that the premises do not conform in all respects with the provisions of the regulations, provided the local authority is satisfied that the premises do not constitute a risk to public safety. It is not an exemption, as such, but an acceptance of compliance to the extent that public safety is maintained.

The regulations further provide, moreover, that, where a licence is granted in the above circumstances, the licensee has to comply with the requirements of the regulations as to the bunding of tanks and the installation of fire-fighting facilities within prescribed periods. In the case of bunding, the period is to be determined by the local authority but may not be later than 1 July 1981. In the case of fire-fighting equipment, the compliance date for small installations expired on 1 July 1979, whereas for larger installations the compliance date is 1 July 1981.

(2) The question of the liability of a local authority in circumstances where damage occurs from premises in existence on 1 July 1976 and subsequently licensed by the local authority is a legal question to be determined having regard to the circumstances of the particular case.

22. GAMBLING REVENUE, QUEENSLAND AND NEW SOUTH WALES

Mr McKechnie asked the Deputy Premier and Treasurer—

(1) What revenue did the New South Wales Government receive from gambling (other than poker machines) in 1978-79 compared with revenue received by the Queensland Government?

(2) Will he relate the answer to (1) to the tax per head of population on gambling (other than poker machines) in New South Wales and Queensland and also the actual amount of money spent per head by people in New South Wales and Queensland on gambling (other than poker machines)?

(3) Did he read an article titled "Keep out the Pokies Says Andy" in the "Telegraph" of 18 August?

(4) Did he read an article titled "Understanding Poker Machines" in the July issue of Aristocrat News, which was written by Ted Vibert, General Manager of the Poker Machine Analysis Bureau?

(5) With reference to (4), did Mr. Vibert claim that he can give advice to clubs that enables them to increase poker machine take to 2.8 per cent of a town's total income?

(6) Bearing in mind that many people gamble very little (or not at all) on

poker machines, what effect would poker machines have on a moderate gambler's household income?

Answer:—

(1) In 1978-79 the revenue collected from gambling, other than poker machines, amounted to—

New South Wales ..	\$129.6 million
Queensland	\$33.3 million

(2) In per capita terms, these collections amounted to—

New South Wales ..	\$25.70 per capita
Queensland ..	\$15.29 per capita

Information on the total amount of money spent on gambling is not readily available. Furthermore, meaningful comparisons cannot be made of the turnovers of different forms of gambling as some forms are high turnover, low tax per dollar invested (e.g. poker machines), while others are low turnover, high tax per dollar invested (e.g. pools).

(3 to 6) I have read both articles referred to by the honourable member, and I did note the claim by Mr Vibert that poker machine income should amount to 2.8 per cent of total town income. Evidence has always been available that as gambling and similar expenditure increases, detrimental effects flow through to the family and household.

23. ENOGGERA PSYCHIATRIC TREATMENT CENTRE

Mr Milliner asked the Minister for Health—

Further to my question regarding the proposed use of the former Enoggera Boys Home in Hurdcott Street, Enoggera, by his department—

Will the former home be used by his department for psychiatric testing of young people and, if so, what security measures will be taken? If not, will his department be using the former home for any other use and, if so, what will that use be for?

Answer:—

Cabinet has granted approval for the Department of Works to negotiate with the Church of England to lease the Enoggera Boys Home for a period of five years, with the option of renewal for a further five years, for suitable public purposes.

The Department of Works has entered into negotiations with the church authorities and the details thereof are under consideration. However, no decisions have yet been taken either in regard to leasing arrangements or for what purpose the property might be used.

24. SALE OF HOUSING COMMISSION LAND,
GOODNA AREA

Mr Milliner asked the Minister for Works and Housing—

Following the recent controversial sale of Housing Commission land in the Redbank Plains area by his department to Rylance Collieries—

(1) Does the Housing Commission own land at the corner of Brennan Street and Jones Road, Goodna?

(2) If so, what is the total area of the land involved?

(3) Have any approaches been made to his department to sell the land?

(4) If so, what was the name of the company or individuals who made the approach?

Answer:—

(1 & 2) The Commission owns 18.5 ha bounded by Redbank Plains Road, Brennan Street and Church Street. Church Street is an extension of Jones Road.

(3 & 4) There has been no contact with any prospective purchaser, other than an oral inquiry six to eight months ago by a church group. The church has made no further approach.

25. PRODUCTION OF URANIUM OXIDE
AT MARY KATHLEEN

Mr Milliner asked the Minister for Mines and Energy—

(1) What was the total tonnage of uranium oxide produced by Mary Kathleen from 1976 to 1979 inclusive and in 1979?

(2) What was the total value of such uranium oxide?

(3) What was the total royalty the Government received from Mary Kathleen from 1976 to 1979 inclusive and in 1979?

(4) How is such royalty assessed?

Answer:—

(1) The total tonnage of uranium oxide produced by Mary Kathleen from 1976 to 1979 inclusive was 2 282 tonnes and in 1979 it was 832 tonnes.

(2) The total value of such uranium oxide from 1976 to 1979 inclusive was \$133,196,095, and in 1979 it was \$63,299,392.

(3) The total royalty the Government received from Mary Kathleen from 1976 to 1979 inclusive was nil, and in 1979 it was also nil; however, \$1,125,000 was received in 1980 with respect to production during 1979.

(4) The royalty is assessed on the basis of two per cent of gross proceeds above \$30,000 or five per cent of profits above \$30,000, whichever is the lesser.

26 & 27. USE OF SEWAGE EFFLUENT
FOR IRRIGATION

Mr Elliott asked the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Police—

Has his department considered the use of sewage effluent from the Gold Coast as a source for irrigation water, and was there in fact any feasibility study carried out in regard to the costing of such a suggestion?

Answer:—

The disposal of the Gold Coast sewage effluent has been investigated over a number of years. Land disposal within the areas adjacent to the Gold Coast was reported on by Camp, Scott and Furphy, consulting engineers, in their report on the Gold Coast region sewage disposal in 1976. This report showed that the cost of land disposal would be considerably higher than that for disposal by means of a single ocean outfall.

Disposal to the Condamine River was also considered by the consultants but was found to be the most expensive alternative both in capital costs and in annual operating costs, owing to the very high pumping heads involved.

Mr Elliott asked the Minister for Primary Industries—

(1) Has his department conducted any trials into the long-term effects which would be produced by the use of sewage effluent for irrigation purposes?

(2) If no such experiments have been done, will he consider conducting such experiments with a view to the better future use of effluent wastes from major population centres?

Answer:—

(1 & 2) Although the Department of Primary Industries has not carried out any research on the long-term effects which may be produced by the use of sewage effluent for irrigation purposes, basic research on problems which could arise from the use of effluents from specific population centres has been carried out overseas and in other States of Australia. Officers of my department have access to the results of such research should the need for an appraisal of an individual waste-water irrigation proposal arise. Advice given is based on these results as well as on the practical experience gained with several irrigation projects based on treated sewage effluent in operation in Queensland already.

Some of the long-term effects of applying sewage effluent on land which need to be considered are—

(1) The effects on the soil itself and its continued capacity to absorb water and transmit it safely either to plants as evapotranspiration or as subsurface drainage to streams.

(2) The area of land required to receive safely the likely maximum effluent flow.

(3) Environmental effects, adverse or favourable, resulting from upsetting the natural hydrological balance of the area and its surroundings.

(4) Animal/human health problems which could be increased by careless use of the system, specifically the beef measles/human tapeworm parasite cycle.

One problem with the disposal of sewage effluent on land in Queensland is the fact that the major centres of population are in the high rainfall coastal zone where drainage of excess rainfall, run-off and seepage is already a major problem for a portion of the year. To make effective use of this sewage effluent as irrigation water would mean transporting the waste-water considerable distances inland at very high cost.

As each waste-water disposal proposal has its own individual characteristics of water quality, water volume, area of land available, soil characteristics and costs involved, general experimentation on disposal as irrigation water would be of doubtful value.

28. BRIDGES, SANDHURST CREEK AND NOGOA RIVER

Mr Lester asked the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Police—

(1) What action is necessary to build bridges over Sandhurst Creek and the Nogoia River on the Capricorn Highway?

(2) What form of planning is in hand for the construction of these bridges?

(3) What are their dimensions and how much will they cost?

Answer:—

(1) The main requirement is a significant increase in funds so that a greater number of projects can be placed on the annual construction programs, and as a consequence on the forward planning program.

(2) In the case of Sandhurst Creek bridge, design has been completed but detailed plans have not yet been completed. As far as the Nogoia River bridge is concerned, survey has been carried out.

(3) The Sandhurst Creek bridge will consist of 2/11 m spans by 8.6 m between kerbs. Estimated cost is \$100,000. The approach road-works over the 6.8 km section from Comet River to Yamala are anticipated to cost of the order of \$1m.

The Nogoia River bridge will probably comprise 11/23 m spans by 8.6 m between kerbs. The estimated cost excluding foot-way is \$1.1m. The approach road-works of 1.5 km from Springsure turnoff to Opal Street are anticipated to cost approximately \$350,000.

29. EMERALD-ALPHA SECTION, CAPRICORN HIGHWAY

Mr Lester asked the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Police—

(1) What were the costs of construction and proposed construction of the Capricorn Highway between Emerald and Alpha from December 1974 to date?

(2) How much was spent prior to 1974 on this project?

Answer:—

(1) The honourable member will appreciate, I hope, that it is not possible to quote historical expenditure figures from a particular month unless it is June, and then on the 30th.

Expenditures in financial years are:

1974-75	\$468,543
1975-76	\$213,417
1976-77	\$446,273
1977-78	\$976,408
1978-79	\$1,274,387
1979-80	\$2,004,677
1980-81	\$930,000

(Program)

(2) The section from Emerald to Bogantungan was declared during 1956-57. Emerald to Alpha was declared part of the Capricorn Highway in 1963.

Expenditures since these declarations are:

1956-57	—
1957-58	—
1958-59	—
1959-60	\$42,220
1960-61	\$96,752
1961-62	\$100,268
1962-63	\$264,956
1963-64	\$205,566
1964-65	\$65,298
1965-66	\$115,037
1966-67	\$262,311
1967-68	\$389,804
1968-69	\$191,328
1969-70	\$324,514
1970-71	\$223,442
1971-72	\$210,881
1972-73	\$42,866
1973-74	\$219,734

30. TOURISM, CENTRAL HIGHLANDS

Mr Lester asked the Minister for Maritime Services and Tourism—

As tourism is featured more in the news now, what can be done to boost tourism in the Central Highlands?

Answer:—

Recent announcements by the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation have centred on the strengthening of the regional tourist concept in Queensland.

The regional bodies embracing the Central Highlands are the Capricorn Tourist Organisation based in Rockhampton and the Whitsunday Wonderworld Travel Council with headquarters at Mackay. The Central Highlands with their many tourist assets have a great deal to gain by co-operating fully with these regional bodies.

For the information of the honourable member, I state that the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation is currently producing a new brochure featuring the Capricorn region. In recent times, too, a new selection of posters has been printed including one which features the Anakie gemfields. The corporation is currently looking at the possibility of introducing package tours to the honourable member's area. I assure him that the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation is well aware of the attractions of the Central Highlands and will use its best endeavours to promote the area.

31. ROAD-WORKS, TOWNSVILLE AREA

Mr Wilson asked the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Police—

(1) Is it proposed to have Bowen Road and Stuart Drive upgraded to a four-lane road and, if so, when will work commence? If not, will he consider having Bowen Road and Stuart Drive made a four-lane road?

(2) When will work commence on the widening of the export road from Cluden through Oonoonba to Railway Estate, as the export road now finishes at the intersection of Railway Avenue and Boundary Street, which is some two miles from the port facilities, and will he declare Boundary Street part of the export road and have it upgraded to a four-lane road, with bitumen from kerb to kerb?

(3) In the interest of safety for the motorist and because of the number of accidents that have occurred, will he have traffic lights installed at the intersections of the Bruce Highway and Stuart Drive and Woolcock and Church Streets?

Answer:—

(1) Upgrading of Bowen Road to four lanes is included in the department's forward planning program. Subject to the availability of funds in the future it is envisaged that the earliest start date would be 1984. There are no proposals to upgrade Stuart Drive to four lanes included in the forward planning program.

(2) The recent Townsville Transportation Study update predicted that, given certain conditions of traffic development, there may be a warrant for the construction of four lanes on the national commerce road from Cluden to the Railway Estate in the five-year period from 1985 to 1990. It is therefore not surprising that this

section of road is not yet on the department's four-year forward planning program.

Although Boundary Road is not a road declared under the Main Roads Act which has been enacted by this Parliament, it is already declared as a national commerce road from Railway Avenue to the start of the port area in the terms of the Commonwealth legislation dealing with road grants to the States.

At the request of the Townsville City Council approval is being sought from the Commonwealth Minister for Transport to a program of works on national commerce roads which includes the provision of funds to allow commencement of surveys and design of Boundary Road between Railway Avenue and Tully Street as a four-lane road.

(3) Yes. The former set will be included in a scheme for reconstruction of the intersection now under design and currently due to commence in 1982. The latter set is included in a scheme for reconstruction of Woolcock Street now under design and due for release in the current financial year.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

Mr CASEY: I had questions without notice to direct to the Deputy Premier and Treasurer but it seems that he has gone down his rat-hole sulking again.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! It is time for questions, not for comment.

USE OF GOVERNMENT ADVERTISEMENT PROGRAMS BY LIBERAL CABINET MINISTERS

Mr CASEY: I ask the Premier: In view of his recent criticisms of the way in which several Liberal Cabinet Ministers have been using Government advertising programs featuring their own photographs in order to project themselves, does he support the current use of such tactics by the Deputy Premier and Treasurer in both newspaper and television advertising for the Joint Government Authority Loan, especially as three of the four authorities, namely, the Agricultural Bank, the Brisbane and Area Water Board and the Gladstone Area Water Board, are administered by National Party Ministers, including himself?

Mr BJELKE-PETERSEN: I am aware of the situation outlined by the Leader of the Opposition and I have made my feelings clear to my Cabinet colleagues. I have noticed what is happening on T.V. and in other forms of advertising. Of course, my Liberal colleagues are seeking to get their names before the public.

Mr Vaughan: That is a lovely state of affairs.

Mr BJELKE-PETERSEN: That is correct. Indeed, as the Leader of the Opposition indicated it is being done for obvious reasons.

Be that as it may, the National Party and I do not need to place a great deal of concern on the issue.

The important thing so far as the National Party, myself and our coalition partners are concerned is that Queensland should continue to grow and expand. If anyone cares to look at the initiatives we have taken it will be seen that we have improved Queensland, right across the State. At a function tomorrow I intend to speak at some considerable length about that. It clearly indicates that there is no need for my party or me to further advertise ourselves. The question of a new style of Government does not come into it because tremendous achievements have been made through the present style of Government, under the leadership of the National Party and myself.

GLUE-SNIFFING

Mr LANE: I ask a question of the Minister for Health. He will remember my raising with him several weeks ago a question about glue-sniffing, particularly amongst young Aborigines in my electorate. Can he advise what action has been taken in this matter and any other information that could be of value to parents and others who are concerned about the fate of these youngsters?

Sir WILLIAM KNOX: The honourable member was kind enough to inform me before the sitting commenced that he would be seeking certain information about glue-sniffing. I am now in a position to give him that information.

This is a rather serious problem among teenagers, and it will not be solved by the sensational publicity and scare tactics that have been employed in some quarters. Like other drug problems, it requires a great deal of co-operation by the people involved, which of course includes the relatives of the victims. Health care workers in this field throughout the world now concentrate their efforts on more direct approaches to drug-taking teenagers through parents and various groups. They now combine warnings about glue-sniffing and drug taking with suggested alternative activities and life-styles. We also need co-operation from the manufacturers. I am pleased to say that one manufacturer, Ramset Fasteners, has taken its toxic glue out of retail outlets and replaced it with non-flammable, non-toxic contact cement. This contact cement cannot be sniffed.

I understand that the member for Merthyr has been directing his efforts on this problem through the professional agencies without seeking to stir up unnecessary sensational publicity which results in some teenagers experimenting in this area. I can assure the honourable member that the Health Department's Alcohol and Drug Dependence Service is aware of the problem in his electorate, and indeed in other parts of the State, and is directing its efforts towards counselling the youngsters involved. I urge

all retailers who sell toxic glues to consider their role in preventing misuse by youngsters, particularly with regard to display and accessibility.

I deplore, as nearly all people in the community have deplored, the screening of a national television programme showing how it is possible to take advantage of glue-sniffing. This, in itself, resulted in many cases suddenly occurring which would never have occurred otherwise.

[Sitting suspended from 1.2 to 2.15 p.m.]

ASSOCIATED GENERAL CONTRACTORS INSURANCE COMPANY LIMITED (MOTOR VEHICLES INSURANCE) BILL

SECOND READING—RESUMPTION OF DEBATE

Debate resumed from 21 August (see p. 149) on Dr Edwards's motion—

“That the Bill be now read a second time.”

Mr WRIGHT (Rockhampton) (2.15 p.m.): The Assembly has before it a Bill to provide indemnity to persons whose motor vehicles are insured with Associated General Contractors Insurance Company Limited in compliance with the Motor Vehicles Insurance Act 1936-1979 and for related purposes. Whenever legislation such as this is presented to the Assembly, members are placed in somewhat of an invidious position. They are confronted with a proposal on the one hand to pick up the pieces, one might say, after a private enterprise—in this instance Associated General Contractors Insurance, or AGCI—has gone into liquidation and, on the other hand, to carry out what the Minister and previous Treasurers before him have called a rescue operation on behalf of many insurees who were parties to outstanding claims for settlement with a particular company. I suggest that it is a dilemma. We are faced with the difficulty of trying to support private enterprise when companies have gone into liquidation and been unable to meet their responsibilities, at the same time being conscious of the fact that we have responsibilities to the many people who are involved with those companies who may have claims outstanding.

In introducing the Bill last Thursday, the Treasurer said that it was reasonable that the Government of this State, having introduced a compulsory scheme, should assist people with compulsory third-party insurance claims when an insurance company such as AGCI failed to meet its responsibilities. It is on this ground, and this ground alone, that I on behalf of the Opposition find myself accepting the proposal that is before the Legislature.

I have to ask: When will it all end? When will we come to some type of conclusion, instead of having legislation repeatedly brought before this Assembly? When will we stop entering into rescue operations? That is what they are. This is the sixth time in

two decades—in fact, in 18 years—that the Nominal Defendant (Queensland) has been prevailed on to rescue insurees or legislative action has been taken to alleviate the problem caused by the failure of insurers.

In that period we have had repeated failures. I go back to the early 1960s, when Standard Insurance went into liquidation. Seven Seas Insurance followed in 1962. In 1971 Vehicle and General Insurance Company Limited also faced the same problem and went out of business. In 1974, legislation was introduced to protect insurees with Northumberland Insurance Company Limited. Members will recall that in this Parliament, in 1978, the same type of legislation was introduced for VIP Insurances Limited. Barely two years later a similar Bill is introduced to assist the latest casualty, Associated General Contractors Insurance Company Limited.

I appreciate that the latest case is a little different from those that have gone before, in that prior to going into liquidation this company surrendered its compulsory third-party licence and has no live policies. Instead, we simply have a number of run off policies that have to be cleaned up and they are now being placed before this Assembly. That burden will have to be carried by the Nominal Defendant's account.

The Minister said that there are ample funds. I recall the then shadow Treasurer (Jack Houston) saying in 1978 that something like \$10m had been invested by the Nominal Defendant, with reserves of another \$1.5m. Irrespective of that, I do not think it is a matter of whether there are ample funds, as the Minister put it, to meet these latest claims. When I first found out about this legislation coming before the Assembly I tried to ascertain how much in actual money terms the failure of insurance companies has cost the people of Queensland through the Nominal Defendant in the last two decades. Unfortunately, the details were difficult to obtain. Although I was unable to obtain specific details, it is obvious that we are talking about hundreds of thousands of dollars.

In the case of the Northumberland Insurance Company, \$100,000 was committed by this Assembly. The commitment in the case of Vehicle and General Insurance had to be increased from the original assessment of \$125,000 in 1971 to \$155,000 in 1974. By the time we dealt with VIP Insurances Limited in 1978, the liability of the Nominal Defendant, assessed at that time by the Treasurer of the day, Sir William Knox, was increased significantly to a maximum of \$500,000. So we are indeed talking about hundreds of thousands of dollars.

As I said earlier, the Opposition acknowledges that, because of the compulsory character of this whole question, there are responsibilities that must be borne by the Government, but I suggest that that factor can be given only a certain amount of weight. Surely the time has come for the

introduction of more stringent controls over the insurance industry, as it is totally unreasonable to believe that the failure of the companies that I have mentioned was caused by their involvement in third party insurance. I do not believe that that is true, and I use VIP Insurances Limited as a typical example to back up my claim.

In 1978, when word got out that the company was in trouble, the Commonwealth Insurance Commissioner directed that it cease operations because it had failed to comply with the Commonwealth Insurance Act. The New South Wales Attorney-General then appointed a special investigator into VIP, and he found that about \$2m of VIP's assets were missing. It is quite obvious that that sort of money was not involved in only third-party insurance.

I often question why VIP was even allowed to operate, because its reputation as an insurance company was very suspect and left much to be desired. It constantly undercut the premiums being charged by other insurance companies, and various people involved in the industry came to me and said, "This should not be allowed. VIP are undercutting us. They are able to do that because, when accident claims are made on them, they challenge them. They reduce the amount they pay to panel beaters and body repairers and force them to use cheaper parts and lower-quality workmanship."

There is a need to review the situation, and I ask the Treasurer, through you, Mr Speaker, to use his office to consider the whole question of the way in which insurance companies are going broke—and there have been six in a short period—dealing only in this area.

Admittedly, each Bill that has been introduced has included a recovery clause, which has allowed the Nominal Defendant to recover costs from reinsurers and liquidators. However, I should be interested to know—and I think that all honourable members would like to know—how much has in fact been recovered, because the clause always says only "may recover", as we know, and there is no guarantee that costs will be recovered. I should like the Treasurer to tell this Assembly—perhaps not today, if he has not the details available: I realise that they may be difficult to ascertain—just how much has been recovered in the last 20 years from various companies that have gone broke, and also what has been the total cost to the Nominal Defendant Fund.

The Opposition will support the proposal; in fact, I do not think it has any choice in the matter. If we do not, people will suffer because the company concerned has not been able to meet its financial responsibilities and liabilities. But I say to the House that there is growing dissatisfaction among the motoring public in this State, and, indeed, throughout Australia, with the motor-vehicle insurance industry. It is, of course, a question for debate whether we ought to reintroduce the controls that

we had on the insurance industry by way of maximum premiums that they could charge. I have discussed the question with representatives of the insurance industry, and they have pointed out, and backed up their argument with statistical information, that in many instances the consumer may be better off with an open-ended approach, because that allows for competition. However, I also make the point that many consumers throughout the State are not in a position to take advantage of that competition.

A matter that really concerns me has been brought to my attention by body repairers and panel repairers. They have stressed that they are facing a financial dilemma, and there are two reasons for that. It is a dual problem. There is the shoddy workmanship and the cut-throat techniques that are being used not only by their own members in the industry but also by some of the insurance companies. They complain of a closed-shop approach. They say that unless they kowtow to the insurance industry, they simply do not get work. Unless they cut their costs, they are at the mercy of the insurance companies, and they find that cars are even taken out of their shops. I have received complaints from Townsville, Rockhampton, Brisbane and Ipswich, all instancing certain types of deals that have gone on. Unfortunately, not even the SGIO has been exempt from these complaints.

Motor-body repairers and panel beaters have told me how they have been forced to quote at lower than cost. They need to work on a minimum basis of at least \$15 an hour, but they are being forced to perform work at the rate of \$11, \$11.50 or \$11.75 an hour. One fellow to whom I spoke just before I came into the Chamber said that the maximum he ever gets from insurance companies in Brisbane is \$11.75 an hour. He claims that he finds it very difficult to operate under these conditions. If panel beaters do not cut their costs, they do not get any work.

Dr Edwards: Is this when they are tendering on jobs?

Mr WRIGHT: Yes, this is when they are quoting for repair work.

Dr Edwards: Isn't that a problem for the industry?

Mr WRIGHT: I am going to show that it is not just a problem for the industry but one for the Government. It is a problem that the industry itself cannot control. It is not only a matter of those involved in the industry being able to compete. It is no longer a matter of quality of work. Unless a panel beater meets the rate set by the insurance company, he does not get the job. If he does not cut his costs, he gets no work. The alternative is lower-quality workmanship, and that is really what is going on. It is a case of his doing a patch-up job.

Today I have brought into the Chamber some pieces taken out of cars in the metropolitan area. They were sent to me by persons involved in the panel-beating industry. Most of those persons are concerned at what is going on. It seems that no longer can a panel beater adopt the attitude that he should do the best he possibly can. It seems that no longer is emphasis placed on quality. Because of the pressure placed on panel beaters by the insurance companies, all the emphasis seems to be on cutting costs.

I have here a piece taken from an HK Holden. It is from the beaver panel, which is under the rear bumper bar.

Dr Edwards: This has nothing to do with the Bill; it deals with compulsory third-party insurance.

Mr WRIGHT: I accept the Treasurer's comment, but this is the only opportunity I will have to raise the matter. Because of our experiments in debating, I feel I should take this opportunity to raise the matter. I ask for your indulgence, Mr Speaker. Besides that, I am sure that the Treasurer himself would not want to stop me from bringing this matter to the notice of honourable members. Whilst I appreciate his point, I would like an opportunity to deal with the matter.

As I was saying, I have here a piece taken from beneath the rear bumper bar of an HK Holden. I have another piece, about half an inch thick, taken from the door panel of a late-model Holden. Another piece I have was taken from the inner sill. Honourable members will notice the patch-work. Nothing was cut out. The panel beater simply used a piece of weldmesh. Today I spoke to a panel beater who told me that some repairers even use cement, soft-drink cans, newspaper or anything at all. Certainly that is shoddy workmanship, but the repairers are being forced by the insurance companies to indulge in it. This is the relationship between this matter and the Bill.

Another piece taken from a beaver panel on a Holden station sedan contains pieces of fill and bits of wire. Some panel beaters do not care what they use. The consumer certainly does not know. The only way he can find out what has been put on the door panels of his car is by using a magnet. And who bothers to do that? I have been told that when working on some vehicles that have been involved in accidents certain panel beaters do not even bother to sand down the door panels. They are simply filled up and painted. Although the door appears to be normal, it is still damaged. The consumer has no hope of knowing.

The panel beater who wants to produce good workmanship is unable to do so. He simply cannot compete. If he wants to carry out repairs properly, he must charge the

appropriate price. However, he is being pressured by the insurance companies to engage in shoddy workmanship.

This morning I was told by a motor body panel repairer that he found the fill on the door panel of a car brought to him to be one inch thick. That gets back to the aspect of rust in vehicles. It occurs not only in the doors but in other parts of the body as well. Some panel beaters do not bother to cut out rusted portions, nor do they bother to weld in new pieces. They simply fill.

The problem comes back not only to those in the industry who do the wrong thing and cut costs—the industry will always have those people in it—but also to the insurance companies that exert pressure on motor body repairers.

An insurance assessor walks into a repair shop and asks, "What is your quote?" The panel beater tells him a certain amount. The assessor says, "No, we won't cop that. We have cut it by \$200." Or, alternatively, if the panel beater tells the assessor that he has assessed the cost at the rate of \$15 an hour, the assessor says, "No. You can have the job if you reduce it to \$11 an hour." What does the panel beater do? Does he play Santa Claus? Of course not. He must make a living, so he reduces the quality of his work. That type of thing happens all the time. Repair firms base their quotes on the hours of work involved and the cost of the parts that will be required. However, it is the insurance company that determines what will be paid. Something has to be done about this matter.

This morning I was told of a Falcon utility that was brought into a workshop and was found to be totally rusted out. When it was investigated, it was found that the space between the inner panel and the outer panel had been completely stuffed with chicken wire, newspaper and weld mesh. Surely that is making a mockery of our laws relating to road safety and road-worthiness. I am not sure that the Insurance Commissioner is even aware of it. It is a matter of concern to everyone. Admittedly it does not relate completely to third-party insurance, but it could relate to the number of accidents that occur. Many vehicles are unroadworthy simply because they have not been repaired properly because the money for it is not available.

The worst part is that the consumer has no real say. He cannot decide where his car will be fixed; the insurance company does that. If a local panel-beater does not do what the insurance company wants he goes out of business.

These practices are not confined to Brisbane. I have received complaints from all over Queensland. In many instances, the panel-beater, like the consumer, is the meat in the sandwich. Either the panel-beater plays the game as it is called by the insurance companies or he is out of business. He has no choice. He has to cut the quality of the job to meet the insurance company's

demands. This certainly means that dangerous vehicles are on the road. The time has come for a full investigation of the panel-beating industry and the insurance industry generally.

This is not the only plight that we are facing today. You, Mr Deputy Speaker, must be aware of the difficulties faced by motor vehicle insurees when it comes to the settlement of claims. When a person does not insure his car—and surely that is the right of any person, although I would counsel against it—and he is involved in an accident, he is faced with the dilemma of settlement on a percentage basis. Previously I have cited cases in which accident claims have been settled on an 80/20, 70/30 or 60/40 basis. The people concerned have to cop it because the insurance companies say "Either you take that or you take us to court". Maybe the argument is over \$300 or \$400, but the consumer knows that the moment he enters court it will cost him \$400 or \$500. He also knows that the magistrate will be bound by the 1968 case in which a learned judge decided that everybody, in some way, contributes towards an accident; there is a degree of contribution, therefore there has to be a degree of liability for repairs and costs.

Recently I spoke once again to an insurance company about this matter. I said, "Will you please tell me when a motorist does not contribute to an accident?" I was told, "The only time is when he has parked his vehicle legally and is not in it." That seems to be ridiculous. I asked, "Why can't he be in that position if he parks his vehicle legally and is sitting in it?" He replied, "It is quite possible that he could see the oncoming danger and he would have the opportunity to start up his car and get out of the way. Based on the judge's decision it is possible that he may have contributed to the problem that arose."

People who cannot afford to pay insurance are being forced into a rather difficult situation. Not long ago I was told of a case where settlement was offered on the basis of 80/20. The fellow who was in the right—the other fellow had taken right of way—had to pay 20 per cent of the costs amounting to about \$2,600. The damage to his vehicle was worth about \$400. When we work it out we see the terrific difficulty he was in. He had to pay about \$520 as his contribution towards repairing the damage to the other person's car and about \$80 towards the repair of his own car—yet he was in the right. There are many other similar instances. A private person cannot afford to institute a court case.

Whilst I have taken advantage of the privilege of this Assembly in raising these other matters, I suggest that the time is appropriate to clear up these difficulties, to relook at the percentage settlement basis used to resolve accident claims and to clean up the repair industry. The consumers are suffering and small businessmen are failing.

Mr K. J. HOOPER (Archerfield) (2.34 p.m.): I agree with the sentiments expressed by my colleague the honourable member for Rockhampton, the Opposition shadow Treasurer, about the legislation to indemnify motorists whose vehicles are insured with Associated General Contractors Insurance Company Limited.

Recently I have had occasion to learn the vagaries of the motor vehicle industry at first hand. I would point out that there are a lot of loopholes and anomalies in some insurance company policies in relation to motor vehicles. The abolition of introductory speeches has made it difficult to participate in this type of debate, but members have been promised a certain amount of latitude when speaking in second-reading debates. That is a very sensible decision.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Row): Order! I take it that the honourable member will respect the position of the Chair in relation to this particular matter?

Mr K. J. HOOPER: At all times, Mr Deputy Speaker.

I want to take this opportunity to refer to the alarm expressed by the Commonwealth Insurance Commissioner in relation to malpractices in insurance in Queensland. The grave concern expressed by the Commonwealth Insurance Commission regarding the practice of what is known in the insurance industry as twisting has been brought to my attention. That is the practice of enlisting policy-holders to replace one policy for the benefit of a party other than the policy-holder. Usually the agent or broker arranging the new policy receives a commission on the replacement policy.

I would like to take this opportunity this afternoon to pose the following questions to the Treasurer: Firstly, is the practice of twisting more prevalent in Queensland than in other States? Secondly, does the Government's own office, the SGIO, have records available from their analysis of discontinuance of existing policies by way of lapse or surrender which could indicate the extent of twisting? Thirdly, if not, should not the SGIO establish such facts to ensure that the forfeiture of cover, and the loss which can be suffered by policy-holders, is principally by genuine change of needs of the policy-holder in most cases, and is not the result of either unscrupulous operators peddling insurance in the market-place solely for personal profit and without due regard to the interests of their policy-holders, or lack of application of the principle of selling to the needs of prospective policy-holders?

There are some over-zealous salesmen who sell policies to the poor old consumer knowing that they contain a lot of loopholes and anomalies. Motivated by the wish to obtain commissions, salesmen engage in snide practices. I think we all know that all insurance salesmen have this same motivation. All members would have received numerous complaints from their constituents

about the snide practices engaged in by some of these salesmen: they come round after dinner at night and will do anything to sell a policy.

Mr Davis: They're bogus.

Mr K. J. HOOPER: Some of them are bogus salesmen, and some are only glorified confidence men. After the policy is sold, unless the consumer is an intelligent man who has the tertiary background of the Treasurer he cannot look for the loopholes in the policy and does not read the fine print.

Dr Edwards: That is the nicest thing you have said about me for a long time.

Mr K. J. HOOPER: I will pay the Treasurer this compliment: he has the advantage over me in that I have had only a third-grade Westbrook education while he has had a tertiary education, but possibly what I lack in not having the Treasurer's tertiary education I make up in brilliance and native peasant cunning and, I should add, common sense.

In all seriousness, every member of this House knows that the principal underwriters of insurance in Queensland are the SGIO, the AMP, the T & G and the National Mutual Life, and they are owned solely by their policy-holders, either directly or indirectly. As the Treasurer would well know, they are concerned about the unethical practices of certain foreign-owned companies, most of them very active in motor vehicle insurance, which allow doubtful practices to carve out a market in Australia dominated by overseas multinational companies.

I am also alarmed at reports that some Queensland building societies are asking for a policy in force for not more than one month as collateral for housing loans. This is nothing short of scandalous; it is just a confidence trick perpetrated by some of these unethical building societies on the poor old home buyer.

Mr Davis: Shoddy.

Mr K. J. HOOPER: That is right, but I will not deal with shoddy builders because they are a different subject altogether. I am referring to young people who are seeking to obtain a loan through a building society and the standover tactics employed by some societies in forcing insurance on them. If this is true, it is nothing short of scandalous. It is a snide form of blackmail of young couples who are seeking homes. If what I am saying was not correct, there would be a chorus of howls and interjections from the Government side of the House. I pay Government members this tribute: I think they realise, as all members of the Opposition do, that some of these building societies are exploiting young couples.

It would appear that the main result of this action by these building societies is to accrue funds by way of commission payments on new policies underwritten by foreign insurance companies. I would like an assurance from the Treasurer that home seekers have not suffered, and are not still suffering, significant losses as a result of current building societies encouraging them to prematurely cancel their insurance to court a housing loan.

I am interested to know the position of a policy-holder who cancelled a policy with the intention of effecting a new cover with a building society or motor vehicle insurer but who was then rejected by that insurer on health grounds. The question I pose to the Treasurer is: Would the building society or motor vehicle insurer be legally liable to provide for his dependants or, as is probable, would his widow and orphans be just more victims of financial greed and corruption by these insurance companies? Also, is there any action proposed by the Treasurer to ensure that widows and orphans are not victimised in this way by some of these rapacious building societies and motor vehicle insurers? I demand to know from the Treasurer what the Government is going to do in relation to the unethical policy of twisting, particularly with its own significant involvement in life insurance through the auspices of the SGIO. Is the Government prepared to make a stand in support of the views taken by the Insurance Commissioner in its own area of responsibility, namely, the building societies?

Hon. L. R. EDWARDS (Ipswich—Deputy Premier and Treasurer) (2.42 p.m.), in reply: I thank Opposition members for their comments. I recognise, as both honourable members have done, that their particular comments were not solely related to the Bill before the House. The member for Rockhampton referred to motor vehicle repairers. That matter is of great concern to many people. As he indicated, it refers to comprehensive motor vehicle insurance rather than comprehensive third-party insurance. He drew this matter to the attention of the House. No doubt he will be writing to me or to the relevant Minister so that we can have the matter investigated. I look forward to hearing from him.

The honourable member asked whether in fact we are recovering moneys from the insurance companies that have gone into liquidation. I can assure him, from information available to me at this stage, that full recovery has been received from the Standard Insurance Company and the Seven Seas Insurance Company. Some recoveries are expected from other failed insurance companies depending on the final liquidation dividend which, according to the advice I have received, has not yet been finalised. This information does indicate that we have had full recovery from at least one or

two of the companies, and we are hopeful that there will be continual recovery from the other companies in liquidation.

As to the supervision of insurance companies—the Commonwealth Government is now supervising insurance companies, and the question of strengthening this supervision is being widely discussed. No doubt these matters are under consideration at the present time.

The honourable member for Archerfield, as usual, made a very useful contribution to the debate. Whilst it was not related to the Bill under discussion, it raised some interesting points. His comment about twisting relates to life insurance and not to compulsory third-party insurance. He has raised a matter that is not necessarily confined to Queensland. It is an Australia-wide problem which is worrying responsible life offices throughout Australia.

Mr K. J. Hooper: You would not agree, though, that it is a practice that should be stamped out?

Dr EDWARDS: I think it is a practice that the responsible insurance companies would like to stamp out. Every effort will be made to find ways in which we can deal with this problem. That will be very difficult. No doubt the people who lose are the policy-holders who surrender their policies at the request of the company and try to take out new ones.

I thank honourable members for their support of the Bill.

Motion (Dr Edwards) agreed to.

COMMITTEE

The Chairman of Committees (Mr. W. D. Hewitt, Greenslopes) in the chair; Hon. L. R. Edwards (Ipswich—Deputy Premier and Treasurer) in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 8, as read, agreed to.

Clause 9—Particulars of claim to be furnished to Nominal Defendant—

Mr WRIGHT (2.46 p.m.): Throughout the legislation the Deputy Premier has gone to great pains to ensure that those who have claims pending are able to get due redress. However, I note that he says that such notification shall be given not later than 30 June 1981. That is ten months away and, although that seems to be a reasonable period, it would naturally depend on the amount of publicity and notice given to those persons who in fact may be claimants. The Deputy Premier may be able to explain what he intends to do, because I notice that further on it is also stated that those who make claims outside that period will lose any right of claim. Would he make some comment on that?

Dr EDWARDS: The matter will be widely publicised. If I remember correctly from my introductory speech, only 12 people have

outstanding claims. They will have to forward their claims to the Nominal Defendant before the prescribed time.

Mr Wright: As there are only 12 of them, they could be notified individually.

Dr EDWARDS: I will take that up with the commissioner to see if that is possible.

Clause 9, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 10 and 11, as read, agreed to.

Clause 12—Duty of Liquidator and Company's officers—

Mr BURNS (2.48 p.m.): I have been watching the liquidation of a number of companies lately and I have found that in some cases people who have been winding-up companies have made reports to Government departments specifically stating that officers or groups of people have acted against the law, or have acted in such a way that the law should be amended, or that there should be some alterations to a specific Act of this Parliament. All I am asking is that, once the report is supplied to the Nominal Defendant, any material of importance to this Parliament be brought to its attention. We have had this sort of thing happen with dozens of insurance companies, including VIP Insurance. In many instances, such as the case of Palmdale, reports should be made available to the Parliament so some action can be taken. I know of some liquidators' reports that have suggested that certain company directors have acted outside the law, but little or no action has been taken against them. As there are a number of rackets in many of these areas, I would like to see some action taken.

Dr EDWARDS: There is no doubt that all responsible Governments have taken action where there is evidence of breaches of the law. I give the honourable member the assurance that if such a breach is drawn to our attention, and if in fact it has occurred, it will be drawn to the attention of the authorities.

Clause 12, as read, agreed to.

Bill reported, without amendment.

THIRD READING

Bill, on motion of Dr Edwards, by leave, read a third time.

GRIFFITH UNIVERSITY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

SECOND READING—RESUMPTION OF DEBATE

Debate resumed from 21 August (see p. 150) on Mr Bird's motion—

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

Mr SHAW (Wynnum) (2.51 p.m.): In introducing the Bill, the Minister indicated that it is largely a machinery measure that has the intention of updating the Act in the

second revision since the establishment of the Griffith University. It appears that a few clauses might cause concern. I ask the Minister if he would consider his statement about the reduction to two years of the period for which students are appointed to the council. The reason advanced for that was that students would be loath to seek appointment in their first year of a course. I well understand why that could be so. Assuming that a student was on a three-year course and was appointed at the commencement of his second year, he would see out nicely his two years, which would take him to the end of his course. The question arises: what happens to those few students who might like to seek election in the first year of a course? There is nothing in the Act, as I understand it—

Mr Bird: They could be reappointed at the end of their two-year term.

Mr SHAW: There is nothing to preclude them, as I see it, from standing again. However, I would have thought there would have been a disincentive there. I take it that they would only be elected for that one year instead of a further two-year term.

Mr Bird: If they were to be there for a further two years, there would be nothing to prevent them from being reappointed for an additional two years.

Mr SHAW: Another clause which will probably cause some comment is that which validates, if such be necessary, the appointment of the vice-chancellor. The only comment I would make is that the purpose of the exercise must be to ensure the ongoing operations of the university. There can be nothing wrong with making absolutely certain that the actions of the council of the university in the past and the appointment and reappointment of the vice-chancellor are in fact entirely legal. I do not think anybody has ever suggested that there was anything improper about it; it is only a matter of putting it beyond doubt.

The Bill authorises the council to make statutes covering the ownership of inventions. This, of course, would be a grey area. We do not get to see the statutes. We do not know what the statutes are going to be. However, the Minister has obviously been assured that the university has the best of intentions and nothing in those statutes will discourage people at the university from carrying out their tasks as they are expected to. In turn, we in the House must accept the Minister's assurances that that will be so.

In referring to the matter of research in universities, I urge the Government to assist universities to carry out research to a far greater extent than they are able to at present. Much more research must be done in the universities, and I think it is to the shame of the present Federal Government that it has not fulfilled its promises to make more funds available

for that purpose. I have in mind particularly the energy problem, which is exercising the minds of many people in the community. The history of successful research shows that it very rarely occurs in universities and that solutions are rarely found by a particular group studying a problem. Nevertheless, universities have a very important part to play in assisting private researchers who come up with something that looks like being the answer. Further development is then required, and it can best be carried out in universities or institutes of higher learning.

In my opinion, we ought to be encouraging the universities and providing them with the wherewithal to ensure that research work is carried on. Often people in the community come forward with ideas to solve problems, but they are forced to take them overseas and seek assistance to develop them. Assistance should be available in this country. If we are ever to make Australia the great nation that the Prime Minister and other members of Federal Government insist that they wish it to be, they are going to have to put their money on the line and provide real assistance.

Similarly, there is a great need to maintain availability of university education for all students in this State. Unfortunately, because of the across-the-board cut-backs that are being made in education funding, university education is becoming available to fewer and fewer people. The Prime Minister has quite obviously set out to see that attendance at universities is based, as it was in years gone by, on class, not on ability. I was quite surprised last year to hear a very senior member of the Liberal Party in Queensland say that it is a great pity that no longer can a doctor be certain that his son can enter university and study medicine. I do not think it is a pity. It is a pity that a great many people who wish to enter courses that are popular cannot do so because there are too few places available. However, I fully support the concept of places being available in the universities for all those who have the ability to pursue a university course.

There is a great need for the Government in Canberra, and the Prime Minister in particular, to get the priorities right, and I condemn the funding of a university such as Casey, in Canberra, with the aim of promoting the education of members of the armed forces. In my opinion, the money would be better spent in existing universities, particularly Griffith and the University of Queensland, and in CAEs. From a philosophical point of view, I think that it would be preferable for defence personnel to be educated in universities of that type, to mix with all sections of the community, rather than be cloistered in their own narrow environment. From the point of view of efficiency alone, the money would be far better spent in existing universities.

Whilst on the subject, I also condemn the miserable payments made to students by way of tertiary allowance. As we know, the allowance is subject to a rigid means test. We are told that in the very near future the allowance will be increased. That could have something to do with the fact that an election is imminent. Election-time is the only time when the allowance is adjusted. Perhaps it is only a coincidence that the allowance was last adjusted three years ago. Even after the forthcoming adjustment, the allowance will still be a lower sum than that available to the unemployed.

I do not know whether the Government wants to perpetuate the belief that university education should be gained only as the result of great personal sacrifice and that people should starve in attics while undertaking it, but no reasonable person would go along with the concept that a university student should be required to exist on a sum of money that is even less than the unemployment benefit, which is supposed to be the lowest sum on which a person should be expected to live.

The temptation is there for university students to register for unemployment benefits and attend university at the same time. Of course, a prerequisite to the receipt of unemployment benefit is that the person seeking it should sit around and virtually do nothing while he is supposedly seeking employment. That means that the university student is ruled out on that ground alone.

I congratulate Griffith University on the very fine reputation that it has gained particularly in the field of Asian studies. If world affairs continue to develop as they have, it is inevitable that Australia will become closer to and more involved with its near-Asian neighbours. The work carried out by Griffith University in the field of Asian studies assumes great importance.

This fact was impressed upon Opposition members who recently paid an official visit to China. We visited several Chinese universities, where we were able to have considerable discussion not only with the faculty staff but also with the students on both a formal and an informal level.

It was interesting to learn that universities in China are extremely anxious to engage in greater cultural exchanges with Australians generally and with Queensland universities in particular. They have sought an interchange of ideas and are very anxious to conduct an ongoing relationship with our universities. I see this as being of great benefit to our community in Australia. Not only will it achieve an exchange of cultures, it will also bring about a better understanding of the cultures of other countries. That will enable us to conduct trade with those countries on a higher level.

I shall not digress from the Bill and start discussing trade negotiations between Queensland and our Asian neighbours, but

I want to point out that we can benefit a great deal from a study and better understanding of the Chinese culture. If we understood the Chinese culture and their ways, we would be able to conduct our business relations with them to our great benefit.

A better understanding of the Chinese culture is important in matters of defence. I was somewhat surprised to learn that the Chinese viewed an alliance with Australia as being of utmost importance. It would seem to me that we stood to gain more from such an alliance.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Row): Order! I think the honourable member is getting off the subject.

Mr SHAW: I am relating it to the university. I bow to your ruling, of course.

I was encouraged by a recent statement by the honourable member for Sherwood who reminded us that, in the absence of Mr Speaker, Mr Acting Speaker (The Chairman of Committees) gave an undertaking that we would be allowed a great degree of latitude in the second-reading debate. He said, in fact, that at no time had anybody been pulled up.

Mr Lee: You are arguing with the Chair.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I do not wish to enter into a debate with the honourable member about the latitude to be allowed by the Chair. I suggest that reason should apply on both sides. The Chair will be reasonable if the honourable member speaking is reasonable in the degree that he strays from the subject. I ask the honourable member to come back to the Griffith University Act Amendment Bill.

Mr SHAW: I said I would accept your ruling, Mr Deputy Speaker. I understand that you are not bound by what other people say.

Mr Lee: That is an insult to the Chair.

Mr SHAW: It is unfortunate that you are not bound by your own policies.

Mr Lee: That is another insult to the Chair.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member to come back to the Bill and suggest that honourable members do not provoke the speaker.

Mr SHAW: A great number of benefits will be derived from Asian studies such as those being conducted at the Griffith University. There are reasons, which I think I have explained sufficiently, for the Government's expending public money to further these studies. As I said, far greater encouragement and involvement must be undertaken by the Government in many of the university's functions. I hope that a medical school will be incorporated in the Griffith University.

Mrs Kyburz: It is not necessary.

Mr SHAW: I think it is necessary because of the great shortage of vacancies in our universities for people wanting to get into medicine.

Mrs Kyburz: There is an oversupply of doctors.

Mr SHAW: If there is an oversupply, one reason would be that we have imported too many from overseas countries. However, I do not think there is a shortage.

Mrs Kyburz: Don't you?

Mr SHAW: No. If doctors can earn the salaries that they do, and we continue to experience difficulty in getting to see doctors, we can well afford to educate a few more of them.

The Griffith University is situated close to the proposed Mt Gravatt Hospital, which should eventually become a teaching hospital.

Mrs Kyburz: It is not a teaching hospital.

Mr SHAW: As yet it is not a hospital at all. It has been on the drawing board for quite a few years. Eventually it will become a hospital and ultimately, I should hope, it will be a suitable teaching hospital. To be a teaching hospital, a hospital needs all the facilities that a good hospital should have.

Mrs Kyburz: interjected.

Mr SHAW: I cannot enter into a debate with the honourable member because Mr Deputy Speaker will pull me up.

The Griffith University is ideally situated for courses in nurse training. I noted in answer to a question this morning that the Minister said that Cabinet had decided, in relation to the Sax Report, that the Queensland Government would not initiate the advanced training of nurses at the tertiary level without the support of the Federal Government.

Mr Bird: It was proposed that the nurse training would be in colleges of advanced education, not in universities.

Mr SHAW: Would that eliminate universities?

Mr Bird: No.

Mr SHAW: Personally I can see no reason why we should differentiate between the two. Generally, there has been a movement of the CAEs closer to the universities. Many people would prefer to see them moving more towards the technical colleges. The general pressure has been more towards the university level.

Mr Bird: It depends on the level of training required, and that level of training would not be necessary in other than a college of advanced education.

Mr SHAW: I accept the Minister's point, but it is a technical point. Despite the attitude of the Federal Government which has almost totally rejected the concept of nurse education

in any tertiary institution whatsoever but has opted more for training in hospitals, I personally believe that if we are going to have an advanced course for nurses, as is being suggested, it would be eminently suitable that it should take place in a university such as Griffith which is situated so close to a hospital. But we seem to be getting nowhere with the problem. While the Queensland Cabinet is saying that it is not opposed to the idea of some sort of tertiary education for nurses but that it wants to have the Federal Government give the lead in this matter, at the same time Mr Fife is saying that most of the issues involved in the schools report are matters for consideration and implementation by the States.

Mr Bird: The funding for this comes from the Commonwealth, and the Commonwealth has indicated that it does not want us to move into that area of nurse training at this time.

Mr SHAW: It seems to be one more instance of talking about improvements and policies that are going to be wonderful things but never ever trying to implement them.

Mrs Kyburz: Do you believe nurse education should go into universities?

Mr SHAW: I believe that what the Federal Government is supporting is a concept of cheap labour in hospitals. It wants to maintain nurses as a cheap labour force as applied in the past.

Mrs Kyburz: They are quite well paid.

Mr SHAW: That is a debatable issue. They are certainly going to be higher paid, and it will cost the hospitals a lot more if they are educated entirely in an academic institution. I do not intend to urge that that is a point not worthy of consideration—I think that it is—but what I have said is that I think that what has happened is that the concept is being overlooked because nobody is prepared to pick up the ball and run with it.

With your indulgence, Mr Deputy Speaker, I would just offer my congratulations to Griffith University on the way it has come forward with the idea for using the institution in association with the Commonwealth Games. It did show a certain amount of initiative, and I think it should be congratulated for it.

I would also like to quickly refer generally to the administration of our tertiary institutions, and in association with that I want to ask the Minister whether any consideration is to be given to the recommendations of the parliamentary committee of inquiry in this regard. Again let me hasten to say that I am not committing the Opposition to support for some of the recommendations in regard to tertiary education—

Mr Bird: You are still agreeing that the Minister for Education in Queensland does the work of two men?

Mr SHAW: I agree that he is overworked, but I do not think that necessarily the best way of overcoming the Minister's problems is to appoint a Minister for Tertiary Education. Some of the recommendations were debated in this House and an indication was given as to what the Government stand on them would be.

In particular, I refer to something that happened just recently in the field of human relationships. One of the recommendations was that there should be a human relationships course in our schools; and such a course would involve sex education. Sex education is being taught in some of our schools at the present time, but unfortunately it is being done in an unsupervised way. I wish to refer to a recent visit to Brisbane by a Mr Derek Llewellyn-Jones, who was pushing his book "Understanding Sexuality".

Dr Lockwood: Have you read it?

Mr SHAW: Yes, I have.

I do not wish to set myself up as an expert in these matters; I freely admit that I am not. I do not believe that it is the prerogative of politicians to set up courses. I believe that they have to present the views of parents. In playing that role, I believe that that book by Mr Llewellyn-Jones is not suitable for use in our schools. The type of human relationships course that we on this side of the House would support would not incorporate that book.

I am concerned that the book found its way into our schools. To the credit of the teachers and the education system generally, it was discovered and withdrawn. I do not know why it was withdrawn, but I would withdraw it because I believe it covered too wide an age span. A book should suit the maturity of the particular child to whom it is given. This book covers a range of children from those who have a very elementary knowledge of these matters to those who have a very advanced knowledge of them. I do not object to what the Education Department did in this instance. I think it acted quite correctly. However, it would be far better if this sort of thing could be properly controlled. There should be a set of rules and regulations governing the introduction of human relationships courses in our schools.

Mr W. D. HEWITT (Greenslopes) (3.18 p.m.): The Griffith University Act that we are amending today was first assented to in this State on 30 September 1971. We look therefore at a university that is not yet nine years old. As far as universities go, it could be described as no more than a lusty youngster. Its fine traditions have yet to be moulded and its best and finest hours still lie ahead of it. It developed fast. It has already established a fine reputation and has offered particularly outstanding courses, some of which the Opposition spokesman has referred to this afternoon.

Certainly the building and the surrounds are aesthetically pleasing, and it is a delight on any occasion to visit that campus. The last-published figures showed that it had an academic staff of 304 and a student enrolment of 1 610. One can contrast it with the James Cook University with an enrolment of 1 831 and the University of Queensland with an enormous student enrolment of 18 517. So, compared with the University of Queensland, it is in every sense still a thriving youngster.

The degrees that the university offers are interesting, and some of them are unique. Certainly they are praiseworthy. The five faculties offered are the School of Australian Environmental Studies, the School of Humanities, the School of Modern Asian Studies, the School of Science and the Centre for the Advancement of Learning and Teaching. It was appropriate that the Opposition speaker should refer to two of those because they are very important. I refer first of all to the School of Australian Environmental Studies. To the best of my knowledge, no other similar course is offered anywhere else in Australia.

Mrs Kyburz: Armidale.

Mr W. D. HEWITT: I stand corrected by my colleague the member for Salisbury. Such courses are, however, still very few in number.

Australian Environmental Studies is certainly a course that is deserving of close interest and the support of this Parliament, because ours is still an environment that is being developed, explored and, to some extent, exploited. It is important that people study the environment closely so that they are at hand to give advice to the decision-makers and to let us know the extent to which the environment can be used without its being devastated.

It is interesting to look at some of the areas of research that were probed in the recent past. The School of Australian Environmental Studies at Griffith University studied the ecology and productivity of estuarine, mangrove and seagrass communities, and the management problems and strategies in agricultural, terrestrial and aquatic systems requiring multi-disciplinary team solution.

I do not intend to read all of these but one is of particular interest to people in the practical business of politics, namely, the politics of the environment; the implications of environmental problems for political philosophy and policy analysis, especially with reference to environmental issues; problems in social choice theory and political decision-making and relevant aspects of democratic theory and social psychology. It would be interesting to know if any of the graduates in that course have ever been prevailed upon to give their advice to people who are embarking upon certain projects where the environment must be disturbed,

because the disciplines involved there suggest that their advice could be very useful indeed. The fact is that we must live more and more in closer communion with the environment, using it to our advantage and, on the other hand, making sure that it is preserved for posterity and not devastated or put beyond future use. So the School of Australian Environmental Studies serves a useful purpose in that regard.

Also of great significance and value is the School of Modern Asian Studies. I refer particularly to the discipline with respect to Japan. Part of the university's report states—

"In 1978, research on Japan focused on the country's political, economic and social structure during the twentieth century, and on the structure and characteristics of the contemporary Japanese society. This included work on the organization and activities of Japanese companies; the modern Japanese economy, and its place in the world economic order; international relations; income distribution and wage differentials; post-war literature; and the image of Australia projected by Japanese mass media."

In recent months, in company with a number of other colleagues, I had the great pleasure of spending 12 days in Japan. We were able to experience at first hand the great pulsating nation that is Japan. For better or worse—I do not resile from it—because of our economic relationship we are closely related to Japan. It is a poor compliment to that country that we apparently understand so little of its culture, economy, trade and its people. That Griffith University has a discipline applying itself to those studies is totally appropriate. I am sure that for many years into the future there will be a great interdependence between Japan and Australia, and that thrusts a great responsibility and obligation upon us all to understand more about that country.

In the same light that I have referred to Australian Environmental Studies, I believe also that graduates from Griffith in Modern Asian Studies could serve this Government very well indeed by placing at its disposal the expertise that they have been able to amass. I refer particularly to one of the graduates in that discipline, Miss Patience Thoms, who was at one time the editress of the women's section of "The Courier-Mail". She is a most distinguished person who undertook this study after her retirement from journalism. In consequence, her knowledge of Asia is quite profound and her willingness to share that knowledge is most commendable. I cite her as being typical of many students who have now passed through that course with, I am sure, great advantage to themselves and, hopefully, with great advantage to the State.

One would hope that when diplomatic postings and appointments are made people holding this degree would have that taken

very much into account. It is of very little value to send representatives to Japan if they do not understand the country they are visiting. Apart from posting people to Japan, we now have so many Japanese businessmen visiting this country that it is useful to have graduates in such a series of studies who can give advice to the Government on the Japanese economy and all of those things that are important to that great nation. Therefore, I particularly commend those two schools in Griffith and hope that they continue to enjoy the support that they deserve. I hope that their graduates can serve this State with great distinction.

When we talk about the Griffith University, we talk about a tertiary institution—post-secondary—and therefore the recommendations of the Select Committee on Education in Queensland should be referred to in this context. We all know that the select committee of inquiry recommended that a separate ministry be established in the field of education, to be designated the Ministry for Post-secondary Education, the thrust of the argument being that, with the best will in the world, the work-load for all education, from pre-school right to tertiary institutions, is too heavy for any one person. The Minister and I have enjoyed too close a friendship for a number of years now for him not to interpret those comments in any way to his detriment. I am sure he understands that the committee had his own welfare and good-will at hand when it brought forward that recommendation.

If there is a necessity for a different ministry in education, the logical place to pare some responsibilities is in the field of post-secondary education, so the select committee of inquiry brought that recommendation down. Consistent with that recommendation, it also suggested that a statutory council be established to be called the Advisory Council on Post-secondary Education, and it laid down a suggested membership. I do not intend to trespass upon the time of the Assembly by reading out the structure of that committee, but I think what is important is that we look at the functions of it, as those functions would certainly affect the Griffith University, which we are debating this afternoon.

The functions of the Advisory Council on Post-secondary Education were said to include the following—

“(a) To assist the Minister and the Government of the State in the formation of State views on the promotion, development and co-ordination of post-secondary education and, for that purpose, to make recommendations to the Minister on those matters having regard to the needs of the State, the number of students to be provided for and the financial and other resources available;

“(b) To advise the Minister on—

(i) the levels of financial support requested by post-secondary education

institutions or authorities governing such institutions, for the purposes of post-secondary education; and

(ii) requests for a variation from an approved triennial programme of a post-secondary education institution or an authority governing such institutions;

“(c) For the purpose of achieving rationalization of resources and the avoidance of unnecessary duplication to advise the Minister on—

(i) the need for review or discontinuance of the existing fields of study or courses offered by post-secondary institutions;

(ii) proposals for the introduction of new post-secondary education courses of study;

(iii) the need for new post-secondary education institutions; and

(iv) the closure or amalgamation of existing post-secondary institutions.”

The purpose of that would be to look at all tertiary institutions throughout the State, to rationalise their activity, to determine to what extent there is duplication or overlapping and, in a word, to be advisory on rationalisation. Neither that council nor the Minister for Post-secondary Education should be seen to be intrusive or taking any of the autonomy away from those institutions. I believe that that council and a post-secondary ministry would do an enormous amount in rationalising their activities and, indeed, in giving many of them the place in the sun that they yearn for. Certainly Griffith, offering these two very distinctive and important schools of study, could only benefit from such a course of action.

As to the amendments to the Act now proposed—there is little with which one could argue. Most of the recommendations seem to be reasonable rationalisation, referring to such terms as “permanent academic staff”, doing such things as reconstituting the council, providing for an acting vice-chancellor and a number of other things which are important to the university. They contain no controversy within them and, therefore, deserve no great argument.

However, I do refer to the provision that proposes to amend Part V—Statutes and Regulations—

“The Council may from time to time make Statutes not inconsistent with this Act with respect to all or any of the following matters, that is to say—”

and it then lists those things on which the council may make statutes. The amendment before us proposes that the council should be able to make statutes relating to the ownership and exploitation of inventions and discoveries which are the property of the university but which are produced by the staff or students. With great respect to the Minister, I do not believe that that is as definitive as it ought to be. It requires some further explanation, and I should

be grateful to him if he would explain exactly what is proposed. My own interpretation would be that the university itself would be able to take out patents upon inventions and be able to enjoy the exclusive use or whatever benefits flow because those patents have been taken out. If there is a broader interpretation than that, the Minister owes it to honourable members to explain exactly what is proposed, and I am sure that he will respond to that invitation.

Griffith is one of the great tertiary institutions on the south side of the river—as I constantly tell the House, the best part of Brisbane—

Honourable Members: Hear, hear!

Mr W. D. HEWITT: It is wonderful to receive such support. For that reason, I have particular interest in the institution; I have a particular affinity with it.

Mr K. J. Hooper: They tell me that the only time you went through a university was on a pushbike.

Mr W. D. HEWITT: That is correct. The world knows that I did not go past primary school. I am old enough now not to worry very much about that. I have never found myself at too much of a loss when it comes to verbal tussles, so I do not worry. I would have liked the opportunity to go through university. If the honourable member wishes me to tell him, I will even nominate the degree that I would have liked to take if my fortunes in life had been different.

Mr Prest: Political science.

Mr W. D. HEWITT: The honourable member is a poor guesser.

The fact is that Griffith is a great institution. It is in a sylvan setting on the south side of the river. Those of us who see it with some frequency are proud of it. We wish it well, and we hope that the amendments to the Act will further facilitate its administration.

Mrs KYBURZ (Salisbury) (3.33 p.m.): I shall canvass a few matters that have been raised in the debate and also mention a few new ones.

Today is a historic day for the Queensland Parliament and for legislation in this State. I refer to clause 23, an amendment of section 40, which omits discrimination on the basis of religion, politics, race and—at last, for Queensland—sex. This is the first time that such a clause has been written into any legislation in this State. It means that in appointments to the Convocation of the University or to the Senate, there cannot be discrimination on the grounds of religion, politics, race or sex. One would have presumed that that would not have been so in any case; but as institutions are wont to follow history, probably discrimination did take place. As I said, it is a historic occasion for Queensland, and I draw the attention of all honourable members to it.

The spokesman for the Opposition made a few points in his speech that I think were worthy of comment. He mentioned Casey University. I entirely agree that it is a waste of time. However, all Governments are inclined to put money where they see votes. That happened in the past with the establishment of the trade union training school, which was a waste of money. It was established only with a view to winning votes. It is an ongoing waste of money. However, the present Federal Government has not ceased funding it, so it is perpetuating the waste.

Obviously the Casey University was proposed primarily to boost the building that is going on in the Australian capital at the present time. That was undertaken probably in an attempt to hold a couple of Federal seats. Nobody batted an eyelid about it, even though people are constantly saying that money should not be wasted in such large proportions.

The housing at Griffith University deserves mention. We have just seen the opening of a new community development in housing. It is quite new in theory. My concern centres on whether or not highly paid members of the university staff are living in Government-subsidised housing. If that were happening, it would be quite intolerable. The housing was built primarily for students and is to be used in a second phase for the Commonwealth Games. It would be recalcitrant of the university senate if it were allowing staff to rent that housing, particularly if the staff were renting it cheaply. The setting of the university is such that it is a top-priority area for housing rental. I make that point. I think that money has been wasted on that housing, but that is just by the way. The sum of \$9m for a few units plonked in the bush in a very nice setting is a lot of money. Apparently the Griffith University council has made the decision as to who shall and who shall not use that housing. I simply ask the question of the Minister.

The points made by the honourable member for Greenslopes concerning post-secondary education and the committee of review are particularly important. Although the Select Committee on Education did recommend a new ministry, I do not agree with its recommendation. I cannot see why the Education portfolio should be split. The overview principle is very important in education. If the person who happens to be Minister does not have the ability to have an overview, nobody will suffer except that person himself and the ministry. It is important that post-secondary education be put in its true perspective together with pre-school education, primary education and secondary education. They are all equally important; each is as important as the other not only in the public's eye but also in the educators' eye.

We might as well say that we need a Minister for Pre-School Education or a Minister for Pre-teen Education. Both of those aspects of education are presently more important than post-secondary education. The developments that have taken place over the past 15 years in post-secondary education have been enormous and have far exceeded those in primary education. It is now quite fashionable—indeed it is Government policy—to have pre-schools and kindergarten education for children of five and six years of age. However, in the future we will see the development of education for children of an even younger age. I simply make the point that if we are going to have a Minister for Post-secondary Education we should also have a Minister for Primary Education or at least a Minister for Pre-teen Education. As I say, that is of greater importance than post-secondary education.

Clause 5, which amends section 5, concerns patenting by the university. Concern would arise only in the School of Science. I know that this matter has been raised and will continue to be raised by other institutions in Queensland. This aspect refers particularly to patents in the field of biology. Perhaps the Minister could set us straight on that. I do not know if anything has been developed at Griffith University that needs patenting, but it could well happen in the future.

Other honourable members have referred to the importance of the School of Modern Asian Studies. Its importance cannot be underestimated, and this is an area in which the Griffith University is playing a major part. I am very impressed by the number of female students in the School of Modern Asian Studies who are learning Japanese and Indonesian. These young women intend to work for mining and other companies trading with Japan and Indonesia. I point out, however, that they will have a very difficult time in Japan, where women are very much on the outer and are not allowed to enter the mainstream of business discussions. These students have a lot to learn, but it is wonderful that they are trying. It could well be that Australian women learning Japanese and Indonesian at our universities will teach the Japanese women something about how to get on in the business world. The university is tackling a modern concept in teaching these men and women students how to get on in the culture of the nations whose languages they are studying.

I was recently discussing this matter with a girl studying Japanese at the University of Queensland. She asked me what her prospects were in Japan. I said that they were very slim and that she would be very lucky to get a job unless she dressed as a man. She realises the difficulties ahead, even in working for a company in Australia.

The work being done by the School of Environmental Studies is obviously of great importance, particularly as it relates to water

quality control and the testing of the various creeks and streams around Brisbane. I do not know whether much of the work has been publicised, but occasionally I read of the important work being done there.

The patenting rights of the university are very important. This matter should be further clarified by the Minister. As I said in my opening remarks, I congratulate the council—I do not know whether it was the council or the department—on deciding to amend section 40 so that discrimination will no longer be allowed on the basis of sex. If the Minister is responsible for the amendment I congratulate him, because this is a historic point for the Parliament of Queensland.

Mr GUNN (Somerset) (3.43 p.m.): I add my support for the amendments in the Bill before us. At the same time I have a few words to say about Griffith University.

Mr K. J. Hooper: Do you know where it is?

Mr GUNN: If the honourable member listens for a while I will tell him how I came to be involved with Griffith University and the marvelous area in which it is situated.

I do not intend to compare the universities in Queensland. We should be extremely proud of all of them. My eldest son studied medicine at the University of Queensland. At the time, I believed the University of Queensland was a little large and a second university was needed in Brisbane. My eldest daughter attended Griffith University and gained her science degree. She went on to take first-class honours, and then took up a post as a biochemist with the CSIRO in Sydney. She is now in Amsterdam.

I am not using this Chamber to praise my family but to indicate the standing of Griffith University throughout Australia and indeed, the world. Its standing will become evident when I point out that when Jennifer applied for the position of biochemist there were 30 applicants from Australia and overseas, and she was the only one from Griffith University.

I should like to make a point that is not generally known, namely, that Dr David Doddrell, the son of our Sergeant-at-Arms, is a Doctor of Science at Griffith University. He is held in high esteem. He is one of the top scientists in the nation today. One has only to speak to any student who has had the pleasure of working with Dr David Doddrell to know what a top scientist he is.

The Department of Asian Studies has already been mentioned. It is in world class and we should be extremely proud of it. I would like to commend the student exchange system. I believe that there are some students who, if they have not already left, will leave within a short time on an exchange visit to China while some students

from that country come here. I think it is a marvellous innovation, and I hope it continues.

In the years since the Griffith University was established I have had the pleasure of watching quite a number of young people from my electorate going through the various courses. In fact, I have recommended the university to a number of them. It is pleasing for me to know that a number of them are now studying in various countries. I know one young man named Crombie, from the little township of Grandchester, who is now in Scotland studying the way various types of trees adapt to the climates of different European countries. The results of his studies could have some application in those inland areas of Australia which receive only sparse rainfall.

I do not agree with the honourable member for Wynnum that there is a need for a course in medicine at Griffith University. I believe that we have almost reached saturation point as far as medical practitioners are concerned. While the honourable member did say that it can be hard to get a doctor at certain times and in certain areas, I think we have to remember the number of doctors who have arrived from overseas recently and possibly block that particular loophole. I believe we train enough doctors ourselves, and I would not like to see the number of medical practitioners reach saturation point.

Mr Shaw: It would take three universities to match what they brought in from overseas in the last three years.

Mr GUNN: The honourable member said that we should stop this overseas invasion and use the doctors we train ourselves. I have found that some of these overseas doctors have come here for only one reason, and that is to make as many dollars as they can as quickly as possible. Unfortunately, the ones who went out into western areas have not given such good service.

Mr Burns: This Parliament changed the law a few times to make it easier for them to get here.

Mr GUNN: I am not commending that at all. I am suggesting that the situation should be rectified, and quickly. Perhaps we misjudged the situation and thought that we were not training enough doctors to meet our needs.

There has been a quota system instituted at the University of Queensland, and there has been a rush by people to enter the course that qualifies them to join what is a lucrative profession. A lot of young people have found after the first year that it is a damned hard course. I do not think a student has to be above average to get through the course, but he has to work extremely hard. But it does not end there; they do not just get the money put into their hands. My son is in private practice in Maryborough, and I know that he has

worked extremely hard to get where he is. I am not suggesting that he does not make money, and good money, but he has to work extremely hard and be on call seven days and nights a week unless he makes other arrangements. So I think we have just about reached saturation point as far as medical practitioners are concerned.

I would like to see the humanities and science courses at the Griffith University expanded. They have proved very successful, as have the courses in Asian and environmental studies. The university lends itself particularly to the study of those subjects. In fact, I would say that no university in Australia would be doing a better job as far as environmental studies are concerned.

I am pleased to see that living quarters are being erected at the Griffith University. They will serve a dual purpose: they will be used for the Commonwealth Games and later on by the students. I thought very hard about that matter before I allowed my daughter to attend the Griffith University. Fortunately, she was able to stay with her relatives.

I can see the Griffith University becoming very important. I hope that it does not become a big university and that it maintains the wonderful atmosphere that it has at present. I have always found the public relations at the Griffith University excellent. I have always enjoyed my visits there. Although no member of my family attends that university now, students from my electorate are continually writing to me inviting me to go there to have lunch with them. I have not been able to do so this year.

I have followed the university's progress very closely. I recommend it to any student who is considering a tertiary education. I do not think that anybody will have any arguments with the amendments before the House. They are timely. I have no doubt that they will be received well by this House and by the people of Queensland.

Mr POWELL (Isis) (3.51 p.m.): I rise this afternoon to support the measure before the House. As the previous speaker said, the amendments to this Act are timely. There are a few innovations that honourable members should note. I do not know how many members of Parliament have accepted the invitation by the registrar of the Griffith University to go to the university, have a look at it and speak with the staff and students. If members have received an invitation and have not so far taken advantage of it, my advice to them is to go and have a look at this very fine institution. Some members here are graduates and, like me, would have undertaken their undergraduate work at the University of Queensland. Probably our ideas of a university are rather stereotyped. I can say without any fear of contradiction that if I were an undergraduate now I would be heading towards the Griffith University.

The first impression I had of the Griffith University was its closeness to the city. In my undergraduate days I lived in the northern suburbs of Brisbane and I tended to think of any place on the southside as being somewhere near Southport. I found that I was able to drive very quickly from here to the Griffith University. The road network that leads to the university is very well designed. I suppose that the three tiers of government should be congratulated on the siting of the university.

The second thing I noticed about the university was the friendliness of the people there. I was an obvious stranger when I walked into the university, but the students quite readily said "Good morning" or "Good afternoon". The staff were only too happy to assist. I found a very healthy atmosphere in the university. I congratulate the registrar, the vice-chancellor and the staff for the atmosphere that they have created there.

The third thing I noticed about the university was that it is in a delightful bush setting. One of its major thrusts is the Australian Environmental Studies faculty. It has been very well sited in that area. All in all, I found the university to be very pleasant and conducive to study. Its friendliness is something that is needed in learning situations. Everybody concerned should be congratulated.

The amendment before the House provides for a few changes. The membership of the council is to be increased to 23, a measure which I support. I am very happy to see that general staff are defined and that they are represented on council. In my view that engenders a general attitude of happiness at the university; everybody is involved in the running of it.

The provision for the continuity of membership is also important. As the Minister pointed out, it would be most unlikely that a first-year student would want to get on to the council. Only when a student finds out what is going on at the university would he be concerned with council representation. Consequently the provision of three years seems to be wrong. The changes to the council are important ones and probably innovative in Queensland universities.

The provision for the appointment of pro-vice-chancellors is something that I fully support. That a person can be appointed for a specific time for a specific task is a very good idea. It is a valuable position to have in a university; it means that a person can carry out a task and then return to his normal academic duties.

A previous speaker in the debate spoke about a separate ministry for tertiary education, as was suggested in a report to Parliament by the Select Committee on Education in Queensland. I reject that argument. I do not think there is a need for a separate ministry for any section of education in Queensland. Education is fragmented enough now. The path that a child follows from

the time of entering school in Year 1 right up through his tertiary education has enough lumps and bumps in it as it is. In my view too many empires have been created in each of the individual areas of education. Quite frankly, the most sensible thing is to have the one ministry for Education as a whole so that students' lives can be gauged by the one department. I reject totally the proposition that one Minister cannot carry out the tasks. I am quite confident that it is a task quite easily administered by one Minister. I certainly would not like to see any breaking-up of the Education Department so that more emphasis was placed on one section than another. All sections of education are important, and although it is vital that the first-year student in a primary school has an excellent teacher, it is just as vital that the Year 12 student has an excellent teacher and also that students in tertiary institutions have excellent teachers.

Mr K. J. Hooper: As a former school-teacher yourself, do you think you could administer the Education portfolio?

Mr POWELL: Undoubtedly.

I believe that any fragmentation is bad indeed, and in fact work ought to be done to smooth out the change between Years 7 and 8, Years 10 and 11 and from Year 12 to tertiary work. But that leads into another argument that people at Griffith University and others in the State might well be interested in. I believe that certainly in Queensland, and perhaps in the rest of Australia, we ought to look seriously at the restructuring of the tertiary education system, or the post-secondary education system. To this time we have been hidebound by a certain sacred cow, and I use the words advisedly, with regard to apprenticeships. We have slavishly followed the system whereby to become an apprentice a person must have left secondary school, found a master and is learning a trade. Following that there is the block release training program. We all know, and we must face the facts, that young people are not obtaining apprenticeships where they wish to. Employers say that the reason for that is the high cost of employing an apprentice. I therefore believe that we should seriously consider this matter.

I see no reason at all why we should not be opting for a junior college and senior college system, under which students could leave school at the end of grade 10 and then move to, for want of a better term, a junior college—probably something equating TAFE institutions—and there undertake what could be a four-year course with a diploma at the end of it. They could then move into their trade or whatever field it was in which they obtained a diploma.

On the other hand, if at the end of the four years they wished to go on to further work which would give them extra tertiary qualifications, they should then be able to move to a university or perhaps a college

of advanced education, where they could obtain further qualifications. That system of cross-college work is quite common in the United States. I believe that we could well learn something from it, especially in Queensland, which is a decentralised State.

I know that it raises problems concerning the status of colleges of advanced education, technical and further education colleges and universities. Quite frankly, I think we have too many CAEs. I have no doubt that some of our friends in CAEs might disagree violently with that statement. However, it seems to me that CAEs are trying to raise themselves in academic standards to such an extent that they believe they are universities. I do not believe that they are universities. The CAEs should recognise that whilst they certainly have a part to play, it is similar to the part that TAFE colleges play. I would dearly love to see research done by the Education Department into whether in some areas, and on an experimental basis, we could not look seriously at restructuring the upper education level in our State.

I know that we have problems with Federal funding; "lack of Federal funding" perhaps is the best way to describe it. The Federal Government enters into all manner of schemes in education and then, after having seen a scheme started, it backs out and leaves the States to either find the funds or close down the initiative. Mostly, of course, we do not close down the initiative, because it is worthwhile and necessary. We then have to find the additional funds.

I would probably be arguing very strongly for a complete withdrawal of the Federal Government from education spending. In fact, I believe that the Federal Government should be handing back to the States a lot more of the income tax pool so that we would not experience the problems that we now have with our Budgets. I do not believe that the Federal Government has a place in education. The total funds spent ought to be given back to the States so that they could distribute them as they saw fit. The needs of Queensland are vastly different from those of Victoria. Victoria is a compact State that does not have Queensland's problems of distance.

While I am most impressed with the Griffith University and the excellence of its learning atmosphere—and, I might add, the employment record of people who come out of that university—I suppose I might selfishly claim that it is in the wrong place. I would much prefer to see it in Central Queensland. There are two universities in the South East and one in the North. Once again, Central Queensland is left out. I personally believe that there is need for a university in Central Queensland, because of the topography of our State.

We have a multiplicity of colleges of advanced education. We need more technical and further education colleges, all looking to take in grade 10 students in a

less formal atmosphere so that they can educate themselves and find employment in the community. That is the critical direction in which the whole education system ought to be steering itself.

One of the other speakers in this debate complained about the amendment that deals with the ownership and exploitation of inventions and discoveries that are the property of the university. He seemed to find something wrong with the provision, but I really cannot understand why he sees a problem. It seems to me to be a fairly usual provision that any invention made on university property, which has involved the use of university materials, time, laboratories, and so on, ought to remain the property of the university so that it can be exploited by that university. If the university has the ownership and control of it, we, the general public, are more likely to see the realisation of that invention.

I have mentioned the School of Australian Environmental Studies at Griffith University. It is really a marvellous innovation and is doing excellent work. The School of Modern Asian Studies is another school that should be congratulated on the work it is doing. Quite frankly, if I were a student again, knowing the world situation as I do, I would be looking to learn Cantonese. It is a language that Queenslanders in particular ought to be able to speak and converse in fluently. With our natural food bowl and manufacturing resources in this State, we are going to have to sell our products, and we have marvellous potential customers in China—

Mr K. J. Hooper: I agree with your sentiments, but the official language in China is Mandarin, commonly known as Peking. If the honourable member sees me after the House rises, I will coach him.

Mr POWELL: I am sure that the honourable member would be an expert in Pekinese. In fact, he is not unlike the four-footed animal that bears that name.

In my opinion, Cantonese is a language that we will all need to know. We ought to be able to converse in basic Chinese. There is no doubt that the Chinese are learning English and, when we negotiate with them, it will be very embarrassing if we have to sit mute while they discuss matters in their own language and we do not know what they are talking about. The Chinese language is one that we ought to be considering very seriously and not only in universities. I would hope that, coming from the School of Modern Asian Studies at Griffith University, there might be teachers who can teach that language in high schools.

The amendments before the House today are necessary. The House should support them without qualification, and I certainly do so myself.

Dr LOCKWOOD (Toowoomba North) (4.8 p.m.): Earlier the Opposition spokesman on education, the honourable member for Wynnum (Mr Eric Shaw), spoke about nursing education. It is true that the Federal Government has baulked at the proposal that there should be more nursing education through the colleges of advanced education. I can see quite well why it has baulked. Whether I agree with it or not is another matter. It has baulked because there will be a transfer of funding from Health budgets to Education budgets. Of course, if that is done, there will be a big transfer of the funding for nursing education from the State Budgets to the Commonwealth Budget.

Mr Powell: We don't want that.

Dr LOCKWOOD: We do not want that. We do not want to lose control of nursing education. However, I do not think that the Commonwealth wants to pick up the bill, so it has baulked.

At present, not enough is known about the real costs of nursing education because costs are hidden in hospital budgets. We cannot cost nursing education because so much of it is paid for from the private health funds, so much of it is paid for by Commonwealth and State Government subsidies to hospitals, and some of it, of course, is paid direct from charity, particularly in cases where private hospitals are raising funds.

Proposals have been put forward to increase the content of nursing education from 800 hours in each basic nursing course to 1 200 hours. That would be an added cost borne by the State, if the State pays for it, or by the Federal Government, if the Commonwealth pays for it. If it is done through a private hospital, that cost will have to be borne directly by the patients at that private hospital and by the charities that work to support it. This is one of the matters that have not been thrashed out fully at Government level. Whether we should be supporting an increase from 800 to 1 200 hours in the basic nursing course, without finding out fully where the funds will come from, is by no means certain.

It is quite easy to say that the funds will come from the Government. But here we have an example of the Federal Government's baulking at the cost. I venture to suggest that the State Government would need to be extremely careful in what it does in funding the additional 400 hours in training.

The basic fact is that insufficient is known about the real cost of nursing education. A proposal has been put forward by the Royal Australian Nursing Federation that 2 200 to 2 400 nurses should be undertaking basic training at colleges of advanced education throughout Australia. The federation believes that, if that number of trainee nurses were in the colleges, statistics would show that some real cost benefits could be considered. It could be determined whether a real cost

benefit advantage can be gained from having nurses trained in colleges of advanced education rather than under the existing system that most nurses use, that is, training through a hospital-based program. The honourable member for Wynnum was trying to get this point across, but I do not know that he fully grasped the significance of what he was told.

The nurses feel that nurses undergoing a course of training in which they have lectures, say, on medicine while they are undergoing a term in the surgical ward do not get the full benefits from either their term in the surgical ward or their lectures. The same applies to a demonstration in surgery while they are undertaking a term in a paediatric ward.

The nurses want their courses to closely follow those undertaken by medical students, not in content but in arrangement of courses. The nurses would like to have a lecture, a practical class and a demonstration—be it on models or in the ward—on one particular subject at a given time. That would mean there would be medical lectures, demonstrations, medical practical work and again demonstrations of what they had been told in the medical ward. This is much the same as the course undertaken by a medical student. The nursing federation believes that nurses would learn at a much faster rate under such a system, and that perhaps some cost advantages are to be gained from training a nurse to registration status in a much shorter time than is presently possible.

An analysis needs to be undertaken of the real cost of a nurse working in the ward while she is studying and attending lectures and practical classes, which disrupt her time in the ward. A study needs to be made of the real cost of that type of training and the cost of training in colleges of advanced education, where nursing aides and fully trained nurses provide the entire nursing care. I think this is what the honourable member for Wynnum was alluding to, but I am not sure he got the message across.

The nurses themselves are quite concerned at this refusal to fund more nursing courses in the colleges of advanced education. This matter is of particular interest to nurses in Queensland, because no nursing course is available in any college of advanced education in Queensland. This is something that the State needs to take before the Federal members of Parliament, all of whom, I am told, are seeking re-election. It is also something that the State needs to take before the Senate candidates who are seeking re-election. It is something that the nurses feel very strongly about. At this stage, the Federal Government has not made any allocations to nurse education programs in this State. Certainly it has not made any funding available for study by from 2 200 to 2 400 trainee nurses in the colleges of advanced education. No comparison has been made between the cost of that type of training and hospital-based training.

Hon. V. J. BIRD (Burdekin—Minister for Education) (4.15 p.m.), in reply: It is obvious from the debate this afternoon that nobody has any objection to the Bill or its contents. During the debate it became very clear that honourable members who spoke had the support of their fellow members and believed that the work done by all those associated with the Griffith University since its inception has been absolutely remarkable. As a member of the parliamentary education committee of the then Minister for Education I took part in discussions on setting up—and it seems to be only a few years ago—the council, and the establishment of the Griffith University as the third university in Queensland.

Today, as Minister for Education, I share in the pride of each honourable member who has spoken today about the work done by the council and all the members of the staff. It is understandable, I suppose, that in the nine years since its inception, the university should find a need to alter its governing Act to cover those things that have been found necessary.

In dealing with some of the matters raised by honourable members who spoke in the debate, I shall refer firstly to the contribution made by the honourable member for Wynnum who talked about students seeking a further term on the council. He was of the opinion that they could serve only the two-year period as set down in the Act, and thereafter would be called on to resign. As I said at the time students can seek re-election to the council. Of course, if their studies finished 12 months after their re-election they would no longer be students and would be required to resign from the council. There is nothing at all to stop their renominating for a further 12 months or two years on the council.

Mr Shaw: That does not really solve the problem. There could still be problems with this system as well.

Mr BIRD: I see nothing wrong with the system as proposed. At least it allows a student who is there for three years, and who decides that he does not want to be on the council in his first 12 months of study, to seek nomination to the council for the remaining two years.

The honourable member for Wynnum referred to that part of the legislation which validates the actions of the council and all those associated with it during the period between the vice-chancellor's original appointment and his recent reappointment as approved by the Governor in Council. As I said in my speech, there was some doubt about whether there was a need to have this validated by amending the Act, because this was simply a reappointment. To ensure that there would be no complications it was decided that the most appropriate course of action was to introduce an amendment.

There seems to be some confusion about the provision dealing with an invention and the taking out of patent rights. I have already tried to make it clear that any person who invents something in his own time or while working at the university has the normal protection under law. But to ensure that no organisation or person can take any invention that results from work done at the university with university expenditure and tie it up so that it cannot be used for the good of mankind, the university is simply seeking approval to have that possibility prevented by statute. I think the honourable member for Wynnum may have said that Parliament does not see the statutes, but let me give him the assurance that each and every statute is tabled in the House and may be disallowed. So I believe that there is every protection to ensure that any invention covered by patent will be used for the benefit of mankind.

The honourable member also spoke about the possibility of insufficient moneys being made available for research. Let me assure him that finance for research comes from many areas, including large companies, and I have not yet heard of any worthwhile project not being able to continue through to fruition because of a lack of finance. That would be one of the lesser worries I would have as Minister for Education.

The honourable members for Wynnum and Salisbury and, I think, somebody else, mentioned the proposed Casey University. While it is not my intention to enter into a debate on that subject here today, let me assure all honourable members that I have spoken to the Federal Minister for Education about this matter, and I have at least been given the assurance that if Casey University is established that funds will come from the defence budget and not the education budget.

The honourable member for Greenslopes spoke about student enrolments at Griffith University compared with the other universities in Queensland. He also referred to the study areas that are available. Whilst we do regard Griffith University as being an infant, particularly compared with the University of Queensland, we must congratulate all those associated with the university on the way that it has grown already. I hope that it will be given every encouragement to continue to grow, particularly as it has already earned such a wonderful reputation.

The honourable member referred to the report of the Select Committee on Education, particularly with regard to post-secondary education. Two or three other members also raised this point, and perhaps I could reply to their remarks altogether. This is an area in which I believe we should not hurry in making any firm decision. I do not think an education commission has been established in any of the States which one could say was completely successful. I would like

somebody to show me that there are definitely weaknesses in the present system before I would recommend any change.

The honourable member also referred to the patent statutes, and perhaps I could repeat to members some of the advice that has been forwarded to me by the Griffith University on this subject. The letter sets out a proposed new paragraph of section 36 of the Act to read—

“the ownership and exploitation of inventions and discoveries that are the property of the University made by the staff or students of the University.”

The letter continues—

“Research or other work undertaken by a member of the University’s staff in the course of his University duties, or by a student in the course of his studies, may lead to an invention or discovery which may have potential value for the benefit of the community. The University has a responsibility to ensure that any such invention or discovery is made available to the community; in such cases, this may be best done if the invention is made commercially available by way of a patent. It is for this reason that the University wishes to have clearly established a power to make Statutes relating to patents.

“The University is interested in patents only as a means to expedite the furtherance of knowledge and the provision of benefits to the community; it is not concerned with the possibility of patenting an invention for financial benefit to the University. Under the provision of the proposed paragraph (xxiii), patent action by the University would be limited to inventions or discoveries which are the property of the University, and it is the university’s intention to assign patent rights to the staff member or student making the invention or discovery except in the following circumstances:

the work leading to the invention or discovery was specifically commissioned by the University; or

the invention or discovery could represent a significant contribution to the general good of mankind, and could be in danger of inadequate exploitation or suppression.

“The main purpose of a Statute made under the new section of the Act would be to set up clear procedures for notifying and appraising discoveries, and for deciding how they should be dealt with.”

I believe that that should be sufficient advice and information to members who had any doubt about the express purpose of that amendment to the Act.

The member for Salisbury referred to the removal of the discrimination against persons enrolling on the ground of sex. I

must be absolutely honest with her and say that the proposal did not originate from me, but I certainly had no hesitation at all in supporting it.

She also mentioned the possibility of members of the staff living in the accommodation provided at the university. That accommodation will be used by the athletes participating in the 1982 Commonwealth Games. Later it will be used as accommodation not only for students attending the university but also for staff of the nearby hospital. I have been assured that only one member of the staff lives in that accommodation, and that is the housing officer. However, a number of tutors will be living there in the future to give a balance to the residential community.

The member for Somerset, because of his own experience as the father of a student at the Griffith University, spoke from the heart about the excellence of the subject areas and the tutorship available at the university. Here again, we have further evidence of the very high regard in which our baby university, if I can put it that way, is held throughout the community.

The member for Isis referred to the aesthetic surroundings of the university and also its proximity to the city. He said it is a pity that the university was not established in Central Queensland. Looking back with hindsight, we acknowledge that our third university could have been established in the centre of Queensland. He spoke also of the value of pro-vice-chancellors. I appreciate the work that a vice-chancellor has to do in running a university, especially a vice-chancellor who has had to establish a university; a vice-chancellor who has seen it grow from bare ground right through to an establishment of which everybody can be proud. I appreciate that a man with that amount of work to do must have assistance, and that assistance can be given by a pro-vice-chancellor, or more than one pro-vice-chancellor, who would be appointed for a particular time to carry out certain duties.

The member for Isis also referred to the difficulties with the present apprenticeship scheme. My colleague the Minister for Labour Relations and I share his concern. We believe that much research has to be done very rapidly to ensure that we are able to train our tradesmen of the future in this State and not depend on importing them from overseas. A lot of research has already been done in this area and, of course, it will be hastened to ensure that we are not unprepared if the apprenticeship scheme fails completely. Let me say that I would be very disappointed if it did, because I believe that there is no alternative to the present apprenticeship scheme which could come even close to training tradesmen in such an excellent manner.

He also suggested a restructuring of post-secondary education. Such things have to be closely monitored and are matters to which

we are continually giving our consideration. He certainly saw no problem with that section of the legislation dealing with inventions, possibly because he sought some additional advice from my department and people from the university prior to entering the debate.

The member for Toowoomba North spoke at length about education. I am very pleased indeed that he entered the debate and made that contribution so that it could be recorded in "Hansard".

I thank very much all those who participated in the debate. The need for this legislation has been of concern to the university for some time. They want to have these small matters tidied up so that they can go ahead and build an even better university.

Motion (Mr Bird) agreed to.

COMMITTEE

Mr Gunn (Somerset) in the chair
Clauses 1 to 24, as read, agreed to.
Bill reported, without amendment.

STATE HOUSING (AMENDMENT OF FREEHOLDING PROVISIONS) BILL

SECOND READING—RESUMPTION OF DEBATE

Debate resumed from 21 August (see p. 151) on Mr Wharton's motion—

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

Mr MILLINER (Everton) (4.33 p.m.): Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of privilege. Having considered the contents of the legislation in detail since it has been tabled in this Assembly and as a business venture I am associated with is on Crown land, I have reason to believe that I could be involved. Irrespective of my right to speak, I wish to dissociate myself from the debate and the vote and to withdraw forthwith from the Chamber so as to leave no doubt as to my integrity in this matter.

Whereupon the honourable member for Everton withdrew from the Chamber.

Mr K. J. HOOPER (Archerfield) (4.34 p.m.): Even though my good friend and colleague the Opposition spokesman on housing, Mr Milliner, has had to leave the Chamber, it is quite obvious that there is no dearth of talent on the Opposition benches. At very short notice I have been asked to fill in.

This Bill is long overdue but its timing is to be expected. In its 23 years of office this Government has never been an innovator.

Mr Frawley: Rubbish!

Mr K. J. HOOPER: It is not rubbish; it is fact.

It reacts to situations—usually years late. In the matter of simple amending legislation, it always lags behind the other States.

Mr Frawley: That is not true.

Mr K. J. HOOPER: That is a fact. It reacts to situations—usually years late. It always lags behind other States with simple amending legislation.

Mr Frawley: That's not true.

Mr K. J. HOOPER: The honourable member for Caboolture is wriggling around in his seat as though he has termites in his truss. He does not know what he is talking about.

As the Minister said when introducing this Bill, it is essentially a straightforward matter. The Opposition agrees. Its purpose is to allow freeholding of what is presently leasehold land. In the main, this relates to shopping centres owned by the Queensland Housing Commission. The Minister has stated also that for legal reasons he is excluding the two main shopping centres owned by the Housing Commission in my electorate, namely the Inala Civic Centre and the Elizabeth Street shopping centre at Acacia Ridge. On the surface, I can agree with the Minister's line of thinking on those shopping centres. It would seem that a group title is the best way of solving the problems that exist at both those centres.

Rather a farcical position exists at the Elizabeth Street shopping centre at Acacia Ridge. It is over the subject of toilets. I know it seems rather a trite matter, but as every honourable member would agree one has to obey the call of nature at some stage during the 24 hours. The Brisbane City Council cannot erect the toilets because it wants to own the land in fee simple. Of course, the Housing Commission is not prepared to grant it that land. Meanwhile, the shoppers at that complex have to put up with the fact that there is no toilet block. That is stupid and inane. Surely the Brisbane City Council and the Housing Commission could get together and arrive at a solution. The shoppers should not have to suffer because of the pigheadedness of the Brisbane City Council and the Queensland Housing Commission.

Mr Warburton: What about the people who own the shops?

Mr K. J. HOOPER: They have their own private toilets, but they do not allow customers to use them. It could be very embarrassing if a shopping mother has a young child who wants to use a toilet. It is a serious subject and I repeat that the Brisbane City Council and the Housing Commission should get together and bring the matter to an end. It is a storm in a teacup and should be resolved as quickly as possible.

Mr Bourke interjected.

Mr Davis: Mr Bourke uses a large gum tree.

Mr K. J. HOOPER: And, I am told, lantana leaves.

However, I will reserve my comments until I see the group titles Bill that the Minister has told me privately he intends to introduce at a later stage of the session to cover the leasehold land at the two shopping centres.

Whilst those two centres are excluded on this occasion, some of the problems encountered at them no doubt prompted this Bill. As the Minister represents the rural electorate of Gayndah, which is a very large citrus-growing area, he is probably still not au fait with some of the problems of the city. I am prepared to make myself available to take him on a guided tour of these shopping centres to show him the problems that exist. Unfortunately, the people of Inala regard the civic centre as neither a civic centre nor a shopping complex in the true sense of the terms. There was no proper planning when the centre was constructed. I think most honourable members would agree that the term "civic centre" applies to a complex that has a civic hall. There is no civic hall in the centre at Inala and, quite frankly, it is a second-rate shopping complex. It has a very tatty, seedy look, which is no fault of the shopkeepers. It is the fault of the Queensland Housing Commission because of its intransigent attitude.

Mr Bourke: You have an alderman on the council, don't you?

Mr K. J. HOOPER: I know the member for Lockyer is not overbright and he does not have a great deal between the ears. In fact, if brains were dynamite, they wouldn't blow the wax out of his ears. Nevertheless, even he should know that the Brisbane City Council has no jurisdiction over the Inala shopping complex, which is owned wholly and solely by the Queensland Housing Commission.

Mr Burns: And they won't agree to anything.

Mr K. J. HOOPER: They won't agree to the Brisbane City Council having any jurisdiction over the land whatsoever. That just shows how little the honourable member for Lockyer knows.

Bearing in mind that Inala is Brisbane's largest suburb, it is obvious that the lack of a departmental store or the like has prevented the Inala Civic Centre from becoming the main and true shopping centre that it was originally designed to be. I am reliably informed that such a store would be a huge financial success. There is certainly ample car parking to attract potential customers. The nigger in the woodpile is the leasehold land. That is the problem there. Large firms are not prepared to make the large financial outlay that is required.

Although I am by no means a fan of large shopping centre developers such as the Bexley Corporation or Westfields and believe that they have much to answer for, I can see that their reluctance to commit large sums of money under the leasehold system has had the effect of stifling Inala's development. I say that advisedly, and I am sure that the Minister's advisers who are sitting in the lobby will agree with what I am saying. At the present time, we have at Inala a host of small buildings that are not exactly architectural gems. They were erected by jerry-builders as the need arose, and they certainly would not receive any classification by the National Trust.

With hindsight, the ideal solution would have been for the Housing Commission to build the shopping centres in both Inala and Acacia Ridge and then lease the shops. That is what any prudent landholder would do. At least in that way the Housing Commission would have been able to exercise greater control over the type and quality of the buildings erected, some of which leave much to be desired aesthetically. Unfortunately, when both suburbs were being built, housing was very scarce, and the commission, to its credit, turned all its attention, both physical and financial, to providing homes for needy people. I suppose one must be realistic and admit that the prime function of such a commission is to provide homes.

I hope that the Bill succeeds in remedying some of the past mistakes that I have outlined to the House today. If the quality of life is lost, particularly in the coming years, there will be a serious effect on Housing Commission estates. If the commission does something about improving both the Acacia Ridge and Inala shopping complexes, the future of Housing Commission estates will be greatly enhanced. I take this opportunity to sound a note of warning to the Minister. Whenever I see the National Party introducing a Bill of this nature, I am very wary.

Mr Davis: We have to be, haven't we?

Mr K. J. HOOPER: Of course. There is usually some ulterior motive. Whenever a Bill of this type is introduced, one of its financial supporters is to receive some sort of a favour.

Government Members interjected.

Mr K. J. HOOPER: That is true, and not many honourable members in this Chamber will deny it. It is 100 per cent correct.

Mr Powell interjected.

Mr K. J. HOOPER: The National Party-dominated Government has such a shocking record of converting public leasehold land to freehold land for the benefit of its wealthy backers that one is quite entitled to tread very warily when Bills of this nature are introduced.

Mr Akers interjected.

Mr K. J. HOOPER: I can never hear the interjections made by the honourable member for Pine Rivers. They are as dreary as his speeches and one can never pick them up.

All honourable members know that some Minister's and some National Party back-benchers, such as the honourable member for Isis and his mates, have had spectacular success in all types of land ballots since 1957. I hope I am not being too skeptical when I say that when the Bill becomes law we will see some of the shopping-centre developers with close links with the National Party suddenly emerge from the woodwork as major beneficiaries of the legislation, and I have no doubt that some of the people who have made major contributions to the Bjelke-Petersen Foundation will be suitably rewarded.

Government Members interjected.

Mr. K. J. HOOPER: There are quite a number of these people. It is common knowledge in Queensland that if some wealthy businessman makes a sizeable contribution to the Bjelke-Petersen Foundation, he is always suitably rewarded. I have already detailed to the House some of the rewards that have been made. Take Keith Williams, the proprietor of Sea World. He made a donation of \$25,000 to the Bjelke-Petersen Foundation. As I have stated in the House previously, he was rewarded with positions on two Government-controlled boards. The honourable member for Albert made a donation of \$5,000 to the Bjelke-Petersen Foundation, and he was rewarded with his ministerial portfolio. There is not a great deal of talent on the National Party back benchers, but even the member for Isis, who is not over-bright, has more ability than the member for Albert. These are the things that are going on in Queensland. The Bjelke-Petersen Foundation is Tammany Hall at its worst.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member to refer to the Bill.

Mr K. J. HOOPER: In conclusion—the Opposition has no objection to the Bill. In fact, we welcome it. However, we feel it is long overdue.

Mr NEAL (Balonne) (4.46 p.m.): I take pleasure in supporting the Minister's introduction of the Bill. The honourable member for Archerfield claims that the Bill is long overdue. I am pleased to hear him, as Opposition spokesman, agreeing in principle with freehold tenure. Certainly the Labor Party's policy is totally opposed to the freehold tenure of rural lands. I wonder what are the honourable member's motives for supporting the principle under these circumstances.

As the Minister has said, the principal Act provides for the freeholding of perpetual lease residential sites and that provision is

being extended to cover commercial sites. I cannot see anything wrong with that proposal. In fact, even the Opposition agrees to it. I give my support to the principle involved because I have always been a keen supporter of the principle of freeholding of land.

Freehold has always been, and will continue to be, the most desirable type of tenure that a person can have. It has been long recognised by land buyers, land owners and financiers as the most secure tenure. It is for that reason that financiers are prepared to lend money more readily on freehold land than on leasehold land.

Mr Davis: That is not correct and you know it.

Mr NEAL: Of course it is correct. Many of my constituents who have leasehold tenure of rural lands have been in financial difficulties because their financiers have not been able to extend credit to them. The landholders were not able to offer long-term security.

Freeholding means something special. It has more attaching to it than has leasehold. That something special is inherent in the title "freehold"; the land is held in fee simple. No Government conditions attach to it. No set term of occupancy is laid down; occupancy depends on the wishes of the owner. That is what freehold is all about. The owner is the one who decides what he will or will not do. He works the land for his benefit and his benefit alone. For those reasons people are desirous of converting to freehold. As distinct from all other lands held under the Lands Act, freehold land does not require prior ministerial sanction for its sale.

The proposals cover commercial sites already held under perpetual lease and they will cover further leases that may be given, as outlined by the Minister. Quite obviously, they will have to comply with the usual local government controls. The Minister has indicated that, in future, land zoned for shopping in areas held by the commission will be sold as freehold in the first instance if possible. However, if a lease is sought it can be converted to freehold at a later date. Provision will be made to convert to freehold, as it applies to rural land. Tenure can be converted for cash straight-out on a determination of valuation. The Minister has suggested that the proposal is that those who cannot afford to pay cash in the first instance can spread the payments over a period of 10 years. This, again, is in keeping with freeholding in the rural areas.

The whole thrust of the legislation is in line with the Government's policy of freehold land tenure. As has been outlined, the procedures will be somewhat similar to the freeholding of rural land except that in this instance an applicant will have recourse to the Valuer-General or the Land Court. The first offer will be made by the

Housing Commission as distinct from an offer from the Land Administration Commission.

As I understand it, an applicant can accept the commission's offer. If he does not do so he can opt to have a determination made by the Valuer-General or the Land Court. If I did not agree with the commission's valuation I would opt for a determination to be made by the Land Court.

I ask the Minister to clarify whether there is any appeal if an applicant, in the first instance, does not accept the commission's valuation, and opts for a determination by either the Land Court or the Valuer-General. When freeholding rural land an applicant who does not agree with the department's offer can appeal to the Land Court. If he is unhappy with the second determination he can then appeal to the Land Appeal Court. I would like clarification on this matter as it relates to these blocks.

The honourable member for Archerfield quite obviously recognises the value of the amendments. He said that leasehold land tended to stifle development and that freehold tenure was the best tenure. He said that financiers placed great importance on freehold land, considering it to have advantages over and above leasehold land. When land is listed for sale with agents the first question the buyers ask relates to its tenure. The Land Act provides for numerous land tenures, some of which do not offer long-term leases.

I certainly support the amendments. As has been said, the legislation is certainly overdue. It will assist those people who desire to get out on their own and be free of Government control. Freehold land is not subject to Government controls. When a buyer pays cash he virtually pays out the amount he would pay in rental over the years.

Mr Jones: Freehold land can be resumed at any time.

Mr NEAL: In the light of Labor's policy, that is quite understandable. In my mind there is no risk about freehold land being the most secure. I appreciate that in certain instances freehold land can be resumed, but by and large it cannot be denied that freehold land has the most secure tenure. Those who opt to buy the land over 10 years are virtually setting the rental for the 10-year period, after which the land will be theirs.

Dr LOCKWOOD (Toowoomba North) (4.55 p.m.): At the outset I say that it was a very proper thing that the honourable member for Everton did here today. Of course, it remains to be seen whether the Labor Party will still persist in its idea that all land should belong to the State and vote against the financial interest declared by the honourable member for Everton in support of its publicised policies which its members avow they will stick to. So in some measure

the Labor Party will be put to a very important test here today; will ALP members dump their brother Milliner and stick to their policy, or will they, for his convenience and the convenience of any individual Labor supporter who stands to gain, vote for this legislation which we believe is very sound? Labor Party members can make up their own minds which way they will vote: to follow their policy or to do their best for a Labor fellow who wants to participate in a little free enterprise. I think for the first time we will see just how they measure up to their own policies.

It was interesting to hear the honourable member for Archerfield speak in this debate on his old shadow portfolio of Works and Housing. He was the architect of Labor's policy and even had his photo placed above it in the policy document.

Mr Bourke: It wasn't a bad collection of lies for a scratch effort, was it?

Dr LOCKWOOD: I refuse to answer that question on the grounds that it might not quite be the truth.

It is interesting to note that the Queensland Housing Commission has done a great deal for the person on an average income who wants to own his own home. I believe that the Labor Party's policy would prevent such a person from owning a home under the Housing Commission's plan. I will elaborate further on that later. Under Housing Commission policy the maximum loan is \$25,000, which can be applied to either a home built on a person's own land—the value of the home would then be a maximum of \$30,000—or to a ready-built home which meets Housing Commission inspection standards, to a maximum value of \$36,000. In either case the maximum loan will be set at \$25,000. Wage earners in receipt of up to \$250 per week are eligible for such loans with a repayment period of 30 years. It is to the credit of this Government that it is subsidising these loans to the extent that in no case does interest exceed 7½ per cent.

Mr Frawley: The honourable member for Brisbane Central tried to get a Housing Commission loan, but he got knocked back.

Dr LOCKWOOD: So he should, because his income is far above the maximum permitted level, and he knew that before he applied. I just wonder whether under a Labor Government he would have got a loan not for one house but for a whole street of houses. The fact remains that this Government has done a great deal for people on the average wage to get them into homeownership. We have done this for several reasons. If a person owns his own home he can develop it to his own liking and to his own standards. He can develop a garden and furnish the home to meet his family's requirements. Such people become part of the stable community, and we are very pleased that they are able to do this.

Typical of the person we seek to help is the tradesman with a wife and three children who recently came to see me. One of his children is seriously ill. He has lived in nine homes since he has been married. The seriously ill child needs special care. Because he is a blue baby he needs special heating in winter, and air-conditioning in summer. It is within this man's capacity to provide these amenities. He has taken time off work to help his wife with the sick child, and this has resulted in a loss of wages which places him within the income bracket set by the Government, so he can seek Government help to purchase his own home. In his own home he can provide the amenities which will help his very seriously ill child survive the rigours of winter and the heat of summer.

A Labor Government would disband the Queensland Housing Commission. Perhaps that is news, but it is in the Labor Party's policy. Labor would replace the entire Queensland Housing Commission—its entire staff and administration—with a housing trust. Labor refuses to elaborate on this proposed housing trust and the reasons for its secrecy. I can only fear the worst for those who work in the Queensland Housing Commission. Recently the Australian Labor Party made a great song and dance about jobs for the boys. Under its policy, and this particular aspect of it, there is the means of injecting a great number of Labor supporters from outside the Public Service into Labor's housing trust. That would seriously disadvantage not only those people in the Public Service but also home owners.

How would it disadvantage home owners? We would have a great many housing authorities—presumably one in each Government department. These authorities would rent houses to workers; they would not finance workers into houses. I can see a huge rental bureau developing, with everybody who wanted a house having to run along and buy favours off a Labor administration—perhaps join the Labor Party, or three or four of its branches; I do not know. People would have to kick the tin for the Labor Party even to get a house, and kick it again to get a better house.

Labor would revamp that most hated department of the Whitlam Government—the Department of Urban and Regional Development. Labor has provided for that in its policy. It would have a subdepartment of urban and regional development injected into the Works and Housing area. All of this would cost money. Let us get some idea of what sort of money it would cost. In 1974-75, DURD had a budget of \$458m, \$235m of which—52 per cent—went on administration. I believe that under a Labor Government in Queensland we could see a massive amount of the total Works and Housing vote—52 per cent was good enough for Whitlam, so maybe it would be 60 per cent here—going straight into the salaries of

the lurks and perks boys. If Labor provided 52 per cent then, I believe that it would provide the same again.

The \$223m left after paying wages and administration costs was misspent on a whole host of DURD projects. DURD told local authorities all over Australia how they should run their own affairs. No matter where one lives in this State, the Liberal Party believes that one's local authority is better able to serve one than a centralist Government in either Canberra or Brisbane. If Labor were to take 52 per cent straight off the top for administration, there would be precious little left for welfare housing. I think that the people in this State who are dependent on this Government for welfare housing, be it the rental of houses or flats or the QHC purchase plan, have to have a hard look at Labor's policy. This is provided in Labor's policy, and every member has sworn to abide by it. It is binding on them. They cannot change it; they cannot escape it. They must implement it.

The Liberal Party encourages equal opportunity for all people to live in, and preferably own, their own comfortable home at a reasonable cost. The Liberal Party promotes, encourages and facilitates by every means possible the flow of finance from all institutions and individuals prepared to lend money for housing. That is our policy and we stick by it; we are not ashamed of it. It means that there is available bank finance, housing society finance and terminating housing co-operative finance. Some people who have very little money for a deposit on a house choose to approach finance houses for loans on housing. If they can do that and meet the repayments, the Liberal Party says good luck to them. If they can arrange the finance, they are entitled to own their own home.

Last Tuesday in this Chamber a Labor spokesman attacked home purchases from finance houses. When speaking later on the same subject of home purchases, the Labor candidate for Toowoomba North, Alderman Lindsay Jones, said—

“I don't think people should have access to that type of finance. I think they need protection really from themselves.”

Labor would deny these people the chance that they presently have under the policies of the present Government to buy their own home. What a fine way this is for the Labor Party to regard people who are determined to own their own homes! A Labor spokesman in this Chamber says they should not be allowed to—that a finance house should be discouraged. Another Labor man says that people need protection from themselves. The Labor Party would deny the right of access to low-deposit finance to those people who believe they can afford it. That would deny people with a very low deposit the right to enter into arrangements to own their own home. Some of the people who entered into contracts, the documentation of which was tabled here

last week by the member for Wolston, earn more than the maximum allowed by the Queensland Housing Commission under its home purchase plan—that is, they earn more than \$250 a week. The Labor candidate for Toowoomba North would discriminate against these people and has said that they really need protection from themselves.

The Labor Party has to sort out its own candidates. If the attack of the member for Wolston in this House last Tuesday was justified, then the Labor Party should reject the endorsement of Mr Sciacca for the seat of Ipswich. If the member for Wolston was wrong, then he should not be endorsed for his seat for the next election. In seeking to protect these people from themselves Lindsey Jones is including Ronald Gordon Fraser, the Labor candidate for Toowoomba South. So the electors of Toowoomba should note that one of the Labor candidates has said that even if people have the money they should be protected from themselves and, on the other hand, he includes the Labor candidate for Toowoomba South whose name was on the documents tabled here. The Labor Party is saying that he should be protected from himself.

The Labor Party is in a sorry state. A Labor member here has attacked a Labor candidate in Ipswich. I believe that one or the other or both must go. The Labor candidate for Toowoomba North has attacked the Labor candidate for Toowoomba South by saying that he should be protected from himself. Who are we to believe? We should believe none of them. The Labor policy is a mess. Its spokesmen are lost in the wilderness; they do not know what to say or do. They have tipped each other in the tin; they cannot stick to their own policy. Their policy is quite clear.

I now instance some of the things that it includes. The Labor Party would revamp the Department of Urban and Regional Development. It would waste money on ongoing public inquiries not confined to housing which would ask open-ended questions that never will be answered. They would ask questions as a hoax and would ramble off into social conditions and try to relate them all to housing. The Labor Party would disband the Queensland Housing Commission and replace it with a Labor Housing Trust about which it refuses to elaborate. Labor would recreate one of its socialist dreams of a Fair Tenancies Board to fix rents and standards, presumably so that Labor members of Parliament and Labor candidates would have protection from themselves.

Mr Neal: Do you realise that their policy states that a Labor Government would immediately renegotiate any new agreement already entered into that conflicts with its policy.

Dr LOCKWOOD: That simply means that anybody who owns a home could expect it to be nationalised.

An Opposition Member: Liberalised, not nationalised.

Dr LOCKWOOD: The honourable member can call it what he likes; he will not be in Government to do it.

Labor seeks to create a great many new housing authorities, one for each department. They would construct, purchase or lease housing for rental to employees, but I doubt very much if very much of it would be sold, as I do not think the Labor Party would be very interested in selling. If such housing authorities felt a need to develop, subdivide or sell a home for home-ownership, then they would have the right to take privately-owned land through resumption purchases. That is perhaps typical of what Mr Jones did when he was Lord Mayor; he resumed valuable land in Brisbane and demanded land for council purposes, but as soon as the time was ripe he sold it for council profit.

Mr AUSTIN (Wavell) (5.10 p.m.): As I am an advocate of free enterprise and the right of people to own their own home and their own business, it is with a great deal of pleasure that I support this Bill today. I fully support the Minister in his introduction of the Bill.

I have the privilege of serving on the Minister's committee. During its discussions of this Bill I questioned the ownership of the properties involved, because a number of allegations have been made in this House in recent times about specific foundations and money that may have changed hands for certain favours. In fact, the member for Archerfield mentioned in his speech that that is what happens. Much to my surprise, when I was given the list, I found that lease No. 216 was in the name of Glen Richard Milliner and his wife. I will not mention her name, because I do not want to bring her into this debate.

That was of some concern to me, because a member of the Labor Party has a pecuniary interest in a lease and in legislation coming before this House. That concerned me particularly in view of allegations made by members of the Labor Party. I took some action. I thought to myself, "I will watch and see what happens." I made further inquiries about it and found that the honourable member for Everton had sought a deputation with the Minister, seeking changes in the legislation which would enable him to freehold his land. I would have thought that that was contrary to ALP policy and that the member, when this Bill came before the Parliament, would have been aware of its contents.

I accept that he has removed himself from the Chamber but, in fact, I suggest that he has done it too late. It could be that he was tipped off that I wrote to Mr Speaker this morning as follows—

“The Hon. S. J. Muller, M.L.A.,
“Speaker,
“Parliament House,
“Brisbane. 4000.

“Dear Mr. Speaker,

“I wish to lodge an objection to a vote taken in the House on Thursday, 21st August, 1980, on the State Housing Bill—a Bill to Amend the State Housing Act and Another Act Amendment Act 1957–1979.

“On the vote that the Bill be read a first time, the Honourable Member for Everton, Mr. Glen Richard Milliner, according to the Votes and Proceedings of the Legislative Assembly, was present in the Chamber on Thursday, 21st August, 1980. The Member for Everton, who is holder in part, of Housing Commission Lease 216, Dallas Parade, Grovely, and consequently having property within the limit of this Bill, and which property will be affected by the passing of this Bill, has such interest as would disqualify from him voting thereon.

“As the Honourable Member has an obvious pecuniary interest in this Bill, I respectfully request that the attention of the House be drawn to this matter, and that you determine whether the Honourable Member should participate in further debate on this Bill.”

Obviously, the member was well and truly tipped off about what may have happened. I do not want to make any allegations about deals that may or may not have been made in this place, but it seems to me that someone has tipped that member off. I think that that is despicable. I will let my case rest there.

Mr AKERS (Pine Rivers) (5.13 p.m.): The Bill is one that I support to the extent that it allows the freeholding of existing shopping centre sites to the people who have actually done the work and built shops on them. The Bill should stop there, but it does not.

The Bill allows any future Government, Housing Commissioner or Minister to go much further than anyone here today might wish. The Bill allows any Government—or any Minister, as I said—to go to the extent of allowing something the size of Toombul Shopping Centre—this may be an extreme case—being built on leasehold land and freeholding it, thus bypassing all the normal procedures that a free-enterprise Government should adopt.

Mr Bourke: Have you heard the story that Mr Milliner made a big donation to the Bjelke-Petersen Foundation to get the Bill into the House?

Mr AKERS: That could well be. I would believe anything these days. After the things that I have seen members of the ALP do in the last few days, after seeing the deals that they have done, after seeing the Premier of this State call the Leader of the Opposition out of the Chamber and have a conference with him and, after five minutes, the Leader of the Opposition come back in and ask a Dorothy Dix question of the Premier, and the Premier then proceed to forget about any semblance of the Westminster system of Cabinet solidarity—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Gunn): Order! The honourable member will return to the Bill.

Mr AKERS: . . . and dump the Deputy Premier, I will believe anything. That is one of the things that makes me worried about what the Bill allows. It allows anything to happen. It depends solely on the integrity of the Minister, the Government and the Commissioner of Housing. Although I am not questioning the integrity of the present Commissioner of Housing or the present Minister, I do not trust any future Government, and the Bill should limit their power.

Mr Vaughan: You can't trust the Liberals.

Mr AKERS: I heard an honourable member opposite say, “You can't trust the Liberals.” I wonder what ALP supporters think of their members when they suddenly find that their leaders are doing deals with leaders of the National Party.

Mr D'Arcy: You have been doing it for years—for 23 years.

Mr AKERS: We have been doing it openly. We have been in coalition for 23 years with the National Party.

In his speech, the honourable member for Archerfield said that he had only a very short time to prepare it. He must have, because it is the first time this session that a member of the ALP has broken away from ALP policy (I wonder whether he will be allowed to stay in the ALP caucus) by not attacking the National Party and concentrating on the Liberal Party. With the exception of the speech of the honourable member for Archerfield, not once has such an attack been made.

Let us look back at the series of things that have happened over the last little while.

Mr K. J. Hooper: Why should I attack the Nationals? The Liberals are doing a good job.

Mr AKERS: Not once have I complained about being attacked by my political opponents. I am not worried in the slightest by the attacks that are being made now. I am questioning the integrity of the leaders of the ALP when they will go against their membership's sworn enemy, the man who is hated most by the ALP membership, and

do a deal like the one we saw this morning and the similar deals that have been made over the last couple of weeks.

It is the right and the obligation of members of the Opposition to attack the policies of the Government, and they have failed miserably to do that in the 5½ years that I have been in this Chamber. They have not mounted one reasonable attack in the whole of that time. However, there has been a series of weird occurrences that members of the Australian Labor Party must find very strange, and I wonder whether some of the ordinary members of the National Party might also find them strange. Suddenly, out of the blue, after all the restrictions that have been put on the Opposition, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition gets a research assistant paid for by the Government, at the expense of the taxpayers. During this session, a series of debates have been initiated by the ALP. At any other time in the last 5½ years that I have been here, those debates would have been cut off before anything was said.

Mr K. J. HOOPER: I rise to a point of order. As a greater stickler for Standing Orders in this Chamber, Mr Deputy Speaker, I draw your attention to the fact that the honourable member for Pine Rivers is not speaking to the Bill.

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

Mr AKERS: In raising these points, I am questioning the intentions of the honourable member for Archerfield in his speech and pointing out the way in which he was caught out. He has not been following ALP policy. He is smiling now, but I wonder what will happen in the caucus meeting tomorrow when he is attacked for departing from ALP policy.

I was mentioning the many incidents that have occurred recently. Debates that were allowed to proceed, which would normally have been stopped over the past 5½ years, all happened to constitute attacks on the Liberal Party. They are another part of this conspiracy that, strangely, members of the Australian Labor Party engage in.

Today we saw two other occurrences. One was this Dorothy Dix question from the Leader of the Opposition. The other, which worries me greatly, was the leakage to a member of the Opposition of the contents of a letter from a Government member to Mr Speaker. The leakage of that letter allowed the Opposition member to take certain action before Mr Speaker raised the matter in this Parliament.

Mr UNDERWOOD: I rise to a point of order. The honourable member's comment is a reflection on Mr Speaker. I draw your attention, Mr Deputy Speaker, to the fact that it was the member for Everton himself who drew attention to his position. There

was no leak to the ALP today. The member for Everton had been contemplating his action for some time.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I accept the honourable member's point of order. However, Mr Speaker is quite capable of looking after himself. I ask the honourable member for Pine Rivers to return to the Bill or be seated.

Mr AKERS: These amendments as such are ones that I would support at any other time. However, they are lacking in the limits that they impose on the powers of a future Government. They are an example of what we have seen in the recent past. They disregard the concepts of what laws are supposed to be. Everyone who claims that the Bill is a good one does so because it is claimed that the Government does not intend doing anything other than freehold existing leases.

The amendments made to the Police Act fall into the same category. No limit was imposed. Complete reliance is placed on the integrity of the Government and the public servants who will be involved in administering that Act until it is repealed.

Some of our laws in Queensland have lasted for nearly 150 years. In Great Britain some laws have lasted for as many as 600 or 700 years. No-one would expect the integrity of all Governments over such a lengthy period to be beyond question. So I question the Bill. I urge the Minister to continue with what he is proposing and to impose a limit as soon as possible, in either this session or the next session.

Debate, on motion of Mr Powell, adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. C. A. WHARTON (Burnett—Leader of the House): I move—

“That the House do now adjourn.”

PRITCHARD STEAM CAR

Dr LOCKWOOD (Toowoomba North) (5.24 p.m.): The Save the Steam Car Appeal was a spontaneous success because of Queenslanders' concern for the future of road transport. Following publicity on the Channel 9 current affairs program “Today Tonight”, hosted by Andrew Carroll, enough Queenslanders responded to save the Pritchard steam car for Australia. Unlike the hydrogen car, the steam car is a goer.

As an office bearer of the Queensland Consumers Association, I, with the member for Rockhampton (Mr Keith Wright), who is State president of the Queensland Consumers Association, and the member for Peak Downs (Mr Vince Lester), who first voiced concern at the plight of the Pritchard steam car, became a trustee of the appeal.

The public response was nothing short of magnificent. It shows that Queenslanders are genuinely concerned about alternative forms of engines to power road transport, farm machinery and stationary engines. They are concerned because they are aware that our known oil resources are failing to meet this country's liquid fuel requirements. It is unfortunate that it has been difficult to get accurate assessments of Mr Pritchard's engine, its fuel consumption and its adaptability to non-petroleum fuels. If the engine is to be a success I believe that Pritchard has to look to coal products for its fuel, which could be either powdered coal, powdered solvent-refined coal or liquid coal/oil slurries.

Because it has been difficult to get an accurate assessment of the engine I believe that the Pritchard engine needs to be run on a test bed to establish its reliability. In particular we need to know about its power output at various consumption rates of kerosene, LP gas and power alcohol. These need to be examined with its oil and water consumption. The endurance of the Pritchard engine also needs to be firmly established and so do the servicing intervals. If the engine is run on a test bed, the type and nature of the servicing required, the time spent in getting that service and the cost of parts can all be discovered, enabling service manuals for the engine to be prepared.

From the meagre information I have been able to obtain without any direct access to Mr Pritchard, it seems that the engine does have vast problems that are common to all steam cars. In order to save water it recondenses the steam instead of exhausting it to the air as our steam locos used to do. It will be remembered that the steam locos carried an immense load of water which was exhausted up the smoke stack. This caused the characteristic choofing. If a steam car does not recondense its water its operational range is restricted more by the water it can carry than by the fuel.

I believe that a steam engine is basically 10 per cent efficient and petrol cars are basically about 30 per cent efficient. There is little point then in having a steam car powered by a petroleum product. Its advantages for the future must lie in its ability to use other fuels, and this is the way I see the need to have continued development.

Approximate prices of fuels, where available, are coal \$27 a tonne, kerosene \$250 a tonne, petrol \$360 a tonne and hydrogen \$6,400 a tonne, when it is available.

The time is coming when the petrol car will have no cost advantage over other types of transport, so the concern of those who supported the save-the-steam-car project is genuine, appropriate and timely.

One of the problems with the engine is that oil used in lubricating the bore leaves the cylinder in the steam and it has to be centrifuged out of the recondensed water before it is boiled again. I understand that

centrifugal extraction of oil from heated water has not yet been perfected, and therefore the Pritchard engine needs a final filter in the closed water circuit. I understand that these cartridges need changing after a day's running. The problem is that if any oil is in the water that enters the steam pipes in the furnace it will coke up the pipe and efficiency falls off.

I have asked the Commonwealth Minister to publish the precise reason why the Commonwealth ceased funding the Pritchard steam car. I did this to end conjecture. It is not true to say that the Commonwealth has not supported the car in the past, because I understand that in the heyday of the Whitlam Government the Commonwealth commenced grants which ultimately totalled \$400,000. I understand that the Department of Supply actually built three steam engines to Pritchard's specifications. The Victorian Government also applied \$50,000 towards the development of the engine.

I believe that Pritchard may have devoted too much available time, energy and resources to a car body, when hindsight shows it would have been wiser to concentrate on the steam engine alone, perfecting its furnace and overcoming the centrifugal oil-extraction problems. The fact that Pritchard went bankrupt should not be any drawback to further development of the engine and furnace here in Queensland. I would see his bankruptcy as a measure of his dedication and determination to succeed, but like the rest of us he was not a multimillionaire and did not have the amount of capital which is required to overcome technological problems and develop the engine and car to the mass-production stage.

(Time expired.)

HANCOCK & GORE LTD

Mr BURNS (Lytton) (5.29 p.m.): I rise to make the Government aware of another Queensland company that has been sold down the drain as a partial result of a southern take-over. I refer to the public company listed on the Australian Stock Exchanges as the business of Hancock & Gore Ltd., one of the oldest and most respected public companies in the State. It is a company which, as most people may know, started as a family partnership in 1867. In 1926 a public company was incorporated, and since then thousands of Queenslanders have held shares in the company. Many men and women worked for the company over the years and enjoyed a good relationship with the company. It gave employment to hundreds of Queenslanders. On Monday a decision was made to sack what is left of the staff.

In the mid 1960s the company had a temporary set-back in its trading and a Mr Charles Viertel joined the board as a company doctor to save the company. Charles Viertel was appointed at the insistence of a group of Brisbane stockbrokers. One

wonders whether they could have been operating as agents for southern raiders, because that is exactly what he acted as when he was appointed to the board. It is significant that Mr Viertel, despite trading losses by the company, purchased large parcels of shares and became a substantial shareholder. It is alleged that Viertel or his family bought 50 000 preference shares at 13c and sold them to the southern interests he represented at around 45c. It is also alleged that Viertel or his family bought an estimated 250 000 ordinary shares at around 10c and sold them to southern interests at up to 56c. He set out to rescue the company and ended up by raping it. After some ups and downs the company continued to trade and Viertel sold his shares to a New South Wales company called Takone Pty Ltd, a subsidiary of Cemac Associated Limited, which is also a New South Wales-based company. I believe Viertel should be investigated under the Insider Trading provision of the Companies Act.

By July 1979 the chairman of the board of Hancock & Gore Ltd was a person named Robert Julian Constable, who was also a director of Cemac and some of its associated companies. I would like the Minister to have a look at Mr Constable to see whether he has been investigated by the New South Wales Corporate Affairs Commission, as has been alleged. I would like to know the results of any such investigation.

To state it shortly, the take-over scheme which Cemac put up, and there is no other way of describing it, had in mind to acquire by purchase the debts of the trading creditors at a genuine discount to by-pass and lock in the preference stockholders in the company in such circumstances that they may never recover their accumulated dividend and capital.

The Supreme Court of Queensland ordered meetings of the ordinary stockholders and the preference stockholders to be held in Brisbane in late 1979. In the creditors' meetings representations were made that Cemac would be a "big brother" to Hancock & Gore Ltd and that it would make available sources of raw materials to keep its production going. Some representations were made in the meetings that there would be no dismissal of employees of the company, some of whom had been employed for upwards of 40 years. There were about 80 employees of the company at that time out of the original 150.

In the Supreme Court proceedings, the chairman of the board of Hancock & Gore Ltd, Constable, who was also a director of the Cemac interests, swore under oath among other things—

"I feel quite confident the company can return to profitability given the support of Cemac Associated."

92145—8

He also gave evidence in answer to a question by his own counsel in relation to employees—

"There would be no alteration of the situation. I do not think that question has been considered at all."

There could be no doubt in the minds of all stockholders who attended the meetings called at the behest of Cemac to consider its take-over scheme that there would be no disturbance in the continued trading of the company and that no employees would be dismissed. The Supreme Court judge who sanctioned the scheme awarded Mr Hancock, one of the grandsons of the founding family, his costs, and this can only be interpreted as recognition by the court of the stand taken by Mr Hancock on behalf of the shareholders and employees in those proceedings. The scheme was sanctioned by the court in November 1979. Within three or four weeks of the sanction of that scheme and without any warning whatsoever, 40 employees of Hancock & Gore Ltd in my electorate of Lytton were sacked. In point of fact, they were told of their dismissals at their Christmas party about a week or so before last Christmas. This, mind you, in the face of what Cemac promised in the meetings and in the court. More than that, valuable assets of the company have been shifted over the border into New South Wales, stocks have been liquidated and now the directors of the company are bent on closing the business down and realising the assets.

The affairs of Hancock & Gore Ltd are so serious that they warrant investigation by the Attorney-General and the Commissioner for Corporate Affairs. In particular, the commissioner should be required to investigate the accounts of Hancock & Gore Ltd for the financial year ended 30 September 1979 as presented to the meeting on 18 March 1980 to see whether those accounts are true or false. I am told that the investigation should also include the question of determining whether the representations made by the Cemac directors to the stockholders at their meetings to consider the take-over scheme which was presented to them were true or false and whether there was full and proper disclosure of all material matters to the creditors and the court which entertained the sanction proceedings of that scheme. I have been advised that there should be an inquiry into the balance sheet and the profit and loss accounts of Hancock & Gore Ltd presented to the stockholders at their annual general meeting of 18 March 1980.

Obviously the distressing fate of Hancock & Gore must concern all Queenslanders and any loopholes in the law must be closed to prevent this sort of thing happening, where well-established and valuable Queensland companies are gutted by interests outside the State for their company assets and where numerous employees are thrown on the scrap heap.

(Time expired.)

GUIDE BONVOYAGE PUBLICATIONS PTY LTD

Mr FRAWLEY (Caboolture) (5.34 p.m.): I want to draw the attention of the House to a firm known as Guide Bonvoyage Publications Pty Ltd of Suite 67, Westfield Shoppingtown, Indooroopilly. This firm is selling a subscription scheme in the form of a book of coupons which enables the purchaser to obtain a discount on service charges from certain restaurants and motels in various countries such as Australia, New Zealand, Fiji, New Caledonia, the New Hebrides, Papua New Guinea, Samoa and Tahiti. For example, if a couple produce a coupon from this firm at a restaurant, instead of paying for two meals they pay for only one. That might sound pretty good to some people. The same applies at a motel; one meal is paid for and the other one is free.

A saleswoman visited Redcliffe on 18 December 1979 selling these Guide Bonvoyage Publications books of coupons. Unfortunately, one of my nephews was gullible enough to sign an authority for periodic payments for the coupons. He was told that he could examine the book of coupons and cancel the order if he was not satisfied, provided that he did so within seven days from the day he signed the authority. I have a copy of the form that he signed. The book of coupons did not arrive for 12 days, so it was impossible for him to examine the coupons and return them within seven days from the date of signing the authority. By the way, the cost was \$132 spread over five years.

On 25 July 1980 he received a notice from Dun & Bradstreet, a collection firm, on behalf of Guide Bonvoyage Publications Pty Ltd claiming \$132. He was threatened with legal action if he did not pay. On 12 August 1980 he received another notice from Dun & Bradstreet—

Mr Davis: Are you looking after your family now?

Mr FRAWLEY: I have to look after my nephews if they are silly enough to buy these things. The notice stated—

“As you have not liquidated this account, we now have no option but to proceed to give effect to our Client’s instructions for recovery.

“Unless payment is received in this Office by 19th August 1980, a summons will be issued against you.”

I advised him not to pay anything because it was blatant misrepresentation. I am not blaming Dun & Bradstreet because they are only doing their job. If somebody goes to them and wants a person summonsed, they will do it for him. I have used White Mercantile, which I believe is owned by this firm.

Mr Davis: Did you find them very good when they brought bills to you?

Mr FRAWLEY: I had quite a deal of success with White Mercantile. They collected a lot of money for me. I have nothing but praise for them.

Mr K. J. Hooper: Didn’t the Electrical Trades Union have to put you in to White Mercantile for arrears of fees?

Mr FRAWLEY: Never. I paid all my Electrical Trades Union fees yearly. I kept all the receipts and books because I knew that some day I might have to produce them.

The Justice Minister should investigate Guide Bonvoyage Publications as its sales people are misrepresenting the situation by telling people that signing an authority for payment is not binding on them. People do not receive the book of coupons for 12 days, so they cannot return them within seven days, and they are hit for \$132. I am not going so far as to say that they are a bunch of crooks; I would not say that about anybody. Nevertheless, I urge the Minister for Justice to have a look at this company before it sucks in too many more people.

A salesman takes along one of these forms and puts up a spiel to some young chap who does not know what the salesman is talking about. He fills the young chap with a lot of rubbish about how good the deal is. Half of the motels and restaurants listed would not be frequented by the member for Archerfield, even if he could get a meal on the grouter. That shows how bad they are.

In conclusion, I hope that every member, when he receives complaints from his constituents about this company, raises the matter with the Justice Minister. The company is Guide Bonvoyage Publications Pty Ltd, of Westfield Shoppingtown, Indooroopilly.

CONTAINER BERTHS, FISHERMAN ISLANDS

Mr HANSEN (Maryborough) (5.38 p.m.): When the Government appoints an authority to manage a facility, it is generally accepted that the people appointed to that authority have some special expertise. Last Thursday the Minister for Maritime Services and Tourism confirmed that in February 1979 he ordered the Port of Brisbane Authority to enter into negotiations with Brisbane Wharves & Wool Dumping Pty Ltd and ANL for the joint operation by these partners of the container terminal No. 1 at Fisherman Islands and the calling of tenders immediately for the operation of No. 2 container berth.

The Minister said that the Port of Brisbane Authority was advised in July 1980, after it had recommended that the tender be given to Seatainers, that the recommendation had been rejected by Cabinet and that no steps should be taken at present to lease No. 2 terminal at Fisherman Islands.

A number of projections have been made and I believe that the Port of Brisbane Authority had gone into the matter very carefully before making the recommendation. In fact, after having had one of its recommendations overruled—overruled after an investigation that took 36 hours—I believe the authority would have been very careful. The matter is very important to the development of the port of Brisbane. The projections provided to me by the Port of Brisbane Authority and Brisbane Wharves & Wool Dumping acknowledge the importance of the development. The report states that the total number of containers likely to be handled in the port of Brisbane will be around 130 000 to 131 000 by the year 1985-86.

In his reply, the Minister said that no decision has been made not to lease No. 2 terminal during the next five years and that the need for a second terminal will be reviewed at the commencement of the operation of No. 1 terminal. It appears that one member of the authority disagrees with most of the others. From a newspaper report that I read this morning, I understand that he has not been associated with the recommendations of the authority, but he seems to have the ear of the Government and has been instrumental in some of the decisions that have controverted those of the authority. That member of the authority says he represents the stevedoring companies and, as such, represents the interests of free enterprise.

Obviously one person, apart from myself, disagrees with this. I refer to Mr. Harpham of the United Graziers Association. He said that the statements made by Mr Baillie on Nationwide that he would use No. 2 berth as an auxiliary to No. 1 container berth would mean that one company would be operating both of these berths, towards which some \$50m has been spent in development by the Port of Brisbane Authority.

Quite obviously there is a change towards containers in shipping through the port of Brisbane. Mr Harpham also said he feels that this is the thin end of the wedge to enable BATL and BWWD to get control of No. 2 berth. They have sole use of these two berths on which \$50m has been spent by the Port of Brisbane Authority. He states that this will be a monopoly.

(Time expired.)

STATE BUDGET DETAILS ON EDUCATION

Mrs KYBURZ (Salisbury) (5.43 p.m.): Today a document has been circulated by the Minister for Education containing some explicit details of financial allocations that are to be made by the Treasurer of this State this coming Thursday—not tomorrow but the day after. I therefore submit that the Minister for Education has blatantly breached the traditions of parliamentary propriety by releasing detailed facts and figures of budgetary allocations which should have remained strictly—I repeat “strictly”—confidential.

What has the Minister done that is improper? I submit to the House that he has given details of increases in funding for at least five specific education-related areas. The document quotes facts and figures down to the last dollar in certain areas of allocations. I deliberately did not bring this document into the House today, although there are many copies of it floating around the building. If I had brought a copy into the Chamber with me I could have been required to table it, and that would have compounded what I regard as a felony before this House. I have a copy in safe keeping and I have given a copy to the Treasurer of this State because I believe that he should be au fait with the fact that a Minister of the Crown, a part of that supposed Cabinet of 18, has not in fact played by the rules.

Now I would like to discuss certain facts of this gross impropriety which this Minister has committed. Only a week ago all of Australia was shocked by the premature announcement of the Federal Budget. At the time Mr Howard said that if he had been in any way responsible for the leak Parliament could have, and would rightly have, expected his resignation. He said that he would give it. Should members of the Queensland Cabinet be bound by any lower standards than those? Should this Parliament expect any lower standards than those? I would say, “No, indeed we should not.”

The Federal Police were called in to investigate. In the Federal Budget leaks, those concerns were paramount. In Federal Parliament, the Treasurer called upon the Federal Police to find the culprit and charge him. I would like to quote from “The Courier-Mail” of Monday, 18 August—

“In November, 1947, the British Chancellor of the Exchequer, Dr Hugh Dalton, resigned after having told a reporter that beer prices would rise by a penny a pint in his Budget.

“The Labour Prime Minister, Mr Attlee, was forced by pressure from the Winston Churchill-led Opposition to appoint a select committee of inquiry into Dr Dalton’s action and to accept his resignation.”

Can we expect any less in this Parliament? My concern centres not only on gross impropriety but also on the commercial advantage that could be gained as a result of these Budget leaks, particularly in soft-wear which is pushed into schools by some firms.

What will happen to the person responsible for these leaks? I consider it, as I said before, to be a gross act of impropriety. I call upon the Premier of this State to step in immediately in defence of the propriety and integrity of the whole of his Cabinet. If he does not act now by immediately suspending the Minister for Education, he will be shown to have no concern for this Parliament.

Another thing that we must be concerned about is the number of copies of the document circulating. I am backed up by my colleague on the Education committee, the member for Southport (Mr Peter White), who has resigned from that committee in protest at being shown Budget leaks. I call upon the Premier to take action over this Minister, who I believe should be suspended immediately.

GROUP AIR FARES

Mr POWELL (Isis) (5.47 p.m.): I rise in this place to discuss a matter which rather shocks me. I refer to an article on the front page of last Sunday's "Sunday Sun" headed "Air fares shock to charity". The article is reported to emanate from "Sunday Sun's" Canberra office. In that we read that the Federal Government has had the temerity to approach both Ansett and TAA to stop concessions being given to sporting bodies and other people who fly in groups.

I would have thought that the Liberal-led Government in Canberra was one that promoted free enterprise and, as such, would have been able to sustain the proposition that those two companies ought to be able to vie one with the other in arrangements for sensible amounts of money for group bookings. As was pointed out by those who oppose the Federal Government's point of view, generally speaking the people who fly in these groups do so in off-peak periods. In other words, the aircraft would otherwise be almost empty and the people travelling by concession are merely filling up those aircraft.

I have sent telegrams to the Federal member for Wide Bay and to Queensland senators asking them to approach the Minister for Transport (Mr Ralph Hunt) to see that something sensible is done. The way the Federal Government is acting in this matter is just plain stupid. In fact, at a meeting of the Bundaberg branch of the National Party last night a resolution was passed unanimously condemning the Federal Government's attitude on this matter. They, too, will be taking the matter up.

It is quite sensible, I suppose, for people of Victoria to complain about concessions for sporting groups travelling on aircraft. However, the problems of communication in Victoria are not comparable with those in Queensland.

The Queensland Soccer Federation conducts a State league competition and teams from Mareeba to the Gold Coast travel throughout the State. That has raised the standard of soccer in Queensland. It would not have been possible if TAA had not been able to arrange a concession for the clubs involved. Now we find that the Federal Government is saying to TAA and Ansett, "You can't carry on with those concessions." What rot! I understand that the Minister concerned was a bit embarrassed and said, "Well, they may be able to do it if they give the Government notice of what they are doing." Why should

they give the Government notice? Surely it is the responsibility of the companies concerned to run their business along the lines that they see fit.

I believe that it is up to us, as members of the State Parliament, to tell the Federal Government that we disagree completely with its policy, that it should allow the companies concerned, as they see fit, to arrange concessions for sporting bodies or other bodies that wish to travel on a group basis. Surely it is their responsibility to have the seats in the aircraft filled and to help people travel throughout the State. As Queensland is such a large State, I believe it has a special case, and I sincerely hope that honourable members will take up the call that I have made to redirect the Federal Government in a sensible direction.

ESTABLISHMENT OF GOVERNMENT-MANAGED FUNERAL FUND

Mr WRIGHT (Rockhampton) (5.52 p.m.): I rise to advocate the establishment of a special Government-managed funeral fund to lessen the financial burden of dying.

It is well known to honourable members that today the cost of dying is nudging the \$1,000 mark. It is certainly a burden for, and a source of worry to, the aged. In many instances, relatives are left with a debt for funeral expenses that they cannot afford. Unfortunately, many pensioners are afraid to put money aside because they believe that any additional savings could affect their pensions.

The existing Federal Government funeral benefit is a miserable \$40, and it drops back to \$20 if the claimant is not a pensioner. I believe that the solution lies with the SGIO, if a special type of whole-of-life insurance cum funeral-benefit scheme is adopted. My inquiries show that the SGIO could launch a special funeral benefit plan, the benefits of which, while being part of an estate, could be paid out immediately without the usual letters of administration from the Public Trust Office.

The policy could cover both the breadwinner and the spouse in a similar way to the "his and her" insurance concept. Depending on the applicant's age, no medical check-up would be required, and a scheme could be developed to cover employees in a particular industry en bloc. It would be possible to subscribe to such a fund for a very low amount. In fact, there could be a \$2,000 coverage for between \$1 and \$2 a week. It would be possible, also, to have written into such a scheme an escalation clause to meet the inflationary trends in our society today.

This would really remove the difficulties now facing many people. There is no reason why we cannot have such a scheme, and the SGIO should take it upon itself to embark upon such a scheme and give a lead to society in Queensland.

The House adjourned at 5.53 p.m.