

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

TUESDAY, 24 MARCH 1981

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

TUESDAY, 24 MARCH 1981

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

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:—

Orders in Council under—

Supreme Court Act 1921–1979.

State Housing Act 1945–1979.

Electricity Act 1976–1980.

Mines Regulation Act 1964–1979.

Harbours Act 1955–1980.

Section 43 of the Metropolitan Transit Authority Act 1976–1979.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

AMBULANCE SERVICES IN QUEENSLAND

Hon. B. D. AUSTIN (Wavell—Minister for Health) (11.3 a.m.): We in Queensland are very fortunate in that we have a dedicated community ambulance service. The report I present to Parliament today deals with an exhaustive investigation into the service, and I am sure the findings will be of great value for Queensland for the future. The report covers all facets of the service, including financing, staff-training, vehicles, equipment and paramedics. I stress that we need rational thinking and planning on this matter, and not some emotive, headline-grabbing response which casts a slur on ambulance officers.

The committee of review of ambulance services was formed in 1979 to undertake a complete review of the Queensland ambulance transport services. That committee, under the chairmanship of the senior health officer of my department, Dr Musgrave, comprised three senior representatives of the QATB, including the former president and current secretary of the QATB State Council; members of the medical profession, including the professor of anaesthetics at Queensland university; and two senior officers of my department, who also hold positions on the QATB State Council.

The committee's terms of reference were to review the State's ambulance services with regard to the following matters:—

The relationship of ambulance services with other arms of the health services;

An examination of ramifications of regionalisation of services;

The rationalisation of services;

A review of financial arrangements; and

Training (including advanced life-saving support techniques) and standardisation of vehicles and equipment.

The committee has now completed its deliberations, and its findings and recommendations are embodied in a 425-page report. I am sure members will be satisfied that the committee has effectively carried out the commission which it was given.

A summary of the committee's main recommendation is as follows:—

The ambulance service should retain its organisational independence and not become incorporated into either the Public Service system or the State hospital system. It should be controlled and governed by a central body called the "Queensland Ambulance Service Board" and administrative responsibility should be devolved into two further tiers in the form of three divisions and 90 ambulance centres throughout the State.

Ambulance superintendents should be in charge of administration and operations throughout the State, subject to a central executive and the Queensland Ambulance Service Board. Area ambulance committees should be retained in an advisory capacity to exercise certain prescribed functions and to lend assistance in fund-raising.

Standardised specifications for motor vehicles and equipment are proposed in order to provide the optimum in type, cost-effectiveness and utilisation.

Uniform standards of training, levels of skill required and standards of service provided, are proposed in some detail. A career structure for ambulance officers is considered essential.

More stable financial arrangements have been proposed which include assurances of minimum Government assistance on the one hand and maximum limits of Government liability on the other.

The proposed Queensland Ambulance Service Board would comprise a chairman nominated by the Minister for Health, the director of the Ambulance Services, two Department of Health representatives including a medical officer of senior rank, a medical officer of senior rank from a major hospital (who has appropriate experience), each of the three divisional representatives of the area ambulance committees, and each of the three divisional (ambulance) superintendents.

Basic administrative units would be called ambulance centres. There should be 90 of these. It is recommended that there will be 26 functional districts created to ensure the optimum in co-ordination of the operational aspects of the ambulance services.

Existing services should be rationalised on the basis of viability and efficiency with the elimination of non-viable centres or their downgrading in status to "subcentres" as appropriate. The latter should occur in 17 instances, and one new subcentre should be created.

The functional structure of the ambulance headquarters should cover staff and industrial, research, radio communications, central training school, supply, property, marketing

and finance and accounts. Motor vehicle servicing should be rationalised and maintenance workshops and vehicle pools established in key centres.

Responsibility for the eight ambulance services operated by country hospitals should be transferred to the Queensland Ambulance Service Board.

The future role of area ambulance committees should be to promote the ambulance service, advise the board, participate in appointment of staff, provide three representatives to serve on the board, assist in fund-raising and provide representatives for attendance at conferences at various levels up to State level.

Seven advisory committees should be created to cover the following disciplines; medical, training, health service co-ordination, industrial liaison, planning-development and building standards, finance and vehicles and equipment.

The operational guide-lines should be based on precise aims and objectives. These should be clearly defined and relate to the provision and maintenance of emergency care through the initiation and maintenance of life support, provision of ambulance transport, provision of first aid and the teaching of first aid. Three categories of vehicles have been suggested with one sort to be used for standard accident emergency transport.

Paramedics are not recommended, but a limited trial of mobile advanced life support units in the Brisbane metropolitan area is recommended. Calls for these would be mediated through the ambulance centre controller, but the vehicles would be staffed by a doctor and nurse as well as the ambulance officer.

Improved communications systems are recommended. A series of training courses of prescribed standards should be introduced over a period of some years. Advancement of ambulance officers would be dependent on this. Special provision should be made for refresher courses and advanced training in special skills.

A new expanded central training school will be required.

Appointments of ambulance officers up to Grade III should be made by a divisional superintendent upon the recommendation of an appointment panel, and more senior staff should be appointed upon the recommendation of a central committee.

The method of financing recommended will involve a limited Government grant plus a marginal Government endowment which will be based upon the fund-raising performance of the ambulance service. A formula has been provided which sets an upper limit on both the Government grant and endowment. It is anticipated that this will serve to safeguard against an open-ended demand upon Government finance and at the same

time ensure that minimum funding will be available to the ambulance service from the Government.

Fund-raising by means of benefits should be abolished except for especially approved capital works projects. Most fund-raising should be the ultimate responsibility of a central promotions and marketing branch.

Uniform rates of contribution should apply throughout Queensland, and variations in contribution rates should be at the discretion of the board. Ambulance officers should not be involved in fund-raising.

Two alternative methods of financing inter-hospital transfers of public hospital patients have been recommended. One involves a single lump sum payment to be provided as part of the annual grant and the other would be provision within the Department of Health annual budget of funds to enable hospitals boards to pay fees levied by the ambulance service for each patient transfer. Centralisation of accounting systems is recommended along with the establishment of a central accounting branch.

It is also recommended that the Ambulance Services Act and part of the Health Act and Hospitals Act should be redrafted to accommodate the changes recommended by the committee.

The question of legal liability of ambulance officers and various insurance policies covering accidental injury and death require further attention by the Queensland Ambulance Service Board when constituted.

I will be very interested in the reaction to these findings throughout the community. The report has been widely circulated. I hope honourable members will take the opportunity to give me their comments on it. I now have great pleasure in tabling the report.

Whereupon the honourable gentleman laid the report on the table.

ELECTROLYTIC CHLORINATORS, SALT-WATER SWIMMING-POOL FILTERS

Hon. I. J. GIBBS (Albert—Minister for Mines and Energy) (11.10 a.m.): Concern has been expressed in recent months over the proper use of electrolytic chlorinators fitted to salt-water swimming-pool filters. Reports have been received of explosions occurring in 24 filters fitted with this device in Queensland. Fortunately, no person has been injured. An investigation has now been completed into the circumstances surrounding these explosions. The investigation involved the Government Gas Examiner, officers from the State Electricity Commission of Queensland and manufacturers representatives.

At the outset it must be stressed that correctly designed and installed electrolytic

chlorinators are safe. The investigation found the explosions had resulted from a buildup of gas caused by two main factors:—

(1) The chlorinator was wired independently of the pump motor allowing the chlorinator to generate gas when the pump was not operating, thus allowing gas to build up in the system and collect in the filter, instead of being swept out into the pool with the water flow.

(2) The chlorinator was installed in such a manner that when the pump stopped, water was not able to drain clear of the chlorinator electrodes, resulting in further generation of hydrogen and other gases.

It is apparent that a number of this type of swimming-pool chlorinators have been installed on a "do it yourself" basis.

I urge all users of electrolytic chlorinators to check to ensure the device is wired correctly so that it cannot operate without the pump motor and create a hazard. A check should also be made to ensure installation provides proper drainage away from chlorinator electrodes. In this context professional advice is available through electricity suppliers or the Queensland Swimming Pools Association Limited.

Following the investigation the Government Gas Examiner has issued instructions under the Gas Act 1965–1976 laying down minimum requirements for the performance, installation and operation of electrolytic chlorinators for swimming-pools. These requirements will become effective as from 1 July 1981.

I repeat that the investigations showed that correctly designed and installed electrolytic chlorinators can be used with confidence and safety.

Mr Speaker, I table the requirements and seek leave to have them incorporated in "Hansard" for the information of honourable members and the public generally.

(Leave granted.)

Whereupon the honourable gentleman laid on the table the following requirements—

The following minimum requirements for the performance, installation and operation of electrolytic chlorinators for use with swimming pools shall apply.

1. The design of the electrolytic chlorinator shall allow all water to drain from the cell on the build up of gas.

2. The location and attitude of the electrolytic chlorinator when installed shall allow all water to drain from the cell on build up of gas.

3. The location and attitude of the electrolytic chlorinator when installed shall not allow a build up of gas exceeding two litres.

4. Any gas generated shall be confined to the electrolytic chlorinator and associated pipework. It shall not be able to collect in the filter,

5. The electrolytic chlorinator shall not be wired independently of the pump motor and shall be wired in such a manner that failure of electric power to the pump motor shall also cause electric power supply to the electrolytic chlorinator to cease.

6. Installation instructions supplied with electrolytic chlorinators shall embody the foregoing requirements 1 to 5 inclusive.

7. These instructions shall become effective from 1 July 1981.

QUESTIONS UPON NOTICE

Questions submitted on notice by members were answered as follows:—

1. NEW POLICE STATIONS, TOWNSVILLE

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

In view of the recent announcement by his department of the proposed building of new police stations in this State, does he intend to honour the pre-election promise made by his predecessor the Hon. R. E. Camm that new police stations would be erected in Townsville in the city proper and in the suburb of Kirwan?

Answer:—

Necessary documentation for the construction of the new Police District Headquarters at Townsville is nearing completion and it is anticipated tenders will be called in May 1981. A new police station for Kirwan is included in the department's program of building requirements. Funding arrangements have not been completed.

2. APPEALS AGAINST MEDICAL BOARD DECISIONS IN WORKERS' COMPENSATION CASES

Dr Scott-Young asked the Minister for Justice and Attorney-General—

(1) As he is aware that an injured and disabled worker has no appeal in any jurisdiction against the decision of a medical board under the Workers' Compensation Act and as a murderer has an appeal against his conviction, is not this an infringement against the workers' compensation appellant's basic rights?

(2) Will he have this injustice investigated with a view to the establishment of an appeals tribunal similar to the tribunal the Department of Veterans' Affairs has functioning?

Answer:—

(1 & 2) Medical boards are set up under the Workers' Compensation Act with the object of determining essentially medical questions. The board consists of highly

specialised medical practitioners dealing with predominantly technical matters peculiarly within their specialties.

It is difficult to make a direct comparison with a criminal trial where so many factors enter into the determination of fact and the application of law. However, if the honourable member wishes to have further information on the topic, he should address his question to my colleague the Honourable the Minister for Employment and Labour Relations.

3. TRAFFIC CONGESTION, CAPALABA

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

Following his inspection of traffic problems in the Capalaba area in the electorate of Redlands, what action will his department take to solve these problems at the busy intersections in this business area?

Answer:—

The channelised intersection at the junction of Cleveland-Capalaba Road and Birkdale Road will be improved and signalised under the provisions of a scheme to be released in the near future. Traffic and pedestrian counts and other necessary investigations have been authorised at three other locations—one at the Alexandra Hills shopping centre, another at Capalaba, and a third at the intersection of Redland Bay Road and Mt Cotton Road. I shall advise the honourable member of decisions taken with regard to these locations after the investigations have been completed.

4. NEW SCHOOL, BIRKDALE

Mr Goleby asked the Minister for Works and Housing—

When will tenders be called for the construction of the proposed school recommended to be built in Old Cleveland Road, Birkdale and when will construction commence?

Answer:—

Tenders will be called during the month of April with a view to having the new school at Birkdale South available for the opening of the 1982 school year.

5. SHOW-CAUSE NOTICES UNDER TRAFFIC ACT

Mr Davis asked the Minister for Transport—

With reference to what is commonly known as the "point system" under the Traffic Act, for the years 1977-78, 1978-79 and 1979-80—

How many licence holders were asked to "show cause" and of these how many had their licences (a) suspended, and (b)

cancelled, and how many licence holders were (i) issued with a warning and (ii) allowed to retain their licence but with restriction?

Answer:—

The information sought is set out on page 85 of the 1980 annual report of the Queensland Police Department which was printed and circulated in December last year during the parliamentary recess and would be available to the honourable member.

6. TRAFFIC LIGHTS AT T-JUNCTIONS

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

(1) Did his department give full approval to the introduction of the T-junction rule and, if so, has the cost of providing traffic lights at these T-junctions been investigated in order to alleviate some of the lengthy delays that are now occurring?

(2) If so, what is the estimated cost to his department to alleviate these bottlenecks at major T-junctions?

Answer:—

(1 & 2) The T-junction rule was introduced as an amendment to regulation 34 of the Traffic Act 1949-1977. The Traffic Act is administered by the Minister for Transport (the Honourable D. F. Lane) to whom any questions regarding the introduction of the rule should be directed.

Since the T-junction rule came into operation, increased traffic delays have occurred at a relatively small number of intersections. On the other hand, traffic operations have improved at others.

Priorities are being arranged so that the intersections which have increased problems receive attention at the earliest possible time. Most of the work brought on by the introduction of the T-junction rule would have been needed sooner or later if the rule had not been introduced.

7. TRANSPORT OF SULPHURIC ACID AND CAUSTIC SODA

Mr Davis asked the Minister for Transport—

(1) Are there any restrictions on the cartage of sulphuric acid and caustic soda and, if so, what regulations cover these restrictions?

(2) If not, will he ensure that his department investigates the carriage of these dangerous materials?

Answer:—

(1 & 2) Yes, there are restrictions on the carriage of goods by rail and by road. I am informed by the Commissioner for Railways that, so far as his department is

concerned, these commodities are accepted only when the relevant packaging conditions for the carriage of dangerous goods are complied with.

The conditions for the carriage of these and a comprehensive list of other goods of a dangerous nature are outlined in clause 59A of the Goods and Livestock Rates Book (By-law No. 1038) and, so far as interstate transactions are concerned, in the Code of Practices and Conditions for the Carriage of Dangerous Goods. Rail tank cars provided for the transport of sulphuric acid are constructed to standards defined and observed by the Australian and New Zealand railway systems.

With respect to road transport, I am informed by the Commissioner for Transport that the requirements for the carriage of the hazardous goods mentioned are set out in the Australian Code for the Transport of Dangerous Goods published in the Australian Government Gazette on Friday, 19 December 1980.

The question of calling up the code following its endorsement by Ministers of the Australian Transport Advisory Council is presently under examination by each State and Territory. At present, observance of the code in Queensland is a condition of permits and licences to hire issued under the State Transport Act, but the broader question involving the movement of hazardous goods not subject to the State Transport Act, such as interstate carriage, is presently under examination.

8. BRITFIX LIQUID POLY 70

Dr Lockwood asked the Minister for Health—

(1) Is the hobby glue Britfix Liquid Poly 70 an extremely toxic volatile solvent liquid that can be used as an inhalation anaesthetic, and does the 30 mL bottle contain sufficient poison to kill six healthy adults or 10 or more children?

(2) Will he consider exercising his powers to ban the sale of this and similar products, (a) absolutely, until the product displays a warning indicating its toxicity, extreme risk when sniffed for the excitement that precedes coma or death, the danger especially to toddlers when accidentally ingested, as well as the chemical formula, name and concentration of the poison it contains and (b) to all minors in recognition of the fact that this poison is at least as dangerous to life as any firearm?

Answer:—

(1) Britfix Liquid Poly 70 has been analysed and contains toluene which has low grade toxic potential in normal usage.

(2) Requirements for labelling are set out in the Health Act and Poisons Regulations.

9. BUTTER QUOTA DAIRY FARMS

Dr Lockwood asked the Minister for Primary Industries—

(1) Has his department encountered complicated leasing arrangements for butter quota dairy farms that have been entered into with the apparent intention of defying the provisions of the Milk Supply Act 1977-1978 and the role of the Milk Entitlements Committee, when a dairy farmer leaves the industry?

(2) If so, approximately how many litres of milk are affected by such practices and, if not, will he investigate the right of new suppliers to supply after farmers leave the industry?

Answer:—

(1) Leasing in the dairy industry is a fact of life and the Milk Entitlements Committee has no wish to curtail such arrangements. Implementation of the Milk Supply Act 1977-1978 has introduced a new factor with negotiability of entitlement for the drop-out farmer.

Following the enactment of the Milk Supply Act on 1 June 1978, the Milk Entitlements Committee laid down a policy that it must be advised of all existing lease arrangements and that new arrangements would be subject to approval by the committee.

The committee has had placed before it many complicated leasing arrangements. However, no evidence has been tendered which would suggest intentional circumvention of the legislation. Nevertheless, the committee is concerned that under certain circumstances, the rights of a lessor producer may be depleted in respect of entitlement. They have, therefore, proposed amendments to the Milk Supply Act which are now under consideration.

(2) It is Government policy that new registrations in prescribed areas of South-east Queensland will not be granted prior to the completion of stage 2 of the redistribution of market milk. At that time, I shall invite submissions from the Queensland Dairymen's Organisation and the Milk Entitlements Committee and the matter will receive further consideration.

10. CALOUNDRA STATE SCHOOL

Mr Frawley asked the Minister for Education—

(1) Is he aware that the Caloundra State Primary School is grossly overcrowded?

(2) How many buildings are there at the school in which temporary accommodation is provided?

(3) Are there any proposals for the construction of a primary school at Golden Beach, Caloundra where land is already held by his department?

(4) Do 240 children who are residents of Golden Beach, Caloundra travel daily to Caloundra State Primary School?

Answer:—

(1) The Caloundra State School had an enrolment of 1017 as at 19 March 1981. There are 32 class-rooms in operation and there is currently one spare class-room to cater for any short-term increase.

(2) Two of the class-rooms are temporary—that is, located in demountable buildings; ten are in modular buildings; eight in double teaching units; and the remainder in standard class-rooms.

(3) An investigation into the need for a school in the Golden Beach area has been completed. There are more pressing needs in the State for 1982 and a school for Golden Beach will be considered after 1982.

(4) According to the principal, 231 children, residents of the Golden Beach area, currently attend Caloundra State School.

11. TRANSFER OF RESPONSIBILITY FOR WATER AND SEWERAGE

Mr Frawley asked the Premier—

(1) Has he received any complaints from local authorities that delays have been caused by the transfer of the water and sewerage sections from the Local Government Department to the Water Resources Commission?

(2) Are many local authorities quite satisfied with the decision to transfer these departments?

Answer:—

(1) No.

(2) I have received a number of letters from local authorities on the decision to reassign certain staff from the Department of Local Government to the Water Resources Commission. However, I want to assure the honourable member that very careful consideration was given to this matter before the decision was made and I am confident that in no way will it be detrimental to the interests of the local authorities in this State. Indeed, a number of local authorities have informed me that they are quite satisfied with the decision.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

HOME LOAN INTEREST RATES

Mr D'ARCY: I ask the Deputy Premier and Treasurer: What action is the Government taking to stabilise interest rates on home loans from building societies? Last September the Treasurer accused me of being irresponsible and unethical when I indicated

that I believed interest rates on housing loans would rise. This is the third time since then that they have risen. I ask further—

(1) Does he agree that this Government has abandoned any attempt to stabilise interest rates?

(2) If the Government does believe in stabilisation, what steps are being taken to stabilise them?

Dr EDWARDS: I again say that the honourable member has been irresponsible in his statements. The honourable member does not understand that the Queensland Government's only influence on interest rates is in the field of building societies. We do not control the Federal savings bond rate, nor do we control the public bond rate. We do not have any influence on those except as one member of the Loan Council. I am sure that the honourable member is well aware that this Government, through the Premier as its representative on the Loan Council and me as his supporter in that area, has consistently reflected our views on the movement of interest rates in this State. To say that there have been three rises in interest rates since September for home owners in this State is totally inaccurate.

Mr D'Arcy: You have to take them into consideration.

Dr EDWARDS: That is not a matter that is under our control, as the Deputy Leader of the Opposition should know.

As to building societies—the Deputy Leader of the Opposition would know full well that for a long time the Queensland Government has resisted public pressure—and indeed pressure from the industry—to allow an increase in building society interest rates. In some instances, that has been to the detriment of the industry. We have to find a balance between the funds that are available for building homes and the cost to the borrower in the community. We have trod that line with great responsibility.

I share the concern expressed by many members of the community that interest rates are too high. This Government has placed its record before the people of Australia—not just those in Queensland. We will continue to battle against rising interest rates in this nation. If the Federal Government does not do something about them, this will be a very big problem for the building industry and for home owners.

My colleague the Minister for Justice and Attorney-General and I had discussions this morning, following the announcement of the interest rate for Australian savings bonds, and a further announcement on interest rates will be made later today by the Government of this State. We are forced into reviewing the position because of the effect that the Australian savings bond rate is having at a national level. It is affecting the whole area of interest rates in this nation. We have acted responsibly and we will continue to do so.

**EVANS DEAKIN INDUSTRIES;
GOVERNMENT SHARE-BUYING**

Mr D'ARCY: In directing a further question to the Deputy Premier and Treasurer, I refer him to the Government's recent foray into the share market in order to prevent the take-over of Evans Deakin Industries by southern-based companies. I now ask:

- (1) Where did the money come from for this operation?
- (2) How much money was involved and how many shares were purchased?
- (3) At what price did the Government purchase the shares?
- (4) What is the current market value of those shares?
- (5) Is the intention to spend any more money in EDI?

Dr EDWARDS: I certainly would not refer to the Government's action as a foray. I believe that the Government took responsible action to protect Queensland companies. I am delighted to know that the honourable member agreed with the action that the Government took. It was interesting to see him and his leader in opposition to one another on that aspect. As to the purchase of shares, I do not have at my disposal at this moment the number of shares that the Government purchased.

Mr R. J. Gibbs: Pick a number between—

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Dr EDWARDS: That might be the way the Deputy Leader of the Opposition operates; I do not operate in that way.

The Government went into the marketplace as a normal share purchaser in the community to purchase shares in those companies. We no longer have any shares in Walkers; we disposed of them. I believe that we still have some shares in EDI and that they will be disposed of as soon as possible. The action that the Government took was taken for the benefit of the people of Queensland. If members of the Opposition wish to identify themselves with southern companies, they can do so. The Government, on the other hand, will be identified predominantly with protecting employment opportunities for Queenslanders. As to the amount of money that was spent and the number of shares that the Government holds, I shall advise the honourable member of those matters in a letter later today.

SOUTH GREGORY COAL DEPOSITS

Mr D'ARCY: I refer the Minister for Mines and Energy to the future development of the South Gregory coal deposits and ask

him: Following on the Winchester South deliberation, which he stated had "set a new standard" for negotiations—

- (1) What stage have applications proposing the mining of the Gregory Basin coal deposits reached?
- (2) How does he intend to evaluate tenders submitted for the project?
- (3) Given the increased Government security surrounding documents concerning this area, does he intend to restrict information concerning the evaluation of tenders to himself alone in order to preserve their confidentiality?

Mr I. J. Gibbs: Recently the Treasurer clearly stated the position concerning future applications. The Gregory project is a totally new one, and it will be handled in the normal manner when applications come in to the Mines Department. That has been the practice for many years. The matter of future applications is one for the Government's decision. The honourable member will be acquainted with the decisions as they are made. It is important that the Mines Department and the Government continue to be authorities that the people can trust and have confidence in. During my term of office as Minister, that is how the position will remain.

It is a pity that documents are leaked. Apparently that is something we have to live with. In fact, I was interested in the comment of the acting Leader of the Opposition to the effect that if such a leak occurred in the Labor Party it would conduct a witch-hunt. And so it should. The Premier has made quite clear how Cabinet Ministers and public servants will stand in future if any further leaks occur. Nothing less than the situation as outlined by him is proper in relation to confidentiality.

The Opposition need not worry about the Government's actions and the way the Government operates. The Opposition should put its own house in order before it disintegrates. In fact, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr Casey) made that very point in his letters to the new guard and the old guard. The way the Opposition is going, it will self-destruct at any moment.

CARCASS CLASSIFICATION

Mr INNES: In directing a question to the Minister for Primary Industries, I remind him that last week the manager of the Parkroyal Motel stated on ABC radio that he would not recommend that customers order rump steak in the motel at this time because the locally obtainable beef was not of prime quality. He further stated that justifiable complaints were made from time to time by guests, particularly from countries where beef classification was in operation, and he would like to see classification so that he and other consumers could be assured of top-quality beef for which they were prepared to pay top prices. I now ask: Does this call from a large consumer, in what is

virtually an export shop-front situation, add a new dimension to the debate over beef classification which hitherto, understandably, has been dominated by producers?

Mr AHERN: The statement by the manager of the Parkroyal Motor Inn restaurant has had a useful outcome inasmuch as it has opened up again some public debate on the need for carcass classification in this State, and, indeed, across Australia. I agree with the honourable member that the restaurant manager's statement indicates very serious concern and constitutes an argument for carcass classification from the point of view of the consumers. There certainly is little chance of carcass classification getting any meaningful implementation in Australia if there is not a demand for it both from the trade and from the consumers. I was very pleased to note what happened.

The ensuing debate has been useful. Honourable members will probably be happy to hear that carcass classification trials around Australia have been proceeding. The stage has been reached where, at the recent meeting of the Australian Agricultural Council in Hobart, Ministers agreed that we should move to more implementation trials in Australia on a voluntary basis. We agreed on machinery to encourage greater voluntary use of carcass classification in meatworks around the country. This will happen and is in fact happening with my complete support and that of the department and the meat authority in Queensland.

I strongly support carcass classification, but I do not believe it can come in compulsorily overnight. It must be a voluntary process. The moves that have been made have been useful, and I support the comments made by the honourable member.

FLOOD RELIEF LOANS, DALBY AREA

Mr HANSEN: In asking the Minister for Primary Industries a question, I refer him to criticism by the Federal member for Maranoa, Mr Ian Cameron, of the Queensland Government's handling of relief loans to flood-affected farmers round Dalby. Is Mr Cameron correct when he charges the Queensland Government with making money from the disaster by charging interest on money which it receives as an interest-free loan from the Commonwealth? What expenditure by the Queensland Government warrants the charging of 7 per cent for these disaster-relief loans?

Mr AHERN: I am aware of the criticism of the honourable member for Maranoa. It is without foundation and I have told him so. The formula to which the honourable member for Maryborough refers was determined at a Premiers Conference, where it was decided that moneys to be expended on natural disaster relief arrangements were to be contributed 75 per cent by the Commonwealth and 25 per cent by the States.

The money from the Commonwealth was to be made available on a repayable grant basis and the contribution by the State, by way of loan funds, for instance, would have to be raised at the normal rate of interest payable on loan funds at the time. The loan fund contribution of the 25 per cent component would have to be raised at interest of the order of 13.6 per cent.

As well, the State Government would have to cover all administration costs associated with the scheme and would have to carry any bad debts associated with the scheme as well as the contribution for any loans made for longer than the arrangements for which the agreement provided. I am advised that the State's contribution has been more than 25 per cent.

Honourable members would be aware that, operating under a Federal and State arrangement, the moneys have to be accounted to the Federal authorities as well as our own auditors. The Federal Government is more than happy with the arrangement that we have entered into. We should also remember that all of these arrangements have to be approved by the Federal Government in the first instance, and it has willingly approved the arrangements that we made.

I have studied the arrangements that have been entered into with other State Governments in respect of the drought and I say, without any fear of contradiction, that the contribution in respect of droughts and floods in this State is at least as generous as, if not more generous than, that in any other State.

BRISBANE CITY COUNCIL TRANSPORT DEPARTMENT LOSSES

Mr GYGAR: I ask the Minister for Transport: Is it a fact that Brisbane City Council buses lost \$6.4m last financial year and carried 1.5 million fewer passengers? Has the Lord Mayor, Alderman Sleeman, described the council's Transport Department as a success story? Is the stated \$6.4m a true picture of the the total loss?

Mr LANE: I did read a report that Brisbane City Council bus patronage figures last financial year dropped to their lowest since 1975 and were still falling. I noted, too, a listing by the Lord Mayor of initiatives taken to attract custom.

However, I cannot by any stretch of the imagination accept either the year's results as a success story or the figure of a \$6.4m loss as being the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth.

The annual report to the council conveniently overlooked the \$6.4m by which the State Government is currently subsidising the BCC Transport Department and the \$9.6m the council diverted from other funds to its Transport Department. By that, I mean the diversion of ratepayers' money to finance the buses.

To put it another way, the total cost of running the council's Transport Department last year was \$27.9m. Revenue paid in fares totalled \$11.9m and the State Government subsidy was \$6.4m. I know that figure will be of a great deal of interest to the honourable member for Brisbane Central.

A simple mathematical exercise, and we will keep it simple for the member for Brisbane Central, will reveal that the total loss last financial year was more in the region of \$16m than the \$6.4m that has been stated.

I freely admit that this has been caused by the competition of electrification, the problems of rising fuel and wage costs and the loss of patronage following the opening of the Merivale Bridge, but I hope full co-operation by the Brisbane City Council with the Metropolitan Transit Authority will result in a fully integrated public transport system for Brisbane involving bus, electrified rail and ferry services as outlined in the MTA's five-year plan, which I commend to honourable members.

TAB AGENCIES

Mr WARBURTON: In directing a question to the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Police, I refer to recent reports concerning the possible closure of TAB agencies, with particular reference to the Shorncliffe agency and other agencies in the Sandgate electorate. I ask: Will the Minister advise as to the correctness of these reports? Should the reports be incorrect, will he inform the House of any plans he may have to upgrade TAB amenities for punters?

A Government Member interjected.

Mr HINZE: My colleague just said, "Yes, carpets on the floor and free beer." It will not be quite as good as that.

There has been some comment recently about improved facilities for punters throughout our TAB agencies. I hope that this will occur. I hope that in the future it will be possible to give punters everything that they are entitled to in the agencies. The practice has grown for members of Parliament to try to have agencies opened in their electorates—I guess to try to pick up a few votes—but I have to say here and now that those days are gone, and that the agencies have to be run as efficient organisations. There is no way in the world that the industry can continue to carry inefficient agencies, irrespective of where they are in the State.

I want to make it quite clear that we will not take away from the public the right to have a legitimate bet in every part of the State. I do not wish to go into the detail of the type of agency that I see in the future, but the legislation to be brought into the House within a week will give all honourable members ample opportunity to consider and discuss our proposals.

GOVERNMENT INTERFERENCE IN BUSINESS AFFAIRS

Mr PRENTICE: I ask the Minister for Commerce and Industry: Is he aware that his Victorian counterpart, the Minister for Economic Development, invited Victorians to telephone him with examples of development being restricted by red tape and indeed received 1 300 complaints in four days? Will the Minister investigate the Victorian scheme with a view to implementing it in Queensland and hopefully reduce the impact of Government and bureaucratic interference in business affairs?

Mr SULLIVAN: I am aware of the invitation extended by my Victorian counterpart. I cannot speak for his way of thinking. I know the gentleman; we were together on an agricultural council for a number of years.

If there is so much red tape in the department under his administration in Victoria, I commend him for his actions. However, only last week I spoke to industrialists from Victoria who, because of the difficulty in getting through to Government departments in Victoria, are transferring their operations to Queensland.

By the way, this is not a Dorothy Dix question, and I thank the honourable member for giving me this opportunity. I think some people who are establishing a steel pipe manufacturing complex on the Murgon Industrial Estate went to see the Premier. I have a letter from the director of the development bureau in Murgon (Mr Tiernan) thanking me and my officers on behalf of these industrialists from Victoria for the complete co-operation they received in their dealings with the department. Those industrialists made the comment that it was rather refreshing to come to Queensland and deal here rather than having to put up with the problems in Victoria.

SAND-MINING ON MORETON ISLAND

Mr MACKENROTH: In directing a question to the Minister for Mines and Energy, I refer him to the statement by Mr K. M. Horler, executive director of the Mineral Sands Producers Association, that mining would affect only one-fifth of Moreton Island and the statement by the Queensland Chamber of Mines president, Mr O. D. Paterson, that he would not be satisfied with mining 6.4 per cent of Moreton Island as outlined in the Cook report. I now ask:

(1) Will he give an assurance that no mining will commence on Moreton Island before the whole issue is debated in this Parliament?

(2) Will he allow the people of Queensland the opportunity to put forward their views?

(3) Will he give an assurance today that, if mining were to commence, it would not exceed the recommendations of the Cook report?

Mr I. J. GIBBS: There is only one thing about which I can assure the honourable member: this Government has always acted properly in all these matters and will continue to do so.

The honourable member will know what the decision is when it is made.

At 12 noon,

In accordance with the provisions of Standing Order No. 17, the House proceeded with Government business.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

RESUMPTION OF DEBATE—FIFTH ALLOTTED DAY

Debate resumed from 19 March (see p. 402) on Dr Lockwood's motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply, on which Mr Casey had moved the following amendment—

"Add to the Address the following words—

'However, it is the opinion of this Legislature that your advisers have failed to immediately initiate both the electoral and Government reform in this State as indicated by them during the election campaign and they have shown no real intent in their legislative program to properly overcome the problems of unemployment and economic hardship which face all sections of the Queensland community, despite the fact that the boundless mineral and rural wealth of this State has provided them with ample opportunity, and that they have therefore lost the confidence of this House.'

Mr D'ARCY (Woodridge) (12.1 p.m.): I rise to speak to this Address-in-Reply debate and to the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition. The people of my electorate of Woodridge, which adjoins your electorate, Mr Speaker, in this populous south-eastern corner of Queensland, associate themselves with an expression of thanks to the Governor of Queensland, Sir James Ramsay, for the work that he has done and for the patronage that he has bestowed upon them. He has gained the respect of all the people of Queensland. We congratulate him and hope that he is able to continue in his high office for many years. I also congratulate you, Mr Speaker, on your reelection to your high office. Furthermore, I congratulate the Chairman of Committees, Mr Miller, on his appointment to that position.

Today I intend to make a policy speech on resource development in Queensland and a policy statement on behalf of the Opposition. The next decade will bring about tremendous opportunities in Queensland. If the maximum benefit is to flow from these opportunities, urgent attention must be paid to the planning and co-ordination of the resources boom that is upon us. At present,

Queensland is riding high on the crest of the wave created by the revival of the international economy in an energy-short world. Queensland is extremely fortunate in that it possesses the resources that the world economy needs. However, without proper management of these resources, the benefits from them will flow overseas instead of remaining in the hands of Queenslanders.

Examples of exploitation and expropriation by multinationals are well documented. Yet this Government's policy remains one of wishing and hoping—wishing the multinationals would come and hoping that they would stay. I suggest that something more is required in planning for the resources boom.

By "planning" I mean indicative planning. This has been widely used for several decades by the Governments of Japan, West Germany, France and Sweden, to name but a few of the more prominent nations. Indicative planning involves identification of growth areas and opportunities as well as the planning, in conjunction with private enterprise, of investment and development strategies in both the public and the private sectors. It involves long-range strategies and co-ordination. It is obvious that the economies of the nations I have mentioned have done much better than ours during the slump that has occurred over the past decade.

Opposed to indicative planning is the stop-gap or ad hoc decision-making of this Government. It solves problems as they arise and looks backward in the hope that things will go forward. Unfortunately, this has been the mode of operation in Queensland. Changes are urgently needed.

Resource development has been and is a rapid-growth sector of the Queensland economy. It is tragic that proposals for development invariably seem to be surrounded by controversy. Much of this controversy can be traced back to the inadequate evaluation of investment proposals. Mining development should not be carried out at the cost of the environment or of the safety and health of Australians as a whole or of Queenslanders, nor should it be carried out to the detriment of Aboriginal groups. It should be made mandatory that cost-benefit analyses and studies determining the optimum rate of depletion of non-renewable resources should be fixed up before they are brought before the Government for consideration.

The current controversy over the Winchester South fiasco is a perfect example of ministerial bungling. It is also another example of the "wishing and hoping" approach of the Government to developmental issues. Clear and consistent guide-lines for development are needed. We need clear and consistent guide-lines for the assessment of investment proposals, with emphasis placed on the benefits that will flow to all the people of Queensland. No more secret deals should be pushed through Cabinet. Winchester South is a current example of such

a deal. Tarong, too, is an example of how economic considerations were pushed aside because of political and parochial interests.

I have referred to Winchester South. I have here a Cabinet document that Ministers were asked to consider, and I wish to refer to it.

Mr HANSEN (Maryborough): I move—

“That the document be tabled and included in ‘Hansard’.”

Motion agreed to.

Whereupon the honourable member for Woodridge laid the following document on the table—

For Cabinet

Central Queensland Coal Area

1. By Cabinet Decision No. 33287 of 15th July, 1980 it was approved, inter alia,

That an area of 50 sub-blocks in the Winchester South area as shown on plan D attached to the Submission be offered for competitive application and the successful applicant be required to pay \$250,000 to the Department of Mines to recoup exploration costs upon the grant of the Authority to Prospect.

2. Applications were called in terms approved for such advertisements by Cabinet Decision No. 23368 of 27th October, 1975. A copy of the advertisement published on page 389 of the August 1980 issue of the Queensland Government Mining Journal is attached. Subsequently the closing date was extended from 1st December, 1980 to 2nd January, 1981 at the request of several potential applicants, because of problems in processing existing data on the area under application.

3. A total of 32 applications were received from the following companies and groups.

81/8001 Amax Iron Ore Corporation (50%); Pancontinental Mining Ltd. (40%); Great Western Australia Ltd (10%).

81/8002 Mareeba Mining and Exploration Pty. Ltd. (50%); White Industries (Qld.) Pty. Ltd. (50%).

81/8003 Bridge Oil Ltd. (50%); Idemitsu International Australia Ltd. (35%); Sumitomo Coal Mining Australia Pty. Ltd. (15%).

81/8004 Thiess Dampier Mitsui Coal Pty. Ltd. (70%); Japan Coal Development Australia Pty. Ltd. (30%).

81/8005 Nuinga Ltd.

81/8006 The Griffin Coal Mining Co. Ltd.

81/8007 Oilmin N.L. (50%); Transoil N.L. (25%); Petromin N.L. (25%).

81/8008 Pacific Coal Pty. Ltd. (90%); Veba/NWK Group (10%).

81/8009 New Hope Collieries Pty. Ltd.

81/8010 Offshore Oil N.L. (30%); Pacific Copper Ltd. (30%); Tricentrol North Sea Ltd. (15%); Southern Cross Exploration N.L. (10%); Ocean Resources N.L. (10%); Longreach Oil Ltd. (5%).

81/8011 A.O.G. Pacific Pty. Ltd. (20%); Poral Ltd. (20%); Hyundai Australia Pty. Ltd. (5%); John Holland (Holdings) Ltd. (10%); Kennecott Exploration (Australia) Ltd. (45%).

81/8012 Australian Paper Manufacturers Ltd. (75%); Mitsui Mining/Tokyo Boeki (25%).

81/8013 Central Queensland Coal Associates.

81/8014 Energy Resource Managers of Queensland Pty. Ltd. (50%); West Coast Holdings Ltd. and Command Minerals N.L. (50%).

81/8015 State Government Insurance Office (Queensland) (39%); Crusader Oil N.L. (23%); Consolidated Rutile Ltd. (14%); Holland Carbon Fuels b.v. (14%); Nissho Iwai Australia Ltd. (10%).

81/8016 Pioneer Sugar Mills Ltd. (30%); The Shell Co. of Australia Ltd. (30%); Austen & Butta Collieries Pty. Ltd. (20%); McIlwraith McEachern Operations Pty. Ltd. (20%).

81/8017 Queensland Energy Pty. Ltd. (57%); H.C. Sleigh Resources Ltd. (20%); T & G Mutual Life Society Ltd. (20%); Mitsubishi Mining and Cement (Australia) Pty. Ltd. (3%).

81/8018 Barclay Mining Pty. Ltd. (24%); Fairclough Mining Australia Pty. Ltd. (1%); Leighton Contractors (Queensland) Pty. Ltd. (1%); Marubeni Coal Pty. Ltd. (12.25%); The Colonial Mutual Life Assurance Society Ltd. (5%); The Moonie Oil Company Ltd. (20%); cdf Minerals Ltd., Mines et Resources S.A., Petroleum and Chemical Corporation Ltd. (36.75%).

81/8019 CSR Ltd. (80%); Ruhrkohle Australia Pty. Ltd. (10%); Toyoda Tsuso Kaisha Ltd. (10%).

81/8020 Texasgulf Australia Ltd.

81/8021 Picon Exploration Pty. Ltd (50%); Consolidation Coal of Australia (50%).

81/8022 Mount Isa Mines Ltd. (50%); Westfalen Colliery Pty. Ltd. (30%); C. Itoh Co. Ltd. (10%); S.S.M. Coal Pty. Ltd. (10%).

81/8023 Metals Exploration Ltd. (27.5%); Southern Pacific Petroleum N.L./ Central Pacific Minerals N.L. (27.5%); Hudbay Oil (Australia) Ltd. (45%).

81/8024 Mobil Energy Minerals Australia Inc.

- 81/8025 Rylance Collieries & Brickworks Pty. Ltd. (25%); Dunlop Olympic Ltd. (51%).
- 81/8026 Agip Australia Pty. Ltd. (45%); Australian Resources Development Bank Ltd. (20%); "The Queensland Syndicate", c/- Evans Deakin Industries Ltd. (30%); Samsung (Aust.) Pty. Ltd. (5%).
- 81/8027 BP Australia Ltd. (50%); Drayton Mining Development Pty. Ltd. (25%); Westfield Ltd. (25%).
- 81/8028 Ampol Petroleum Ltd. (25%); Consolidated Press Holdings Ltd. (25%); Esso Exploration & Production Australia Inc. (50%).
- 81/8029 Amoco Coal Australia Co.
- 81/8030 North Broken Hill Ltd. (42.5%); Aquitaine Australia Minerals Pty. Ltd. (32.5%); Sumitomo Corporation (10%); Queensland Interests (undetermined) (15%).
- 81/8031 BMI Mining Pty. Ltd. (90%); Eastmet Ltd. (10%).
- 81/8032 ARCO Australia Ltd. (42.5%); ACI Resources Ltd. (42.5%); Hancock Prospecting Pty. Ltd. (7.5%); Wright Prospecting Pty. Ltd. (7.5%).

4. The applications were presented in great detail and were generally of a high standard. They have been considered in terms of the proposed exploration programs, the technical and financial ability of the applicants to carry out the programs and any subsequent project development, and their potential for securing markets in the near future for any economic deposits of coal discovered. In considering this last aspect, the availability of undeveloped coal reserves in deposits already held by the applicants is relevant.

5. Upon consideration of all these factors the application submitted by the consortium comprising BP Australia Ltd., Drayton Mining Development Pty. Ltd., and Westfield Ltd. was found to be substantially superior to any other. This group

- commits to an accelerated exploration program over 15 months, in order to commence production for export in mid-1984, increasing to 4 million tonnes per year from the upper (Leichhardt) seam by 1986.
- has a high degree of immediately available expertise in exploration, coal mining, and marketing in terms of the international activities of BP and the experience and skills of Sir Leslie Thiess and his associates.
- propose under existing letters of intent to export 2.5 million tonnes per year to Europe, and will offer the remaining tonnage to consumers in south-east Asia (BP have undertaken to underwrite this remaining tonnage).

- propose, subject to reaching mutually advantageous commercial arrangements with the State Electricity Commission, to deepen the initial opencut operation some five years after start-up to provide coal from the lower and higher ash Vermont seams for an on-site power station, involving the mining of up to 7.6 million tonnes per year of raw coal from these seams.

Additionally the applicants

- have completed preliminary assessment of infrastructure requirements for the project and have expressed an intention to work closely with all relevant Authorities to ensure efficient completion of these requirements.
- will offer the Queensland public an opportunity to take up a shareholding in the project at an appropriate time.
- from 1986, the date at which maximum export tonnage will be achieved, will pay an additional levy on such tonnage to the Queensland Government escalating from \$1.00 per tonne in 1986 to \$4.00 per tonne in 2005, representing a total payment to this State of \$220 million in this period above royalties and rail freights.

6. RECOMMEND approve that the area in the Winchester South region (Group 25) of 50 sub-blocks be offered under Authority to Prospect for a term of three years to a consortium comprising BP Australia Ltd., Drayton Mining Development Pty. Ltd., and Westfield Ltd., with an initial expenditure commitment of \$6,200,000 over 15 months as proposed by the applicants, to include payment of a premium of \$250,000 to the Department of Mines for its exploration costs, and with expenditure on the balance of the three year term to be negotiated between the Department and the consortium.

IVAN J. GIBBS,

Minister for Mines and Energy.

Brisbane,

9th March, 1981.

Mr D'ARCY: I wish to make some observations about that document, which refers to one of the wealthiest resources that the Queensland Government has had to dispose of in recent times. The Winchester South coalfields are reported to be worth \$1,600m. This is a resource development that belong to the people of Queensland.

It appears that the Executive arm of the Government sometimes forgets that the people of Queensland own the State's resources. Some of the Minister's remarks in this Parliament indicate that he, Cabinet and the Executive arm think that they can do best for the people of Queensland. It is the role of the Government to make decisions on such projects—nobody denies that—but decisions must be taken with open consideration for the people of Queensland so that they may have confidence in the decisions reached.

Although Cabinet decisions, in my opinion, should not be leaked or disclosed, certainly when a tender is accepted after Cabinet has made its deliberations it should be justified to the people of Queensland by the Executive arm, through the Government and through this Parliament. Unfortunately that has not been happening in Queensland. In Queensland the Executive arm of Government has become too blase. Since 1974, because of the huge numbers that the Government has managed to amass, Parliament has lost the confidence of the people and control of the Executive Government.

While it is the role of Government to make decisions on tenders, it is the role of the Opposition to represent the people of Queensland and act as a watch-dog over Government activities. We are elected to this Parliament to question decisions; it is our right to take that role on behalf of the people of Queensland. We are not convinced that by this decision the people have got the best deal. Judging by the Minister's actions and what has occurred in Cabinet over this deal, I am sure that the people of Queensland are not convinced that they are getting proper returns for the resources of Queensland.

I have these comments to make on the document:

(1) It is so sketchy that it would be impossible for any Cabinet member to use it in arriving at any decision on the respective merits of each tender;

(2) Given that, the Minister was requesting *carte blanche* from the Cabinet and implying that he knew best and that all Cabinet had to do was rubber-stamp his decision.

This Government has become known Australia-wide as a rubber-stamp government.

(3) It is an insult to the tenderers, some of whom reportedly spent up to \$500,000 on preparing their tenders, merely to be listed in a table.

I know tenderers who said that they spent only \$200,000 but that, too, is a considerable sum of money. They have not been given a chance to have full Cabinet consideration of their proposals.

(4) It is gross incompetence of the highest order that a project worth \$1,600m was not economically evaluated by the Treasury and the Co-ordinator-General's Department;

(5) Without proper economic evaluation it would have been difficult for the Department of Mines, alone, to have carried it out.

How can the Minister claim that he knew best? He was away for quite a considerable time during the evaluation period. The tenders were quite detailed and complex

in nature. I doubt that he would have had time to consider the tenders—because Einstein, he ain't!

(6) If what the Minister said is true, that is, that the BP/Thiess consortium tender was, indeed, the best, why did Cabinet immediately set about renegotiating the tender?

If one company is given the right to improve its offer, all companies should be given that right. I have seen other tenders and, judging by the scant information released about the successful tender, the others appear to be better in some of their conditions.

(7) Given this complete and utter fiasco of ministerial incompetence, there should be a complete reevaluation of all tenders by the appropriate departments, with final deliberation being undertaken by the full Cabinet.

Cabinet should state categorically that it will not allow itself to be misused in this fashion in future. The only way to do that at this stage is to order a complete reevaluation of the tenders.

From developments yesterday we hear that this probably will not be the case. Apparently Cabinet has backed down completely on its tough stance of last week. The Minister for Mines and Energy is hiding behind the skirts of confidentiality and it is obvious that his future would be even more on the line if details were made public. The Premier has recognised the seriousness of this leak and it is obvious that his colleagues want it blown away as quickly as possible.

The Liberals, and in particular Dr Edwards, have again backed down to their National Party colleagues. When it comes to the crunch it is obvious that the Treasurer is unable to bring his National Party colleagues to account. Despite all the facade of unity, Dr Edwards and the Liberals are not consulted on matters of importance. They only bleat publicly about accountability.

To ensure that Queensland and Queenslanders obtain maximum benefits from the resources boom, we must first realise that our natural resources belong to the State and that it is the people who must benefit from them. The companies that mine them, whether they be multinational or Australian, are fully entitled to an adequate return on investment, that is, a level of profit. However, the return to the company which is called abnormal profit or windfall profit, and which economists call economic rent, that is, a return on capital to labour above the going market rate or the rate of return for input and output, should be appropriated by the State for the benefit of the people.

The most effective way to collect that economic rent would be to tax those abnormal or windfall profits progressively through a resource tax. At the moment Queensland has a very crude and inefficient resource tax collected by way of rail freights and charges.

Whilst I am in sympathy with the crude attempt to impose a resource tax, I think the benefits to Queenslanders would be substantially greater with the imposition of a proper resource tax, for without one Queensland is making a gift to a company over and above the rate of return which is necessary for it to undertake the venture in the first place, that is, normal profit.

It is even worse to make a gift of Australian money and resources to a foreign nation. We need only look at the windfall profits of Utah and the transfer pricing policies of Swiss Alumina, which has paid negligible tax on profit of \$1.22m over the past eight years, to have this point illustrated. Another example is Alcoa. In 1978 Alcoa sold Australian aluminium to its US parent company at \$108 per tonne when the world price was \$150. At times we have even seen displays of standover tactics being used, such as Utah and its use of its coal loaders. The creative writers of multinational accounts are experts at minimising profits in Australia, and it is traitorous for the State Government to subsidise profits even further through non-taxation of economic rent.

Another important and well known way for a Government to ensure that benefits remain here and are not exported is to take an equity interest in projects. We do not have to take it as far as the Japanese did. Until 1978 Japan effectively banned foreign investment in that country. But we can take a lead from Japan and let Government-owned authorities such as the SGIO and the State Electricity Commission take up equity in a project. An example is the South Australian Gas Corporation, which has a 5 per cent interest in the Cooper Basin consortium. Foreign companies and foreign investment are here to stay, and they can be very beneficial, if not essential, in developing our resources; yet it is we who must retain control over those resources. Unfortunately, up till now, we have often abnegated control over our financial cost.

A few figures may be enlightening. The figures concerning foreign ownership and control of the industrial section in Australia indicate that some 55 per cent of all mining ventures in Australia are owned by overseas companies. In Queensland the figure is 84 per cent. That is a disgrace. That makes a mockery of answers such as that given by Dr Edwards this morning to a question regarding the Government's professed policy of support of Queensland companies. Even the BP/Thiess/Westfield consortium is some 50 per cent foreign owned and only 25 per cent Queensland owned.

The figures on foreign ownership and control must have become very embarrassing to the Federal Government because that section of the Australian Bureau of Statistics which kept the figures on foreign investment and ownership in Australia was disbanded by the Tory Fraser Government three years ago. A major way in which the

policies of this Government mean that the Queensland taxpayer is subsidising the costs and therefore increasing the profits of the multinationals is through this subsidisation of inputs and the provision of infrastructure. The details of these deals are usually kept secret, again under the pretext of confidentiality, and we all know the hue and cry that would emerge if the details ever became public knowledge.

The Federal Treasury has recently made a detailed attack on the production of services which are not priced at opportunity cost; that is, on pricing policies that do not take into account the alternative uses and returns for scarce capital. For instance, if lower than opportunity cost prices are being set in the aluminium industry for large quantities of electricity going into export-oriented processing, there is a *prima facie* transfer from the Australian or Queensland economy to overseas interests, whether they be profit-makers or consumers.

If the aluminium could be exported for enough to cover opportunity pricing for coal, electricity, alumina and capital invested, then presumably there would be an alternative, more profitable use of these resources. Yet here in Queensland we are doing just this—subsidising overseas interests and consumers by providing them with cheap electricity and charging them less than half the cost to the ordinary household consumer.

Another area in which this Government distorts the functioning of market forces is the provision of infrastructure to development projects. Vast amounts of money are spent on the provision of roads, railways, water supplies, ports, docks, etc., which undoubtedly are necessary for the development of our resources, but is it necessary to call on the taxpayers to subsidise them to ensure that the companies reap even larger profits? Again, I believe in the "user pays" principle, and all direct costs associated with the development of a venture should be borne fully by the consortium and not subsidised by the taxpayer.

If a project's costs are distorted in this way, the real benefit or profitability of any project is, of course, much less than it appears to be. There has to be a realistic and appropriate cost appraisal to determine the benefit to the community, and any tender for a project that is not properly and economically evaluated must remain suspect and the benefits to the community must remain nebulous.

Perhaps the major way to judge the success or failure of any growth phase is to look at the development flowing from it; that is, to look at the structural changes occurring in the economy, for it is this structural change, not the growth phase, that will determine the long-term success or prosperity of the State's economy.

It is important to realise that it is easy to get an economy to grow, such as in Queensland, particularly when the world

economy is in need of our resources. But where is the program to develop the secondary processing of our raw materials? It was only two years ago that the Government rejected a \$1 billion petrochemical complex which would have used coal as a feedstock and led directly to the creation of hundreds of jobs. Yet it was rejected in this State.

One of the merits of the tender from Queensland Energy, Sleigh and the T & G group for the Winchester South coal deposit was that it proposed to build an ammonium nitrate plant at Mackay. If the industrial and economic future of the State is to be assured, it is projects exactly like this that we should be welcoming, not turning away. Our natural resources are not renewable, yet we are selling them off only hoping that other things will be around after they have gone.

If the Government thinks that these demands are too rigorous and will frighten away overseas investors, let us look at the example of the oil industry in Indonesia, another energy industry. There the State oil company, owned wholly and solely by the State of Indonesia—Pertamina—controls and manages Indonesia's oil resources. The following tough conditions apply to foreign oil companies which wish to operate there—

(1) The foreign companies pay all the costs of exploration and production.

(2) All property used immediately becomes the property of Pertamina—that is, the State—upon entry into Indonesia.

(3) All infrastructure is to be paid for by the company, and in addition other public services such as schools, hospitals, the provision of water supplies, etc., are to be paid for by the company in its area of operation.

(4) The company must have a policy of Indonesianisation—that is, over 90 per cent of the employees are to be Indonesian and the company must have an active policy of training Indonesians to take over all phases of company work.

(5) After the costs of production are deducted, the share of production going to the State varies from 72.5 per cent to 92.5 per cent, depending on the level of operation.

Do we see companies running away from these hard deals? No, we see them flocking to do business in Indonesia, even with all the bureaucratic interference and other problems associated with business ventures in Indonesia that have been well-documented in financial circles throughout the world. Given the relative ease of doing business in Australia, especially in Queensland, it would appear on the face of it that the Government is indeed giving away our resources.

One point which can be forcefully emphasised is that despite the present level of unemployment, especially youth unemployment, the Government is doing little to ensure that companies involved in resource development employ and train young people

through apprenticeship. We are constantly barraged by Government statements that there is a shortage of skilled workers. The Federal Minister for Immigration is going overseas to recruit skilled workers, but this Government should be taking steps to encourage companies to employ and train young people instead of importing skilled workers. The pay-off to Queensland would, of course, be considerably better in the long term. It would lessen the need for other Government job-creation programs, and at the same time it would contribute to diversifying employment opportunities in this State.

Another obvious area of neglect has been the resources cities themselves. Gladstone has a population of some 27 000. My colleague the honourable member for Port Curtis made his case for Gladstone in his speech. That city has received no contribution from either the private sector or the Government to help pay for its infrastructure. The burden falls directly on the ratepayers of that city. The sewerage system and water supply are inadequate, roads are sub-standard and schools are overcrowded. It has a pollution problem and a tremendous housing shortage. It has only one welfare officer to cope with all the social problems resulting from rapid and unplanned development. The Premier has described Gladstone as a work town and not a play town, but that glib abdication of responsibility is typical of this Government's deliberate refusal to involve itself in such problems.

There is a need for additional assistance to local government in these high-growth areas to ensure that proper and adequate services are provided. Without doubt foreign investment is required to help us develop our resource projects, but much greater reliance can be placed on local resources if the restraints on banks and other institutions to lend risk capital are removed. Australia has undeveloped money markets and merchant banking development systems. However, it is exactly that sort of bank which has played a prominent role in mobilising capital for resource developments in other countries.

We have a relatively small development bank attached to the Commonwealth Banking Corporation, and recently a similar bank was established in the form of a new Australian bank. Ordinary trading banks have played a relatively minor role in raising funds for development expenditure, and it is about time that the institutional restraints were removed so that banks and other financial institutions could expand their investment portfolios in this area.

The ordinary investor should be given the opportunity to invest his money in resource development in this country. At the present time it is necessary for him to take decisions in foreign countries, in capitals and boardrooms of those countries, and invest in their foreign stock exchanges in order to invest in our own mineral resources. At the

moment we are offered nothing more than the opportunity to invest in Government guaranteed loans. Their return is barely above the inflation rate.

The ordinary investor should be given the opportunity to invest in Government corporations, which would then invest in the resource. Risk associated with such ventures would be minimal, and the Australian public would directly have an opportunity to benefit from the development of our natural resources. A guaranteed rate of interest could be given, together with a bonus, depending on profitability.

Investment along these lines could, I am sure, generate large sums of money for resource development. The funds were certainly available during the '60s when Australia went through the iron ore boom. At that time 87 per cent of the funds were invested locally and only 13 per cent originated from overseas. So it is necessary to remove any constraint and to let both institutions and individuals participate in the funding of resource ventures, and participate directly in the returns from them. This proposal is in addition to seeking Government authority equity participation in resource ventures.

In spite of the current problems and obvious challenges ahead, there are few imaginative problems aimed at creating new investment, which would ensure the proper development of our economic resources. We know that economic development is capital intensive and provides relatively few opportunities for employment. For example, the resources boom Australia-wide will probably provide fewer than 100 000 jobs—and that is a Federal Treasury figure. We need diversification of employment opportunities, and planning bodies need to be established to look into the technological change and its effect on employment.

A technological information and research unit has been recently set up by the Western Australian Government. The Government's approach to small business, a most important sector of our private enterprise, needs to be reassessed with attention being placed on financial assistance such as possibly a State relief tax and/or loans.

From the foregoing it is clear that the ordinary citizen should not have to subsidise the profits of companies involved in resource development in this country, as he is undoubtedly doing now. Infrastructure subsidies, input subsidies, subsidies on items such as electricity and the provision of goods and services at non-opportunity cost prices and the softness of the Queensland Government deals compared with overseas resource deals all mean that the taxpayer is footing the bill, when it should be the other way around.

When it comes to taxation, this Government is farcical. The Premier continually talks of low taxation but it is a fact of life that the salary earner in this country is now paying the bulk of taxation. He is now the

tax agent, the tax collector for the Federal Government and hence the State Government. PAYE taxation has risen from 47 per cent of the total Australian tax income in 1946 to 72 per cent today. That is a disgrace. It means that the salary earner is paying his taxation while in other areas there is tax avoidance. However, the Federal Government refuses to change the tax mix in order to make taxation more equitable. The Federal Government estimates that it loses between \$500m and \$600m annually through tax avoidance, and goodness knows how much more is lost through soft back-door deals that allow State Governments to sell off our non-renewable natural resources without due concern for future development for the generations that will follow us. Again it is the ordinary taxpayer—the PAYE fellow—the person who is unable to take advantage of all the tax lurks and deals, who has to pay for the resource development in our State at this moment. Vast amounts of public money are being spent on the resources boom, yet the Government has no idea what the return on the investment is or what it will be. Because mines are being dug and coal loaders are being constructed, the Government assumes that development as well as growth is taking place. If we are not very careful this may turn out to be a simple-minded fantasy and the Government may, like the three little bears, look into the bowl only to see that somebody has eaten all the porridge. However, I assure the Government that in this instance there will not be a Goldilocks upstairs; she will have flown to seek larger and fuller bowls elsewhere.

I point out that I have tabled the Cabinet documents referring to Winchester South so that future generations of Australians, Queenslanders and parliamentarians will be able to judge for themselves the naive way in which resources worth \$1,600m were handled by the Minister for Mines and Energy. That Minister stated that he had set new standards. I can only comment that the standard was abysmally low, and I am certain that will be borne out in the future.

Today in this Parliament the Deputy Premier (Dr Edwards) virtually indicated that this afternoon interest rates would rise. In fact, with the Minister for Justice (Mr. Doumany), he said that to the Press. His reply to my question about interest rates this morning was his usual glib one. He blamed the Federal Government. I wanted to know—I still want to know and all Queenslanders want to know—what this Government is doing to stabilise interest rates. I want to know what action this Government is taking, the answer to which is not even known by the Premier of this State. That is obvious because he is not taking any action. It is necessary to work out what needs to be done and what can be done for this wealthy State. At the moment we are bleating, and justly so, that the Commonwealth Government may take

extra funds from this State. Naturally Queensland is concerned that this could occur. Most members' speeches indicate their concern about the problems that apparently face this State in the areas in which this Government spends most of its money: in the fields of education and health, areas in which we are falling further and further behind.

If we have such huge financial advantages from our resources boom, surely these funds should be able to keep pace with our projected development and provide a better standard of living for the population of this wealthy country. In my electorate of Woodridge—an area that typifies the fast growth rate of any other State—huge problems are caused by the population explosion. Many problems face the schools in my electorate.

At the fast-expanding Slacks Creek State School there are not enough toilets for the Year 1 pupils. The parents are seeing the Minister this afternoon. The present position is a disgrace. Shailer Park State High School, a brand new school that was opened only last year, will not have enough room next year. Another primary school will have to be built to accommodate the population growth in that area or the school numbers will be out of all proportion.

The projected pupil population of the Kingston State High School in 1983 is 3 000—that is something that will have to be remedied—and, on current indications, Springwood High will have over 2 800. Those are ridiculously high numbers which have been commented on by the Education Department and the education industry generally. Such abnormally large numbers in schools hinder a child's education.

I am asking the Minister to increase the works program not only by upgrading facilities in schools already built but also by commencing new schools so that the children of Queensland can be educated normally, with reasonable facilities; so that they do not get wet when walking from the lunch areas to class-rooms in wet weather; and so that they have adequate toilets and playground facilities. The Government is not keeping pace with population increases. Overcrowded class-rooms and modular class-rooms—the tin sheds, as they have become known—are part of our education system. When other areas are progressing so much and we are making such a tremendous and effective use of our resources, it is a shame that these conditions exist.

The hospital system is breaking down. There is a problem of over-crowding in hospitals—a problem that the Federal Government is foisting upon us by abrogating its responsibilities. New hospitals are desperately needed in many areas of Queensland. In the south-east corner there is no hospital in the areas of Woodridge and Salisbury and through to Beenleigh. Because of the

growth pattern in those areas, there is an immediate need for at least a holding hospital. That area has had one of the largest population increases in the State.

Most of the electorate problems of members in that area are associated with the Housing Commission. Not enough accommodation is available for those who need welfare housing and rental accommodation. The Housing Commission is falling further and further behind. I am glad that the Minister for Works and Housing is in the Chamber. The situation has been reached where Mr Hall will not talk to my electorate office. I am a little disgusted about that. We have many problems, and they are difficult ones. I am constantly receiving complaints about repairs, unused housing and lack of accommodation in the Woodridge area.

The roads in my electorate are improving rapidly. I thank the Minister for Main Roads for the job he is doing. Kingston Road is being extended and widened into a four-lane highway. We have more overpasses across the Pacific Highway, which means fewer traffic delays. With the increased traffic flow in those areas, they are a necessity.

We have a bad flooding problem on Paradise Road, which adjoins my electorate and Mr Speaker's electorate. Flooding poses enormous problems for a school in Mr Speaker's electorate—the Maple Park school. I make a plea on behalf of his electors and mine that the flooding problem be solved. Some pupils at that school come from my electorate.

The overpass at Daisy Hill is going ahead, but I urge the Minister to get on with the one at Bryants Road. Fatal accidents have occurred at that intersection, and there will be more. The intersection is on the crest of a hill. The Bryants Road overpass will carry traffic from the new development of Kimberley Park.

There should be a reassessment of police numbers in my area. While I am on that subject, I suggest to the Minister for Justice and Attorney-General that he take a hard look at our justice system. I will mention two cases in my own area. It is a working-class area and we have working-class problems. I realise that the police in my area are understaffed, but they do tend to be a little too vicious. I shall mention two cases in my electorate that have shocked me. One is the Mankey Major case, as it has become known in police circles. The family of the Mankey child who was killed have asked me to mention this, and I do so. Possibly, what occurred was not the fault of the Police Department. The justice system is to blame, and I ask the Minister for Justice to review the two cases that I am about to mention.

The first concerns a young boy who, late last year, was struck at night on the side of a road by a vehicle which, it was later proved, was driven by an off-duty policeman. During the court case that followed, it was proved that that off-duty policeman had been drinking for a considerable time prior to the incident and that the incident was a case of hit and run. The policeman was charged on three counts and was acquitted on all three.

A disgusting aspect of that case is that it was claimed in court that the off-duty policeman said he thought he saw the boy whom he hit get up after he had been struck.

At about the same time a 19-year-old soldier was charged in the Beenleigh court with speeding away from the scene of an accident. It is no secret that the local police apprehended this young man and put him through a rigorous grilling. We all know what that means. His blood was found not to contain any alcohol. However, he did run off the road and unfortunately injured a mate who was in his car. His mate spent three weeks in hospital. The soldier had his licence suspended and was sentenced to 12 months' imprisonment.

The two cases that I have mentioned simply cannot be compared. There is no justice at all in this State. Court procedures should be changed so that not only must justice be done, it also must be seen to be done to all Queenslanders.

I mention another incident that has caused me concern. Admittedly, drink-driving is a curse and has to be eradicated. But how far should we go in trying to eradicate it? I have been told that the police have been harassing the staff of the Kuraby Hotel. The young assistant manager was charged with a certain offence and was brought to trial. He was sentenced. He was so disgusted with police harassment that, on the day he received sentence, he said that he would commit suicide. He did so. That is an indictment of our system and the way in which it works.

The police have a job to do. I hope they do it effectively and fairly. It is time that we looked closely at the problems associated with the police in Queensland and the way in which they carry out their duties. I have the highest respect for police officers; most do their job very well. However, isolated instances of their not doing their job properly are brought forward. It is sad that they are. Perhaps that fact is an indictment of the system itself.

As you now occupy the chair, Mr Deputy Speaker, I take this opportunity to congratulate you personally on your appointment to the position of Chairman of Committees. Finally, I again associate the people of Woodridge with the message of loyalty to the Governor.

Mr FRAWLEY (Caboolture) (12.38 p.m.): Firstly, I express my allegiance and that of my constituents to the Queen. I congratulate the Governor, Sir James Ramsay, who, while he has held that high office, has done a fine job for the people of Queensland. I hope that he continues to be the Governor of this State for many years. I congratulate Mr Speaker on his re-election, and you, Mr Deputy Speaker, on your appointment as Chairman of Committees.

I congratulate all new members in this House, including those on the Opposition side. I am a sport and am prepared to congratulate any candidate who wins the seat that he is contesting.

Today I want to address myself to the activities of Lions clubs. Last week the member for Archerfield, during a speech, maligned the Lions clubs in Queensland. I am not a member of a Lions club, so I have no axe to grind. The member for Archerfield claimed that Lions clubs were composed of greedy, grubby, small and petty businessmen who were very good at spending other people's money. In view of those comments, I want to tell the House about a certain Lions club in my electorate and a worthwhile public service that it performed. The Deception Bay Lions Club received one of only 10 international awards for outstanding service and activity. That club was chosen in the top 10 from a total of 36 000 Lions clubs throughout the world.

The activity that earned the club the award involved the installation of alarm systems in houses belonging to the aged and infirm. Mr Terry Head, who was the president of the Lions club in 1979-80 and who is a personal friend of mine, suggested the idea to his fellow members. It is a simple project that fills a very real need.

The system consists of an alarm bell placed outside the house and connected to two switches inside the home. One is placed close to the person's bed and the other is in an area of common use during waking hours. When the switch is turned on, the alarm bell rings. I believe about 20 homes belonging to elderly and infirm people in the Deception Bay area have been wired in this way. The job must be done by an electrician, and costs between \$60 and \$80. The Lions Club of Deception Bay footed the bill to connect up these 20 houses. The club raised the money by holding gymkhanas, horse shows and other fund-raising projects. I am sure that the club will continue the project in the area so long as it is needed.

Since the success of the Deception Bay project, other Lions clubs have emulated it and are installing the system for old people. That is a good indication of some of the good work that Lions clubs do. I thought that today I should give the House information about the good work done by a Lions club in my electorate. It is a very worthwhile community service. I sincerely congratulate the Deception Bay Lions Club on the work it has done.

A Government Member interjected.

Mr FRAWLEY: It was a shameful attack on Lions clubs.

So far as Lions clubs being political is concerned, I have not struck one Lions club in my present electorate, or in Murrumbidgee, that was political. I know of some politicians—sad to say they are on both sides of politics, not necessarily in this House—who have attempted to use Lions clubs for political purposes. I know that some ALP candidates have attempted to use parents and citizens associations in State primary schools as political platforms. I will have more to say about that later.

I have some comments to make about the 1977 election in Caboolture. In all, there were five candidates, including myself. One was an Independent, another a Liberal, one a new guard Labor candidate and another an old guard Labor Party candidate.

Before I get on to what happened in the election, I have some comments to make about electoral visitors. An electoral visitor is a person who goes to the homes of people who are unable to go to a polling booth. Electoral visitors do a worthwhile job, but scrutineers from all political parties, including my own, should not be allowed to accompany the electoral visitor anywhere. Scrutineers should not be allowed to go inside people's homes to watch how they vote. I received complaints from people living at Deception Bay, Bribie Island and Caboolture, not about the electoral visitor but about the scrutineers. The worst ones were from the new guard of the Labor Party. People complained that the scrutineers were looking over their shoulders to see how they voted. One scrutineer even wanted to fold up the form for an old lady who had voted. That is wrong. Scrutineers should be kept out when an electoral visitor goes to a person's home.

Applications for electoral visitor votes are another matter. Many political parties have people taking round application forms for electoral visitor votes. I do not oppose that, but at the Church of Christ Bribie Island Retirement Village votes were collected by a new guard organiser. She did not hand them in if she found out in conversation that the people intended to vote for the old guard, the Liberal or National Party candidates. I received complaints from the village. I had to arrange for some people to get electoral visitor forms although they had already filled in applications, simply because those forms were not handed in to the Clerk of the Court at Caboolture. That is a shameful situation.

As I said, there were five candidates in the 1977 election. The first one was the Independent candidate, John Ferguson. He was a soil tester with the Caboolture Shire Council who was dismissed in rather peculiar circumstances some years ago. I believe that he was not at fault; that he was dismissed

wrongly. He polled 2.2 per cent of the vote and was no problem to anyone. The Liberal candidate (Miss Virginia Day) conducted the campaign on a very high plane. I congratulate her on the way she conducted her campaign. She received 15.7 per cent of the primary vote. That was a very good effort for a Liberal contesting the seat of Caboolture for the first time.

I must say that statements made by the former Liberal Party president (Mrs McComb) that nominating a Liberal Party candidate in a three-cornered contest maximises the anti-Labor vote are not quite correct. It might maximise the anti-Labor vote on the primary count but it certainly minimises the vote after the allocation of preferences. I have no argument with a Liberal candidate standing against me in Caboolture; I have always said that it is the inherent right of any person in the State to contest a seat. So I am not complaining about three-cornered contests; I am complaining about some of the reasons given for having them.

I personally checked all the votes. I went to the Caboolture Court House during the recount and checked every preference so that I would know what I was talking about. I received 76.7 per cent of the Liberal preferences and the other 23.3 per cent went to the Labor Party. In most cases where the Liberal candidate received the No. 1 vote, I was given No. 5. I do not say that this did not occur with National Party voters. It is possible that many of the people who voted first for me gave No. 5 to the Liberal, because there was a lot of ill feeling about three-cornered contests. I urge people not to do that. It is dangerous when the anti-Labor parties do something like that. Fortunately I needed only 45 per cent of the preferences and, as I said, I received 76.7 per cent. But it is still not a good performance. I congratulate the Liberal candidate because she did a fine job.

The old guard of the Labor Party had the deputy chairman of the Caboolture Shire Council as its candidate. The Caboolture Shire Council is billed as a non-political council. The chairman, Councillor Barr, was the Labor candidate who stood against me in 1972. Incidentally, he ran a polling booth in 1977 for the deputy chairman who stood for the Labor Party and he also ran a polling booth in 1980. That is his right. I am not against that at all. Councillor McLoughlin, the deputy chairman of the council stood against me in 1977 and in 1980. In 1980, Councillor Broomhall was his campaign director and Councillor Camilleri from Division 2 ran a polling booth at Golden Beach, Caloundra.

Councillor Hill, from Bribie Island, was the new guard candidate. His how-to-vote cards were given out by Councillor Gassner at Wamuran. Councillor Sheila Wilson is a member of the Liberal Party. Councillor Roy Barraud was a member of the National

Party but I do not know whether he still is. He attended the inaugural meeting of the Liberal Party on Bribie Island. By a strange coincidence, the Liberal candidate was a part-time employee of the Caboolture Shire Council. So a total of 8 out of 11 councillors worked against me at the last election. And, I repeat, it is supposed to be a non-political council. One could be forgiven for thinking that that is not correct.

The old guard candidate was the deputy chairman of the Caboolture Shire Council. There was a Labor Party meeting at the Morayfield State School before the election. The following day \$3,500 was drawn out of the Caboolture electoral council funds and transferred to the old guard funds. I do not know who did it but I do know that Denis Murphy took out a writ in an effort to get the \$3,500 back. The money was not misappropriated; it was used to conduct the campaign of the old guard candidate.

Literally hundreds of signs were knocked down in Caboolture. I lost only about 11 because people knew what would happen to theirs if they knocked mine down. Most signs were knocked down by the old guard supporters who knocked down the signs of the new guard candidate. He lost a couple of hundred signs. A green Volkswagen, registration no. 992-NHV owned by a person at Glasshouse Mountains, was driven by some of the people who were knocking the signs down. I will not mention the owner's name because the car might have been used without her knowledge.

Mr Vaughan: Stolen.

Mr FRAWLEY: I am glad the honourable member said that. A lot of old guard signs were made of masonite which I believe was stolen from the Railway Department. It is interesting to note that the chairman of the old guard in Caboolture, Mr Frank Freemantle, is a night officer at the Glasshouse Railway Station. I do not know whether there is a tie-up there. I leave it to the House to judge. I believe in presenting the facts and allowing honourable members to draw their own conclusions.

Mr Gygar: He is in Mr Beattie's union.

Mr FRAWLEY: Yes. He is the deputy chairman of the Caboolture Shire Council and he lined up outside the council works depot on the Friday before the election with his loudspeaker and handed out a lot of pamphlets. He told council employees that if more money was not given to the Caboolture Shire Council by the State Government they would all be sacked before Christmas.

Mr Booth: Did that happen?

Mr FRAWLEY: Of course it did not happen. They then spread a story around Burpengary about me. One woman telephoned me and said, "Don't you live in

Caboolture?" I said, "I have lived here for three and a half years." She said, "There is a story going around that you do not live in the electorate." When Caboolture was in the electorate of Murrumba I lived in Redcliffe, but a few weeks before the new boundaries were declared I shifted to Caboolture, having had the foresight to work out beforehand where the new electorates would be. I predicted the new boundaries of the electorates of Cooroorra, Landsborough, Caboolture, Pine Rivers, Murrumba and Redcliffe, and I sincerely believe that when I retire from Parliament I should be appointed a redistribution commissioner. I would offer my services free, because I think that every member of Parliament should be prepared to do something as a community service when he stands down. When I retire from Parliament I do not want a "job for the boys", but I would like to be put in charge of the Burpengary Weighbridge—that is the job I would like.

Regarding the lies that were told by the Labor candidates—as I said, a woman from Burpengary telephoned me, and another bloke wrote a letter to the Caboolture newspaper stating that he never saw me anywhere around the place. He said he never saw me at p. and c. meetings around Caboolture, Morayfield or anywhere else. A bloke said to me one day, "It's no wonder he does not see you; he never puts his head out of the Burpengary Tavern until closing time."

I predicted that the old guard candidate in Caboolture would get 23 per cent of the vote, and he got 23.9 per cent. That shows how popular he is in Caboolture.

We now come to the even worse matter of the new guard candidate. I regarded his campaign as shocking. I received a letter from the Caboolture Shire Council stating that no signs were to be erected until the writs were issued. I agreed with that. I paid \$100 deposit as a security bond. The new guard candidate had erected a lot of his signs up to a week before the writs were issued.

If one's signs are still up 30 days after that date, one loses the \$100 bond. This fellow's signs were still up 30 days later. In fact, last Saturday week I noticed one of his signs still on a tree, and he has not forfeited his \$100. I wrote to the Caboolture Shire Clerk regarding that matter, and I would like to read the letter into "Hansard". It reads—

"Dear Mr Warren,

"I realize that Officers of the Caboolture Shire Council do not have any control over the actions of Shire Councillors but I wish to draw your attention to what I consider to be a blatant disregard for Council regulations.

"As you are no doubt aware I applied for and was granted permission to erect election signs in the Caboolture Shire.

"A letter dated Monday, 20th October granting this permission outlined a number of conditions, the first being that no signs were to be erected before the writs for the election were issued and I have complied with that condition.

"The writs are to be issued today, 27th October, yet on Wednesday, 22nd October elections signs advertising Councillor N. Hill as the ALP Candidate for Caboolture were erected in Upper Caboolture, Morayfield and Bribie Island.

"Does the Caboolture Shire Council have one set of rules for a National Party candidate and none for Caboolture Shire Councillors representing the Australian Labor Party? Do Councillors apply for permission to erect election signs and pay \$100.00 Security Bond as other candidates?

"In conclusion I do not expect any action from the Council but the matter is not going to end here. I intend to do something myself and will send you a copy when the time comes."

The council held a meeting about this matter, and following it I received a letter from Lex McCarthy, the campaign director for Mr Hill. In a moment I will explain why I regard him as a reprehensible person. That letter contained an apology. To cut a long story short, they were whitewashed and got out of the whole thing.

The new guard candidate had some thugs at his polling booths. In my electorate the police draw for the positions for the different candidates, and the National Party drew No. 1 at Golden Beach, Coloundra. I happened to be there at 8 o'clock, before the booth opened, and a great big bloke from the Seamens' Union was there. He must have been 6ft 2 inches tall and weighed about 14 stone. I said to him, "You have taken our position." He said, "What are you going to do about it?" As I did not have my javelin or 16lb. hammer there, there was not much I could do. So I said, "Your bloke needs a start" (the fact that he got 16 per cent of the vote proved it) "so we will let him take the No. 1 position."

Then, although we had the first position at the Burpengary State School, the new guard again took over. Somebody contacted the police and they were made to move. Unless everybody sticks to his position, things of that sort make the police draw useless. We did not move out of our position and neither did the Liberal candidate. I have to be fair to the old guard Labor candidate and say that his polling booth workers stayed in their right places, too.

I do not know whether the new guard candidate was responsible for this, but his organisation used the Bribie Island Retirement Village, a Church of Christ nursing home, for political purposes, and I think that that was rotten. They published a

photograph in "The Near North Coast News" of 5 November 1980, together with this statement—

"A 30-bed nursing home will be built on Bribie Island in 1983.

"The home which will be attached to the Bribie Island Retirement Village, has been included in planning for the 1982-83 Federal budget.

"Spokesman for the committee that has been raising funds for the home in the hope of future government assistance, Mrs McCarthy—"

her son was the campaign director for the new guard Labor candidate—

"said the decision had come 'out of the blue'.

"Mrs McCarthy said that the committee had made tentative approaches to State Health Minister, Sir William Knox, but he had refused to discuss the matter.

"She said that the small committee had been plodding along with fund raising and had lobbied Senator Jim Keefe when he visited the island earlier this year.

"He said he would look into it and the next thing we received notice that the project had been accepted for funding,' Mrs McCarthy said."

That caused no end of trouble. Evan Adermann, the member for the Federal electorate of Fisher, received the following letter from the two people depicted in the photograph with Mrs McCarthy—

"Dear Sir,

"With reference to an article appearing in the North Coast News 5/11/80 concerning the proposed nursing wing to be erected at B.I.R.V., any political over-tone of that article is not the opinion of the management of Bribie Island Retirement Village.

"Mrs. Cornwell & I are well aware & appreciate the efforts on behalf of the Retirement Village that have been made by you & your colleague Mr. Frawley, & that it was your work that will provide the government funding for the nursing-home.

"I apologise for any inference that our thinking might be other than expressed here; we understood the article was to be nursing home advertising."

Under the pretext of advertising a nursing home, the new guard Labor candidate's campaign director got his old mother to go and pose for a photograph and tell a pack of lies about how Jim Keefe got the funding for the Bribie Island Retirement Village. What a terrible thing to do—to use old people to try to put over a political point. Honestly, I have never done that in my life, and I never will.

So Evan Adermann got into the act. He said that he was both surprised and disappointed by statements attributed to Mrs

McCarthy. He said that the process by which funds had been allocated to the nursing home had been completely misrepresented by Mrs McCarthy. He added—

“As member for Fisher I have personally assisted in the fund-raising activities of the Church of Christ social services committee—”

incidentally, Evan Adermann is a member of that congregation—

“and had either attended or officially opened their annual fund-raising fete every year but one.”

The only year he did not open it, I did. He continued—

“Indeed I have known personally and worked with the committees directors, Mr Hart, Mr Tucker and Mr Stewart respectively over many years.

“The project has had the personal support of both myself and the State member for Caboolture, Mr Des Frawley.”

Mr Adermann said that he had made strong personal representations over a number of years to the Minister for Social Security, urging that the Bribie nursing home be accorded top priority for funding at both the Federal and State level.

He went on to say—

“Mr Frawley and I were successful in demonstrating to our respective colleagues the urgent need for approval of this facility on Bribie Island. I was delighted when the Minister for Social Security informed me of the Government’s decision to provide further funds. In fact, I immediately contacted the committee to let them know that our combined efforts had been eminently successful.”

I believe it was shameful to attempt to use the retirement village on Bribie Island for political purposes.

I wish to support the remarks of the member for Windsor about cruelty to animals at the refuge at Yeronga. Dogs and cats are put into a chamber and then the air is pumped out of it. I think he stated that the atmospheric pressure inside a dog is 14.7 lb. at sea level. When the air is pumped out of the chamber, the animals blow out. They suffer severe pain before they die. I think that is a disgraceful situation. I do not intend to blame anybody, because there could be a shortage of funds.

[Sitting suspended from 1 to 2.15 p.m.]

Mr FRAWLEY: Before the luncheon recess I was speaking about the disposal of animals at the animal refuge at Yeronga.

Mr Lee: It is in my electorate.

Mr FRAWLEY: I hope the honourable member does something about it.

Last Thursday the member for Windsor told the House of the method of disposal of animals at the refuge. It is a very cruel method of sucking air out of the room and leaving the animals to die. If that is correct, something should be done about it. We should not tolerate cruelty to animals; if they have to be disposed of, it should be done properly.

I now wish to speak about the Commonwealth Games to be held in Queensland next year. A lot of people may not know that the first Commonwealth Games, originally called the Festival of the Empire, were held in London in 1911 with the attendance of only four countries: Great Britain, Australia, Canada and South Africa.

We read statements in the Press about the Games being in jeopardy because of the proposed South African Rugby tour of New Zealand. Quite frankly, I for one do not care if the African nations do not come to the Commonwealth Games; they will go on without them, anyway.

Mr Hansen: You are a racist.

Mr FRAWLEY: I am not a racist.

In 1978 at Edmonton a record number of 46 countries out of a possible 53 competed. Nigeria, Uganda and Botswana, three of the African countries, were not represented. Malta, Tonga and Brunei also did not compete, but the Games were held without those countries. The Olympic Games were held in Moscow without a great number of countries competing. If most people were asked which countries did not compete at Moscow, they would not know. The Olympic Games and the Commonwealth Games are far greater than any one country. If the African nations refuse to attend the Games because Australia will not intervene to try to stop the South African Rugby tour of New Zealand, that is their loss. The Games can be held without them. If the African nations stop their sportsmen and sports-women from competing at the Commonwealth Games just because of South Africa’s policy of apartheid it is a pretty poor show.

Mr Bertoni: Do you think that the African nations are trying to dictate the terms of the Commonwealth Games?

Mr FRAWLEY: They certainly are.

Mr Lee: They have no chance of winning a gold medal.

Mr FRAWLEY: Yes, they have. There are some fairly good sportsmen in the African nations. With some good runners and jumpers they could win some medals.

Nigeria’s president of the Supreme Council for Sport in Africa, Mr Ordia, was here last week speaking about this matter. He said that he did not really know what would occur if the South African Rugby tour of

New Zealand went ahead, but he said that the African people will not dine with the supporters of the oppressors of their brothers in South Africa.

The Australian Aboriginal activists are doing their best to give Mr Ordia a crash course on Aborigines so that he is prepared for his meetings in Canberra this week. The Australian Aboriginal activists are looking to the Supreme Council for Sport in Africa to back them. At a Press conference the activists' spokesman (Les Malezer) said that if the Games are not boycotted they will be disrupted. So the Aboriginal activists are saying that they will disrupt the Commonwealth Games. If that occurs they should be given the treatment the disruptive groups received in New Zealand in January at the 1981 world veterans championships for competitors over 40 years of age. The South Africans took part in those events because veterans athletics does not recognise racial discrimination. People from all nations in the world attended. In the 400 metre hurdles, as soon as the starting gun was fired, one of the activists rushed out and dragged away the first hurdle in front of the South African competitor. The same group disrupted the opening ceremony. I was quite pleased when the athletes got stuck into the disruptive element and gave them a good flogging before they were rescued by the police.

Mr Borbidge: Did you give them a hand?

Mr FRAWLEY: No, I didn't. The javelin throw was on at the time. I am pleased I didn't; I might have put a javelin through one of them.

I am not suggesting that anything like that will happen at the Commonwealth Games in Brisbane. We will hold successful Games. We have a good venue. Nathan has a good track. The Chandler Sports Centre is all right. I do not think it will make any difference at all if half a dozen of the black African nations do not send representatives. We should not be subject to any kind of blackmail. I am quite certain that the Prime Minister and Doug Anthony, after their futile efforts in trying to interfere by having the Australian team boycott the Moscow Games, should stay out of it. The only time Doug Anthony played sport was when he got in the school cricket team because he owned the bat.

Mr Bertoni: Don't you support the call by Mr Muldoon about the South African Rugby Union tour?

Mr FRAWLEY: The tour should not be stopped. Participation in sport provides a greater opportunity for understanding between countries to be fostered and improved than anything else does. There should be more sport, not less. If the African nations do not want to give their athletes the opportunity to compete, then that is their loss. If they do here what they

did in Edmonton, it is tough luck. We will have the Games without them. We should not let ourselves be subjected to any blackmail or allow ourselves to be pressured in any way into taking their side against South Africa.

In the Address-in-Reply debate a member can talk about his electorate. At Burpengary, which is just south of Caboolture, there are two Government weighbridges. A side road leading off the Bruce Highway in a 100 km/h zone is used by trucks going in and out of the weighbridge area. As trucks come out of that road—I took particular notice again this morning—they take right of way. There is no "Give Way" sign. I have asked the previous Minister for Transport, the present one, and the Minister for Main Roads to have a "Give Way" sign erected so that trucks coming out of the Burpengary weighbridge travelling either south or north are required to give way. The trucks just take over. If a motorist travelling on the inside lane has a car outside him, he has to hit the brakes because there is nowhere to go if a truck pulls out in front of him. I have had many complaints about this from women in my electorate. A lot of truckies seem to take great delight in terrorising women. In fact, they terrorise male motorists, too. A motorist driving a small car will lose the argument with a semi-trailer or a truck. He has to let it in.

At the Burpengary overpass, the Caboolture overpass, the Redcliffe overpass and the Kallangur overpass there are "Give Way" signs for the traffic entering the Bruce Highway. If it is good enough to have "Give Way" signs for traffic coming from those four overpasses onto the highway, I can see no reason for not having "Give Way" signs at the Burpengary weighbridge. I again stress that it is in a 100 km/h zone. There is nothing worse than driving along and having a big truck come out and just take right of way. Ninety per cent of them are doing it. Few give way. Only one in 12 actually gave way.

Mr Lee: Some of them are good drivers.

Mr FRAWLEY: I said one in 12.

In the few minutes I have left I shall take an opposite role. The member for Peak Downs made a statement in the newspaper recently—I wish he was here today—that the squash court proposed to be built at Parliament House should have been built before the gymnasium. That is absolute tripe. He doesn't know what he is talking about. Anybody who plays squash should use the gymnasium first to get himself fit. Anyone who says that playing squash will get him fit does not know what he is talking about. Only fit people should play squash.

Mr Bertoni: Have you played regular squash?

Mr FRAWLEY: I do not play squash at all. I have no hesitation in saying that I would be among the top six in this House for physical fitness—including the women. I would not play squash at my age. Anyone over 35 years of age needs to be careful about playing squash if he has never played before. On the other hand, perhaps we should encourage it. We might get rid of some of them and have a few by-elections. As far as I am concerned, the gymnasium plays a very useful role in this House. There has been some bad publicity in the Press lately about lurks and perks at Parliament House.

Mr Lee: Don't you think Kruger should play squash?

Mr FRAWLEY: He is in the next electorate to me and I would have to go to his funeral. I don't want to do that. I don't have the time.

All joking aside—the gymnasium at Parliament House plays a very useful role. More members use it than people realise. I have heard it said that only one or two members use it. That is not true.

Mr Simpson: They should have a fellow there who devises a proper program of exercises.

Mr FRAWLEY: I do not know about that, but it should have a bit more equipment. I have already spoken to somebody about that and tried to improve some of the equipment up there. There is nothing wrong with having the gymnasium. A lot of members use it. Some use it early in the morning, others at night-time. Some members may be shy and do not want others to see what they are doing. Nevertheless, they do use it.

Mr Jones: Members of Parliament shy?

Mr FRAWLEY: I think so. I am a shy type myself.

The exercise bikes in the gymnasium are put to good use and the gymnasium itself plays a very useful role. Several people have criticised the amenities in this building. In fact, students at the Queensland Institute of Technology wrote to all members challenging them to go over to the QIT and play the students squash. I think most members received such a letter. I certainly received a copy. The students at the QIT do not know the rules. In ancient times, when somebody challenged somebody else to a contest, the choice of weapons was made by the person being challenged. I rang the students at the QIT and challenged them to the javelin throw.

Mr Kruger: Are you still living in ancient times?

Mr FRAWLEY: No, I am not. I am simply saying that the ancient code of chivalry proclaimed that a person who was

challenged had the choice of weapons. The QIT students have challenged me to a game of squash. I want to challenge them to the javelin throw.

Mr Jones: Hand grenades at 10 yards.

Mr FRAWLEY: The honourable member wouldn't last 10 yards. He couldn't even walk across the road.

Mr Jones: I said, "Hand grenades at 10 yards."

Mr FRAWLEY: Hand grenades are about the honourable member's only weapon.

Recently, a good deal of talk has taken place in my electorate concerning the reimposition of a toll on the Bribie bridge. As honourable members know, Bribie Island is a well-known seaside resort situated 25 km from Caboolture, which is 40 km from Brisbane. In other words, Bribie is 65 km from Brisbane. The Caboolture Shire Council wants to reimpose a toll on the Bribie Island bridge, on the pretext—maybe it is not a pretext—of using the money to provide better facilities at Bribie Island for day trippers. The people who go from Brisbane to Bribie Island for the day are the ones who throw their rubbish around the place and do not bother to clean it up. That means that the Caboolture Shire Council is forced to employ people to clean up the rubbish every Monday morning. Similarly, Suttons Beach at Redcliffe has to be cleaned up after day trippers have visited the place, in spite of the fact that the Redcliffe City Council has installed an adequate number of rubbish bins at Suttons Beach.

I am violently opposed to the reimposition of any toll on the Bribie bridge. I have received a complaint from a man who lives in Brisbane and whose mother lives in retirement on Bribie Island. He has asked me why should he have to pay a toll to drive over to Bribie Island to see his mother. I totally agree with him. The proposed toll is 50c. Why should anybody be forced to pay 50c just to visit his relatives at Bribie Island?

The proposal is that people who live on Bribie Island—the landholders and ratepayers—have free access to the island. It is suggested that they be given a pass by the council and be allowed to drive over the bridge without paying the toll. What about the other people in the Caboolture Shire? Bribie Island is part of the shire, so if people who live on the island are to be allowed to travel backwards and forwards to it without paying the proposed toll, why shouldn't those people who live in the other parts of the shire be given the same privilege?

Mr Lee: Councillor Barr wants to charge you to go over.

Mr FRAWLEY: I am not going to come into that.

No toll should be imposed on the Bribe bridge now or for evermore. The State Government has made large sums of money available by way of subsidy to Bribe Island. Recently I looked up the figures for the past five years. Over that period, a total of \$1,900,000 has been made available by way of sewerage and water grants and subsidies for beach protection. Furthermore, it has paid subsidies on the sports hall and other amenities. The Government's effort over the past five years has been a good one.

Mr Lee: Thanks to sensible representation.

Mr FRAWLEY: I think so—and I say that with all due modesty.

To turn to another matter—last September a young lady in my electorate who, until then, could not get a job and did not want to loaf around on the dole took a job as a cook on tours run by a gentleman named L. G. White of 98 Mountain Street, Mt Gravatt. Perhaps the honourable member for Mt Gravatt will take some interest in this matter. Mr White was trading as Searock Tours.

Mr Kruger: That's Terry White's good friend.

Mr FRAWLEY: No it's not; nor is he a relation.

This Mr White agreed to pay the lady \$200 a week. He paid her \$760 but he still owes her \$600. He will not talk to her and he will not meet her, nor will he pay her the money.

I wrote to the Minister for Employment and Labour Relations about this matter, thinking that I might be able to have her paid some of the money that is owing to her. The Minister, in his reply, stated that the work performed by this lady was not covered by any award. She was employed to accompany bus tours as cook and cleaner. She also cared generally for the passengers. She did a good job, but because her duties were not covered by any award, this fellow has got away without paying her the sum of \$600. It is shocking that any employer should act in this way, especially when there is no redress for the victim. This young woman has to take legal action to recover the \$600 that is owing. She took the job in good faith with only a verbal agreement, and now he refuses to pay the money. I would say that Searock Tours is run by a crook.

I congratulate newly elected Opposition and Government members on winning their seats.

Mr Lee: You have always been fair.

Mr FRAWLEY: I have always been fair, even when sinking the boot.

Mr Hooper: You are unusually subdued today.

Mr FRAWLEY: I have a cold and I am speaking very quietly.

The duties of members are varied, and they receive a great deal of criticism. It is about time someone stood up and said a few words about Press criticism. I do not mind Pressmen coming down here and drinking grog that costs 20 cents a glass less than they would pay outside. I do not mind their coming down here and getting cheap meals. That is fair enough. They are down here to report the proceedings of Parliament and they can partake of the refreshments available here. But I do object to their bucketing members of Parliament in Press articles.

Only recently a Press reporter wrote an article that appeared in "The Sunday Mail" stating that back-bench members of Parliament, got \$200,000 in superannuation after serving eight years. That is a deliberate untruth. There is no way in the world that any back-bencher can get \$200,000 after 14 years' service. The claim concerning \$200,000 in superannuation after eight years is ridiculous.

Some of the announcements about members' superannuation make me sick. Why doesn't the Press print the truth? I did a little research and found that many superannuation schemes are equally as good as the one applying to members of Parliament. The Brisbane City Council local government superannuation scheme was introduced in 1965. The average pay-out under that scheme is \$130,000. Young men who have come under the local government superannuation scheme after 1965 in a professional capacity, such as shire clerks and engineers, can expect to receive \$300,000 when they retire. I do not object to that, because they pay in 5 per cent of their salary and the council contributes 5 per cent.

An Honourable Member: We pay more than that.

Mr FRAWLEY: Parliamentarians pay 11½ per cent of their salary and get a higher contribution from the Government. It works out much the same. It has to be remembered that a member of Parliament has no security of office. That is evidenced by the fact that some members are missing in this new Parliament. A parliamentarian's job is not safe. He is elected for only three years.

I see nothing wrong with members of Parliament accepting their superannuation pay-out. As an electrician, my superannuation pay-out from the Otis Elevator Company would have been \$120,000 when I retired at 65. I had a secure job there but I cashed in my superannuation to stand for the Redcliffe City Council in 1967. I virtually gave up

\$120,000 in superannuation. I have no hesitation in saying that when I retire I will take my superannuation with both hands.

Members of Parliament deserve superannuation. They pay for it; they work long hours; they are telephoned at any hour of the day from breakfast-time until midnight. I have received telephone calls at midnight and 1 a.m. One night a drunk rang me up to get him out of gaol. I said, "You can bloody well stay there until the next day. I am not getting out of bed to get you out." Those are some of the things that we have to put up with. It is about time the Press presented the facts as they really are.

(Time expired.)

Mr GOLEBY (Redlands) (2.34 p.m.): At the outset I congratulate Mr Speaker on his re-election as the one who is responsible for law and order in the House. At the same time I offer my congratulations to the new Chairman of Committees (Mr Miller) and the members who have been appointed as Temporary Chairmen of Committees. I take this opportunity also to express my loyalty and that of the people I represent to the Crown. I thank my electors for placing their confidence in me and re-electing me.

In the past three years the Redlands electorate has shown the highest percentage of growth. My electorate is not the only one that is experiencing this unprecedented development. Almost every south-east Queensland electorate is experiencing it. It is most important that the Government looks seriously at a redistribution before much longer. The growth rate in the south-east part of the State is increasing particularly because of the influx of people from other States. If something is not done soon, many of the South-east Queensland electorates will contain 30 000 voters by the next election. I know, Mr Speaker, that your electorate contains the greatest number of voters. It is experiencing some of the strains and pressures that are being experienced in neighbouring electorates.

Three years ago a partial redistribution was made, because the enrolments in some electorates were approaching 30 000. One of the mistakes in that redistribution was that no allowance was made for future growth. All electorates in this region were brought back to about 16 000 voters but, by the time the election was held, they contained nearly 20 000 voters. At present, many contain 22 000 to 24 000 voters. When a redistribution is made, some allowance should be made for the growth factor or the electorates will get completely out of balance and will contain more voters than are allowed by the tolerances under the Act. The majority of the South-east Queensland electorates are held by the National Party.

Mr Frawley: Eight out of ten.

Mr GOLEBY: That is right. It is in this region that the Government must make a partial redistribution so as to achieve some equity.

My electorate is a very diverse one. It was noted mainly for its horticultural industry. That is still the largest industry in the electorate but it is fast being overtaken by secondary industry and the fast-growing housing industry. The fishing industry, which is as much a primary industry as the horticultural industry, has been added to the responsibilities of the Minister for Primary Industries (Mr Ahern). The fishing industry is a very important one in my electorate, which has a long coastline and contains many islands, such as North Stradbroke Island. Many people are associated with the fishing industry and the oyster industry. I am pleased that the fishing industry and the Fish Board have been brought under the control of the Minister for Primary Industries.

The Brisbane Market at Rocklea is one of the show market-places of Australia. I compliment the members of the trust and the Government on the establishment of that market. It has developed rapidly during the last 12 years. It set the pattern for marketing in this nation. Some southern States have built new markets similar to it and their facilities very much resemble those in the Brisbane complex.

The business carried on at the Brisbane Market involves the producer, the agent, the retailer and the consumer. From time to time we hear criticism of all those people, but let us be fair about it. The producer has to battle the elements. If the season is good, the produce on sale at the markets is good. Recently, however, many growers have suffered from drought, hail and flood and, when the season is bad, that fact is immediately reflected in the quality of what is offered at the market-place.

One of the things that attracted my attention on a recent visit to the market was the packaging of fruit and vegetables. Tremendous changes have taken place in packaging, and the person who has gained the most benefit from these changes is the consumer. These days fruit and vegetables, particularly fruit, are arriving at the markets in a much better condition than ever before. We have learnt a lot from New Zealand in the packaging field. I think all members will remember the introduction of kiwi fruit into Australia by New Zealand growers. It was beautifully presented and extremely well promoted. The packaging used and the promotion undertaken quickly caught on with consumers and our growers were forced to follow suit.

It would be well worth the while of any member to visit the Rocklea markets to see the new packaging methods being adopted for fruit and vegetables, particularly fruit. These methods ensure that the product is delivered to the consumer in a much better

state than previously and the shelf life of the product in the store has been greatly extended. The introduction of cold storage, not only at the markets but in retail stores and, most importantly, by producers on the farm ensures that the produce that ultimately ends up in the consumer's refrigerator has been kept at an even temperature right from the time it was harvested. It is most important that field heat is removed from the commodity, and this has greatly extended shelf life.

I now want to make some further comments about the fishing industry, which we have learnt from experience over a number of years is a very complex one. The industry has experienced many problems, including the weather. One often hears of the elements keeping the in-shore fleet at home. We have done very little to exploit and harvest our off-shore fishing grounds. It has been left to the Japanese and Taiwanese to show us just what can be done with the resources off our coastline. I believe that we as a Government, both State and Federal, must do a lot more to encourage the exploitation of the vast fishing resources of our coastline by our fishermen and not leave it to foreigners to exploit these resources right on our doorstep.

I believe that we as a Government have to take a close look at certain parts of the local fishing industry. It is the duty of the Minister and the department to make sure that the industry is carried on in an efficient manner. In addition, conservation must be practised to the advantage not only of the fishermen but this State as a whole. I refer particularly to the prawning industry. Most people believe that the prime purpose of a prawn trawler is to catch prawns, but unfortunately from time to time they catch large numbers of sand crabs, many of which are undersized. Most of the crabs that are brought to the surface are dead, so consequently they are all processed by the trawler operator, even if they are undersized. If the sand crab industry is to survive, the Government must do something to prohibit the sale of sand-crab meat processed from undersized crabs.

I would also like to mention the exploitation of the mud crab, a delicacy on our tables for many, many years. It is being exploited not only by the sale on the open market in New South Wales of undersized crabs but also—

Mr Hooper: Do you think unmarried crabs should have nippers?

Mr GOLEBY: I will leave that one to the honourable member; he seems to be an expert on everything.

Unfortunately, net fishermen in this State take little care to ensure the continuation of the species. Mud crabs that become entangled in fishermen's nets are crushed and destroyed. The mud crab population,

particularly in the southern area of Moreton Bay, has been decimated. In recent years it has not been uncommon to see thousands of mud crabs crushed and destroyed because they have become entangled in nets. When they become entangled in nets, it takes a considerable time to untangle them. I can appreciate the annoyance that fishermen feel when mud crabs become entangled in their nets.

Mr Moore: What about sandies?

Mr GOLEBY: They are nowhere near the problem that mud crabs are. Mud crabs entangle themselves a lot more and they live well after the water has receded from the net. On the other hand, the sand crab dies quickly and is easily taken out of the net. Very few sand crabs are caught along the foreshores; they are caught out in the channels. Mud crabs are being killed off by the thousands, and I hope that the new Minister who has responsibility in this area will do something to try to preserve the Queensland mud crab and its identity in Moreton Bay.

As a member who represents a large area of the coastline—no doubt other members represent similar areas—I have come under tremendous pressure from organisations and groups, particularly those in the tourist industry, to have the commercial fishing industry banned from the southern part of Moreton Bay. I do not want to see that happen. There is room for the tourist industry and also for the commercial fishing operators. After all, the sea is not there for any one section of the population; it is there for all. As long as we, as responsible people, use the resources in the sea wisely and well, there is no reason why both the tourist industry and the fishing industry cannot operate in the sea for many years to come.

The mining industry forms a large part of industrial life in the electorate of Redlands. I refer to the sand-mining industry on Stradbroke Island. Unfortunately, there have been some retrenchments in this industry as the mineral lode has become depleted. Now, activity is winding down in the beach areas. I wish to pay tribute to the work that the miners, particularly in the beach areas, have done. I look at the open beach on North Stradbroke Island and see the work that has been done there, by dredging and rehabilitation, to rebuild the coastal dunes.

There is a half-mile strip of beach just south of Point Lookout that has not been mined. That is a wonderful example of what the elements will do and how destructive they can be to our coastline. The sand dunes have been completely denuded of vegetation and large sand drifts have occurred. A moving sand dune is shifting across behind the township of Point Lookout. Yet the areas that have been mined are well grassed and vegetated. The 18-mile swamp that runs the length of the coastal area there has been saved from denudation by blowing sand.

The mining companies are to be congratulated for the work they have done in restoring the beach areas of North Stradbroke Island. The areas are far better now than they were when the sand-mining companies started to work on them in the mid-1950s.

Mr Simpson: They could stabilise some of Moreton Island in that way.

Mr GOLEBY: Moreton Island is not in my electorate, but I know that if they adopt the same procedures that they have adopted on North Stradbroke Island, Moreton Island will be the benefactor: the beaches will be stabilised and the vast erosion that is taking place at the present time will be halted.

The rehabilitation that has been carried out by the mining companies on the mountain slopes and ridges has also proved to be most satisfactory. I do not want to sound as though I am so pro-mining that I believe the miners do not do any damage, but I do believe that there is room for mining. However, unless mining is properly controlled, it need not necessarily be advantageous to any region. I think that many of the vast areas that are under mineral lease on Stradbroke Island and on other islands can be mined without any detriment to the natural islands or their terrain. There are many beauty spots and areas of interest to tourists and naturalists on these sand islands, and I can see no reason why these areas cannot be preserved.

I firmly believe that the perched lakes and lagoons and the ponded areas that are to be found on the sand islands must be preserved and that no mining should be allowed to be carried out near them, because once the peat seal in the bottom of these lakes is broken there is every chance that the fresh water will flow out and the lakes will be drained.

I have mentioned the building industry. The Redlands area is experiencing the same sort of building boom that is occurring in other areas along the Queensland coast and also in some inland areas. One of my concerns is that unless land is quickly subdivided and developed for residential use, the land bank will run out. In fact, it is very close to running out at the present time. The majority of the estates that are being sold at the present time on which houses are being erected were subdivided no later than the mid '70s. Very little land has been subdivided for residential use since 1975. Unless local authorities and this Government are careful and take a good look at the situation, there will be a vast shortage of suitable residential land.

If that happens, there is a great escalation in land prices. In fairness to all sections of the community and the industry, no-one wants to see a tremendous escalation in residential land prices. Actually the base land cost of any residential allotment forms only

a minor part of the end cost. The costs are in the development and provision of roads, sewerage, water and other services. Unless something is done to make available adequate areas for residential use and let subdivision take place, the base land cost will become of prime importance and land prices will escalate.

The tourist industry is of considerable interest to Queenslanders and Australians generally. I pay credit to the work of the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation. In its early years that body received much criticism, but it has reorganised the tourist industry in this State so that it is now rapidly progressing. I understand that business from the tourist industry over the last 12 months has increased in the vicinity of 31 per cent. That will grow even more. Queensland is already the major tourist State in Australia and tourism here will expand even further.

The Government must play a role in this and I believe that the training of suitable staff for the tourist industry is one of the most important areas in which it can assist. A limited number of people are being trained at TAFE colleges for employment in restaurants, as hotel managers, and so on. They will find work in the hospitality industry, but I believe the amount of training should be escalated.

If two international hotels were built in Queensland this year, they would require approximately 1 000 new staff. At the moment they are just not available in such number. I understand that at the present time eight to 10 national hotel syndicates are investigating the possibilities in Queensland and the general feeling is that the majority of these will be constructing first-class tourist hotels in this State. If that happens, there will be a major shortage of trained personnel. Any young person who is looking for a career in the tourist industry, in hotel or motel management or anything to do with the hospitality industry, has a very wide field in which to look and a golden opportunity for the future.

Tourism in my electorate is growing year by year. At the present time the local chamber of commerce and other community groups are doing all they can to cater for and promote tourism. The Redland Shire Council has set aside special offices to deal with and promote the tourist industry and also has a special officer to deal with the preparations for the Commonwealth Games to be held near the border of my electorate in 18 months' time. Anybody who has an electorate close to the site of the Commonwealth Games will realise very fully what will be involved with the tremendous influx of visitors, not only from this State but also from interstate and overseas.

I believe tourism will in a very short time become second only to the mining industry and will surpass the beef, wool and grain industries. Although the mining industry is

important to Stradbroke Island, I believe that tourism will be the life blood of the island for many years to come. Its wonderful beach resort has 35 miles of uninterrupted coastline providing facilities for those who like the surf and sun. The most important thing is for people to be able to get to Stradbroke Island and in that vein we know that the Main Roads Department has done certain studies on the provision of quick access to the island by way of a bridge. I am confident that that will be provided in the very near future. The people in South Queensland, particularly those in the Brisbane metropolitan region, will demand quick access to that very fine tourist facility and beach resort. At present it is not very encouraging to anyone who wants to visit the area to find that before he can leave the mainland he has to obtain a barge booking. If it is a holiday period—Easter or Christmas—the booking must be made weeks in advance. The cost is \$28 a time, which in itself is a deterrent to any family group wishing to get to the beach. Those costs will escalate. As fuel prices increase, naturally that portion of the barge operator's cost has to be passed on to the public.

Local government plays a most important role in all electorates. The Redlands electorate is unique in that it is the only one in the State where the electoral boundaries and local authority boundaries are exactly the same. I have had a long association with local government and it is one sphere that is still very close to my heart.

A concern confronting all local authorities is finance. The Federal Government must be responsible for providing additional finance to local government. The costs of services such as water and sewerage are recoverable costs for local authorities, which receive a 50 per cent subsidy from the State Government for water and 40 per cent for sewerage. However, what happens with roads? They are most important and uppermost in the minds of most people, whether they live close to Brisbane or out in western Queensland. The ability to move readily from one point to another is important to everybody; yet the provision of roads is the greatest strain on local government finances.

The Federal Government should return a far greater proportion of the money that it is taking in petrol taxes not only to State Governments for main roads and highways but also to local authorities for road-works for which they are responsible. It is not so many years ago that Commonwealth aid was returned to the States virtually in full. The local authorities received their share and there were no strings attached. Local authorities could spend that money on roads where they saw fit and where they felt most advantage could be obtained. Whether it was resealing work in a minor residential street or work on a principal council road, Commonwealth aid could be used and no questions were asked.

During the last decade, however, all sorts of restrictions have been placed on the expenditure by local authorities of funds that have come from the Commonwealth Government. This is where the trouble has started. In many areas where the spending of money is urgent, the guide-lines set down by the Commonwealth do not permit money to be spent. Although the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Police is not in the House, I know that he shares my concern about the problems confronting local government, particularly in their funding for local roads.

Another very touchy subject for local authorities is the Brisbane and Area Water Board. Fortunately, the Redland Shire has an adequate water supply and is not included in the area of the Brisbane and Area Water Board. I hope that it is never included, because apart from having an adequate supply on the mainland since the ponding of Tingalpa Creek, more than 60 million gallons of fresh water a day run into the sea from Stradbroke Island. That just has to be harnessed and reticulated through the bay islands, which have 17 000 allotments, and to the mainland of the Redland Shire.

There is an adequate supply of water for that shire for many years to come. I can see no reason at all why there should be any interference with the Redland Shire's water supply by putting it under the Brisbane and Area Water Board. If such an attempt were made, I can assure those responsible that all possible resistance would be offered to it.

The bay islands—I am referring to Russell, Lamb, Karragarra and Macleay—have been headline news in recent years, particularly Russell Island, because of certain incidents that took place with recent subdivisional development. However, those islands are developing and many facilities have been provided since they were brought under the local authority. Every one of those islands has had its main road—its central road—bitumen sealed or partly sealed. Ramps have been constructed at every island so that barges can land and small craft can use them. The jetties have been maintained and are adequate. However, the point I raise relates to the payment for those facilities.

When the islands were handed to the Redland Shire Council, there was an unwritten agreement that the water facilities would be provided by this Government. However, when the time came, the water facilities had to be funded in the main by the local authority. As to the \$250,000 loan that was to be provided for ramps—the only subsidy that was received was from the Small Craft Fund so that ramps could be made suitable for small craft. The cost of the major ramp construction work was fully carried by the ratepayers by way of loan. In that respect, this Government fell down on the job. I certainly hope that the Minister for Northern Development and Maritime

Services will see fit to have the jetties maintained. I can assure him that, contrary to the suggestion that has been put forward, the Redland Shire Council will not be maintaining that.

The most important amenity for the three islands is, of course, reticulated power. It is ridiculous to think that an area that is not much more than 30 miles from Brisbane has no electricity. The islands of Macleay, Lamb and Karragarra contain a total of 4500 allotments. I thank the Minister for Mines and Energy for the concern that he has shown for the residents of the islands and for having visited them to see at first hand the problems that confront them. The running of generators in a closely settled community is just not on. The allotments are only 24 perch allotments, and it is disgraceful to have every landholder running his own generator. It is noise pollution at its worst, especially at night.

I congratulate the new Minister for Education on his appointment to that portfolio. Education is a very controversial topic and no matter who the Minister might be, he will not stem the tide of criticism from one section of the community or another. I like the way in which the new Minister has approached his task and is handling his portfolio.

This morning I was pleased to hear the Minister for Works and Housing, in answer to a question asked by me, announce that tenders will be called for a new school to service the fast-growing area of Birkdale/Alexandra Hills. The new school is urgently needed. Every week a large number of new homes appear in the area. By 1982 a large number of students will be enrolled at the school for opening day.

In the planning of new schools provision should be made to set the buildings far enough back from the road to allow land to be used for parking. Such a step would enable buses to pull off the main carriageway adjacent to the school to pick up or set down passengers. The danger to students would thereby be lessened greatly, because they would not be forced to go onto the busy carriageway to board the bus. Many mistakes have been made in the past, and they should not occur in the future. The Minister should ensure that roads outside schools are wide enough to allow a bus service lane to be provided so that primary and secondary students do not have to go onto the main carriageway to board and alight from buses.

As to free bus transport in general—a three-mile limit is imposed in the case of high school students and those in the higher grades at primary school. A student below the age of 10 years and living within two miles of his school is entitled to free bus transport. Nothing is wrong with that set-up except in the densely populated areas containing busy thoroughfares. In such areas it is dangerous for students to ride bicycles.

In other areas the ordinary bus services do not pass close by to schools, so it is necessary for the family to have a second car so that one of the parents can take the children to school in the morning and pick them up in the afternoon. The alternatives are riding bicycles or walking. No-one would say that it hurts anyone to walk. However, it is dangerous on a three-mile road without footpaths. Although it costs \$25m a year to provide the school transport system, something must be done to reduce the limits. The three-mile limit should be reduced to two miles so that the dangers confronting children either riding bicycles or walking along very busy roads can be reduced.

Another matter for concern is the lack of standardisation in textbooks. I applaud the Government's policy to standardise textbooks. It has been subjected to many angry comments by teachers, but when students transfer to a school that uses a completely different range of textbooks there are many reasons for concern. Textbooks are not cheap. When two or three children in a family attending high school have to be completely re-equipped with textbooks because of the whims and fancies of the subject masters standardisation of textbooks becomes very important. It will save parents a lot of money, a lot of confusion and the disturbance that students suffer when transferring from one school to another. Surely the hassles of transferring from one school to another are enough on their own without the student's having to completely change textbooks. If standardisation is Government policy I urge the Government to introduce it quickly.

This year we have experienced many calamities and disasters in the State. The Brighton disaster has been well aired by honourable members from time to time. The Press has also given full coverage to what happened from day one to the present time. It behoves everyone to insure his home. Just as it is compulsory to have third-party motor vehicle insurance it should be compulsory to have replacement-value home insurance. It is useless for anyone to have insurance on his home if it is not at replacement value. People can be hoodwinked into believing that their home is adequately insured when it is not. If it is not adequately insured what is the good of having insurance? Anyone whose home is burnt or wrecked finds, if it is insured on values applying ten years ago, that inflation accounts for a large portion of the value, and the insurance company deducts about ten per cent a year for depreciation. The only adequate insurance is a replacement policy. By making replacement insurance compulsory we would take away much of the responsibility that falls on Governments and community organisations after a disaster. The Government and community organisations have to help those who were not prudent enough to insure. Insurance for everyone would be cheaper. The more

people who insure, the cheaper insurance and the fire brigade levy become. Those who insure their premises today carry the major burden of the fire insurance levy. Every landowner pays approximately one eighth of his rates by way of precept to the fire brigade service. If all homes and buildings were insured everyone would share the cost, and the burden would be less for those who are presently prudent enough to insure. At the moment they are providing a fire brigade service for the rest of the community.

I come now to a primary industry that has experienced many problems, namely, the dairying industry. It is well known to you, Mr Speaker. About two years ago, when we introduced the milk entitlements legislation, we provided some stability for the industry. The large drift from the industry was somewhat arrested, and it became more stabilised. Although the market price has been stabilised and made a payable proposition for the producers, the manufactured milk price is far from satisfactory. At the present time there is a variation in the price for milk factories. Some producers receive about ten cents a litre for manufactured milk while others receive about fourteen cents a litre. That is caused by the price differential used by the various milk processors.

The milk processors are operating and competing on the one market, and it is time that something was done to make sure that the processor paid an adequate price for the milk he processes and that a base price was paid. How can anyone hope to compete in the market-place unless every supplier is paid the same for the commodity which is being retailed to the public? The Government must look at this matter and make sure that the dairy industry is stabilised and that a suitable manufacturing milk price is paid.

Queensland can ill afford to lose the dairy industry. Approximately 3 000 dairymen are left in the industry in Queensland, and their numbers are continually diminishing. If the Government does not do something soon the dairy industry will no longer be able to support itself, and we will have to buy our milk from New South Wales and Victoria. Queenslanders do not want that and I am sure that the Government cannot afford to let it happen. Unless the price is adjusted for manufacturing milk, the industry will be finished. I hope that the Government will do something to stabilise the dairy industry which has always been part and parcel of the agricultural scene in this State.

Mr KRUGER (Murrumba) (3.12 p.m.): Firstly in this Address-in-Reply debate I should like to congratulate you, Mr Speaker, on your re-election to the very high office of Speaker of this Parliament. I am sure you would admit that you had a few problems early in the piece but we have learnt to

accept you as quite a fair and honest Speaker. I trust that, as the years go by, Parliament will enjoy a lot of good service from you.

I congratulate the members who have entered Parliament for the first time, particularly those on the Labor Party side of the House. They are very staunch supporters of the party and will be a great asset to Queensland. I am very pleased to have them alongside me so that in 1983 when we form the Government, they will strengthen our ranks.

I thank the helpers in the Murrumba electorate who did so much for me during the election campaign. The team that works with a candidate is all important, and I was very pleased to have such a good team working with me.

I want to raise a very important matter, that is, the amount of money spent during election campaigns. I refer particularly to the ridiculous amount of money spent by the National Party on its advertising campaign. It is high time that we legislated to place some control or an upper limit on the amount of money that can be spent by a candidate or a party.

Mr Moore: Why would you want to do that?

Mr KRUGER: Because I believe that there is an unfair situation. The members of the National Party—the multinational puppets—are being given money to conduct their campaigns. They accept large sums of money. Many years ago the Liberal Party members were very pleased to accept some of the money that came forward. That seems to have died out somewhat over recent years.

Mr Moore: We still get our fair share.

Mr KRUGER: I do not doubt that, but Liberal Party members must have slumped a bit this time. Their numbers went down in line with the available finance.

I know the amount of money that was spent in the electorate of Murrumba. I do not believe that the expenditure of that sort of money is of any great advantage to politics. I have been told on good authority that, in some areas round Brisbane where the National Party was having trouble holding or winning seats, candidates were being offered round \$40,000. They could spend as much as they wanted on the campaign and they could keep the rest for their own personal interests.

Mr ELLIOTT: I rise to a point of order. I personally find that statement offensive and I ask the member to withdraw it.

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

Mr KRUGER: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. I just wanted to bring to the notice

of the House that that sort of thing goes on, and it is not in the best interests of Queensland.

Mr Hooper: Wasn't there a large amount of money that went into the electorate of Cunningham?

Mr KRUGER: I am not too sure about Cunningham; it is quite a long way from my electorate.

I now want to discuss some of the matters raised in the Governor's Opening Speech, and in particular the proposed rail link from Petrie to Kippa-Ring. I was very interested to hear the Governor say that plans for this development were well under way. I had not intended to raise this matter today, but things that have happened since the Governor made his Speech have changed my mind. The other day I asked this question—

"(1) How much of the allocated funds has been spent to date on the planning and surveying of the Petrie-Redcliffe rail link?

"(2) When will the plans and references be completed?

"(3) What is the Government's intention regarding the timing of construction of the link?"

I received a good, clean-cut answer from the department which read—

"(1 to 3) I am advised by the Commissioner for Railways that up until the end of February 1981, a total of \$34,636.25 has been spent on the planning and surveying of the Redcliffe-Petrie rail link. Survey plans relating to land acquisition will be completed during June 1981. Civil design and planning will be commenced when the necessary funds are made available, and these are expected to require 12 months to complete.

"With reference to the timing of the construction of the rail link, this will largely depend on the availability of finance. However, members will appreciate the ground work is well under way."

Then at the foot of the departmental answer, in his own handwriting the Minister had added—

"I would advise the honourable member that I am keeping in regular contact with the honourable member for Redcliffe, who is in the forefront of local interests in this matter."

I would like to bring to the Minister's attention the fact that he should have a look at the electorate of Murrumba and the route along which the railway will be built and then decide who is in the forefront in this matter. This information is possibly not known to him because of his lack of interest to date in his job. I have a map here which shows that the electorate

of Murrumba takes in all of the Petrie and Kallangur growth areas as well as one-third of Redcliffe city.

Mr Goleby: It is upside down.

Mr KRUGER: The map is not upside down, it is just that the honourable member is standing on his head. I would remind the honourable member that this is a serious matter. On too many occasions I, as member for the area, have been snubbed by the Minister about this matter. The people of the district are quite concerned at the Minister's habit of trying to avoid me. They are upset that Ministers of the Crown would act in this manner. I would go so far as to suggest that the Minister should resign because of his lack of knowledge and interest in the proposals I have put forward. As he is new to the job he ought to make sure he knows what he is talking about. At the very least he ought to know which electorates will be affected by such plans.

The third of Redcliffe city which is in the electorate of Murrumba is the growth area around Kippa-Ring where the shopping centre has been established, and that is where the railway will terminate. Many people in the old part of Redcliffe will continue to travel across the Houghton Highway to Shorncliffe to catch the train. If the Minister is not prepared to find out the route of the rail link and through which electorates it will travel he ought to resign.

Let us now look at another grave problem in this State. I am very concerned about the freeholding of leasehold land, particularly on our near coastal islands. I will use Curtis Island as an example. I have here a Press release which I issued to "The Gladstone Observer" on 3 August 1980. I referred to the Government's transfer of what was possibly freehold land to an American, Mr Jay Richey. He reportedly applied to have 5418 ha or 13380 acres of leasehold grazing farm land in his name transferred to freehold tenure. That is an enormous amount of country that that gentleman wanted to freehold under the new transfer arrangements.

Mr Moore: How big?

Mr KRUGER: 13380 acres of leasehold grazing farm land held in his name.

I said at that time that Mr Richey, who lives in America, must have been given exemption from the normal conditions of occupancy under grazing farm leases. Present negotiations cover special leases 2803 and 2784. Mr Richey may also be negotiating to freehold special lease 27199 which adjoins the above lease. The lease is a part of a recreation reserve, which is in two parts. That reserve is R64. Part B is the township of South End, and part A is the section under lease to Mr Richey, an area of

336 ha, or 830 acres. Mr Richey presently owns 314 ha, or 776 acres, of freehold land on the island.

I envisage that, after the Minister brings forward the new proposals for changing land from leasehold to freehold tenure, a special arrangement with the Government, people will freehold their land and sell it at huge profits. I do not think that that was ever the intention with land, particularly along the coastal strip where it is so important to the tourist trade. I understand that a resort is to be constructed as soon as possible in that area of land that Mr Richey owns. Some delay has occurred recently, and I think that was due mainly to the article that was published in the "Observer" by the member for Port Curtis, and more recently by me as the Opposition shadow Minister for Lands and Forestry. I am very concerned about where this is all going to finish if the Government does not step in and take some sensible and realistic action.

I move now to the Heron Island situation. I have received good advice recently that the reserve on Heron Island is being expanded. There are some very rare types of birds in that Capricorn group. I am aware that with this expansion some trenches were dug through the bush but that no attempt was made to save the lives of the birds. I am led to believe that over 1 000 birds in the nest were killed during that work. I can see no need for that sort of thing.

I look at the next move that is contemplated, which is to take over Wilson Island. Wilson Island is a very small island in the group. It has an area of some 7 ha at low tide and about 5 ha at high tide. The island houses some of the rarest of our earth-nesting birds. I quote from an article written by experts in their field—

"The individuals whose names are set out below have contributed directly to the preparation of this paper. It is largely based, however, on the accumulated knowledge of the area that has developed through the work of many, over many years."

The people concerned are listed. It continues—

"The vegetation is also essential to the conservation of the islands, since without it, the sands of which they are formed would quickly erode. There is an intimate relationship between the vegetation and the sea birds (which it shelters and protects) that rest, roost or live on the island. Its maintenance is vital to their continued existence on the islands, and their existence there is vital in transferring nutrients from the sea to fertilise the vegetation, to colonise the cays with plants and maintain gene flow between otherwise isolated populations."

There are four species of turtles in the Capricorn/Bunker area, and they, too, are creating a lot of interest in other parts of

the State. Heron Island, too, has quite a few turtles on it. In developing these islands for resorts we have to be careful to protect the environment and the wildlife species on them. Referring to the bird life the article states—

"The birds of the Capricorns and Bunkers form one of their most characteristic features. Visitors to the islands can live close to nesting White-capped Noddy Terns and Wedge-tailed Shearwaters, and (together with nesting turtles) this may add greatly to the satisfaction they derive from a visit to the cays. These two birds species nest in abundance in the area (17 000 Noddy Terns and 16 000 Shearwaters estimated to nest on Heron Island by Shipway, 1969)."

Of course, Shipway is the person who made the estimate. It continues—

"The birds are also critical to the conservation of the cays since they are the agency by which the nutrients are transferred from the sea to the land."

The article continues with a table showing how many species are on those islands. I think 33 per cent of the birds use the Wilson Island area as a nesting area. It is very important that some control is exercised. The Government should not let P & O take over the island in the way that appears to be happening. I want to know what the Government has done and whether it has studied fully the various reports that have been made and whether it has contacted the Federal authorities.

Another article about seabirds is contained in a document titled "Wilson Island Resort Proposal and its Environmental Implications". It states—

"Wilson Island is listed among the 9 most important seabird colonies on the Great Barrier Reef. It has one of the three major colonies of roseate tern on the Great Barrier Reef and in fact in the whole of eastern Australia. It also has major colonies of black-naped terns and reef herons, and a colony of crested terns."

If these people are allowed to go in there before an environmental impact study is carried out, and they disrupt the bird life, some of the rarest species of birds in Queensland and Australia will be lost. We cannot allow that to happen. The companies concerned have a responsibility to live up to.

I draw honourable members' attention to a letter to the editor in "The Australian" of 19 March written by Harold Heatwole. He went into great detail about the effect the proposed development would have on the bird life of the island. He is a much better authority on this subject than I am, but I share the concern of these interested people.

An attempt was made by TAA to take over the spit on Dunk Island. That was

prevented only by the uproar of the people who were concerned about its future. The Government allowed certain development to take place on Wild Duck Island, and declared the remainder of the island as a national park so that now the lessee cannot be affected by any other development.

Under the heading "Tourist island building to start soon" a Press article of 5 June 1980 stated—

"Construction of a \$3.9 million tourist resort on Wild Duck Island . . ."

That is not a minor resort; it is a massive undertaking. I went to the Press with the problems arising from that development on Wild Duck Island but the daily newspapers did not print anything about them. When some of the newspaper people objected to what was going on the reporters in their own newspaper, "The Clarion" printed the article. It said—

"The State Government has been called on to explain alleged preferential treatment in the allocation of tourist resort licenses.

"Opposition Lands spokesman, Mr. Joe Kruger, fired the charge at the State Government.

"He said: 'Wild Duck Island off the Central Queensland coast is the latest example of the favoritism shown to friends of the government.

"The tourist resort lease was given to a group that includes a federal parliamentarian.

"The rest of the island was then declared a national park. This excludes further licenses.

"The allocation of this resort licence was even raised in State Parliament by a government backbencher, Mr. Lindsay Hartwig, but no really satisfactory explanation was given."

That the Government does not give a reasonable explanation of what it intends to do in these circumstances is serious.

Mr Hansen: What happened to the member of Parliament?

Mr KRUGER: He is still about; he is the six million dollar man. He got that name because he spent most of the money on overseas telephone calls trying to arrange the finance for the resort.

I want to refer to the proposed development on Stradbroke Island which has recently been held up. I am quite sure from the documents that I have available that there was Government interference there; I do not think that Russell James Hinze was very far out of the limelight when those decisions were made in the Cabinet room.

There is also the problem with the Iwasaki development, which is way behind

schedule. Admittedly somebody threw a spanner in the works, if one can put it that way, which cost him a lot of valuable time, but before then he was not being realistic and he is not honest about it now. As a Parliament I suppose we all have to take the blame in a way, but I believe it was the Premier who took it upon himself to make sure that Mr Iwasaki had a free run through that development program. If anybody else tried to get the same sort of treatment, unless he was prepared to subscribe in some way towards the National Party, he would not get the type of hand-out that I believe was made.

Far too many back-door deals in land matters are being made through this Government. I am very concerned about that. An old gentleman rang me the other morning and he finished up in tears. He is a fifth-generation Australian and he does not like to see the Premier giving our State away to other people.

Mr Hooper: It's a scandal.

Mr KRUGER: It certainly is, and it is getting worse by the minute. Until someone starts to take notice of what we say in this House and brings it to the notice of the people of the State, it will go on getting worse. I cannot see it stopping until real pressure is put on.

I shall now deal with some of the problems of the other part of my shadow portfolio—forestry. We need to expand our forestry areas greatly—and not just along the coastal strip, which has been the policy in recent years. With the exception of the odd small plot out West, this has possibly been the policy for most of the life of the Forestry Department in Queensland. I want to talk about the possibility of growing timber in what is becoming the dry and withered part of our State. If there is a drought in the West, TV camera crews often go out to photograph dying stock. They show bulldozers knocking down trees. Admittedly, the timber is not too good. It is pretty scatty in its make-up, but the trees do create shade and have a mulching effect.

In the old days, to help their animals survive, graziers used to fell by axe or saw a limited amount of timber to keep the cattle alive. These days they put dozers in and take large swoops through the stands of timber that are left. The following year, when the drought is over, all that is left is bare land, which withers up immediately. I will read to the House an article I presented on this matter—

"The State and Federal Governments should make money available to experiment with timber planting to encourage rain to cross the Great Dividing Range. Moisture creates moisture, and this is a well proven fact.

"For too long we have stripped our land of the scanty timber that clad areas west of the Divide. This has led to limited mulching of the soil which has expanded our deserts into the semi arid regions. More serious and larger droughts have been occurring as a result of man's interference and we owe it to ourselves to halt these actions.

"Money should be made available to experiment with timbers which could be cultivated to stand hot, dry conditions. This would create the much-needed exusions of moisture into the atmosphere which would create heavier dew fall and rain. Timber can, and does, create a mulching effect unequalled by most other crops. Mulch encourages the earthworm which keeps the soil open and plays a great role in the natural fertilisation of the land. The worm also gives new life to our land which has suffered years of compaction, by machine on some areas, and beast on others.

"If steps are not taken to encourage more rainfall and mulching of western lands we will find ourselves with more desert and less agricultural producing lands. We should not sit back and watch our great State turn into a desert. If suitable plantations of fast-growing, moisture-creating timber created heavier falls of rain through the normal gulf monsoons then we could possibly encourage better falls beyond the Divide when our cyclone and eastern rains batter the coastal region.

"A lot of experimental work will be necessary and I believe it would create a lot of jobs within the Forestry Department and it would be a way of employing men quickly.

"As forestry work is an on going programme, it would not be just providing temporary jobs.

"Australia is currently importing large amounts of timber and the forests are running out in North Queensland."

Mr Hansen: This is what they have done in the Sahara.

Mr KRUGER: Yes. It has been proved in several parts of the world that timber will grow in desert conditions. If one goes to Longreach, for example, where there is some water on the timber, they have some of the nicest green trees to be seen anywhere. What they are doing is putting water on the trees and making the trees flourish.

The other alternative is to plant trees in order to bring moisture. Trees do exude quite an amount of water into the atmosphere. I think a good eucalypt puts out into the atmosphere something like 370 gallons a day. That is a tremendous output of moisture. Of course, it is moisture creating moisture.

I will now read an article written by Dr St. Barbe Baker, who was out here recently. He is an expert on trees and the very man

the member for Maryborough was talking about who proved what could be done in the Sahara Desert. The article, headed "Let us declare war", reads—

"Current talk of no more war is a merely negative approach to mankind's most urgent problem and creates a void which, at its most generous estimate, is an armed truce. Without sacrificing our idealism we can also be realists and honestly accept the fact that man is happiest when struggling and that he loves a fight.

"At the present elementary stage of man's evolution it is, therefore, plainly useless to ask him to stop fighting, but we can at least find something against which it is worth declaring war. Instead of campaigns of destruction against fellow members of the human family we could unite in a constructive battle against mankind's real enemy. An all-out onslaught on the deserts would call forth as many—indeed more—of man's noble instincts as does the impersonal, long-range devastation of modern war.

"Is it too optimistic, too fantastic to imagine divisions of our young men travelling to those parts of the world where the deserts are always making their insidious, all-devouring advance on man's food producing soil? What a welcome they would receive, carrying not the weapons to destroy their brothers but tools to construct a new earth. The Sahara is surely a foe worthy of the fighting character and struggling nature of all young men. It is small wonder that most men will never talk about their war experiences for they are best quickly forgotten; but what a joyous and lasting memory for a man to remember in the years to come that he and his company planted the trees that first stemmed the advance of the desert. In its place he would be leaving myriads of young trees, green pastures and life-giving irrigation. Surely this is no pipe-dream.

"Modern warfare demands vast expenditure, endless streams of material and great organising ability, all to achieve destruction and to reap long-smouldering resentment and hatred. A campaign against the deserts on all counts would cost less, and the harvest would be an earth of fair beauty, lands of rich production and hearts filled with loving gratitude.

"While man fights man, a real enemy, the desert, advances unchecked. Let man unite with man, as brothers all, and together they will throw back their common foe and reclothe the earth in a mantle of green peace."

Those people who do not know much about timber and have not seen the desert might find those statements hard to believe. St Barbe Baker has been dedicated to his work for many years. He has thrown out a challenge that all Australians should accept.

I have received a letter from the group of men who recently formed the association known as The Men of the Trees. They are planting trees in various areas and they are looking for land that has been allowed to go to waste in the past so that they can plant trees on it. They are accepting the challenge that St Barbe Baker issued when he made his statements.

Further work should be undertaken to combat the diseases that attack timber in Queensland. Whilst the incidence of die-back in eucalypts in Queensland is minor compared with that in the New England area of New South Wales, it is beginning to manifest itself. Furthermore, a disease known as phytophthora is creating problems. It is up to the Government to ensure that every cent possible is spent to control that and other diseases.

Similar diseases occur in short-term-production plants such as tomatoes, cabbages and pineapples. Methods can be found to check diseases in those plants. However, it is very difficult to combat such diseases in timber, which has a lengthy life-span. If a disease is similar to phytophthora, there must be some way in which it can be stamped out. If it is not eradicated, what are presently forest areas will become nothing more than deserts.

The system of mill allocations for the harvesting of forests leaves a lot to be desired. From information that I have received, it appears that the smaller mills are not getting a fair crack of the whip. Apparently the larger mills have the ear of Government departments and Government members and therefore stand a better chance of obtaining mill allocations. It seems that if a mill is a big one it has a good chance of getting even bigger.

I want to read from a very interesting letter that I received from the former Minister for Forestry. The portions that I want to draw to the attention of honourable members are as follows:—

"I refer to your representations concerning the clear-felling of softwood plantations in south-east Queensland.

"As you would be aware the softwood planting programme was designed to meet a projected short-fall in the availability of timber supplies from our native forests. The programme has reached the stage where the oldest plantings are ready for clear-felling and replanting. . .

"For some time my Department of Forestry has been developing proposals relating to the sale of the final crop material. The utilization of this resource represents a major new development, and has the potential for great benefit to the State in terms of industrial growth, employment and financial return. . .

"As part of the process of finalizing major proposals for consideration by myself and the Government, it is usual for my

Department of Forestry to have preliminary consultations with timber industry associations in Queensland to ascertain their views."

I should like honourable members to keep that in mind. He said that the department checks up with certain sections of the industry.

I thought that the last paragraph was very amusing. The Minister spoke to the industry about its requirements and then made this statement—

"While you may certainly be assured that neither I nor my department will be led by any views which may be expressed by the existing sawmilling industry nor any particular sections of it . . . "

How ridiculous it is to go to the industry to find out what it wants and then say that no notice will be taken of what is said! That explains very clearly the problems I have been talking about.

The Governor's Opening Speech refers to the International Year of Disabled Persons and forecasts that the disabled will be helped. In my area some people formed a committee to build a home for disabled people. They asked me if Government assistance is available. Rather than make a guess, I said I would check with the Ministers concerned. When I wrote to the Minister for Welfare Services I received this reply—

"I acknowledge receipt of your letter of the 11th February, 1981, regarding subsidies available towards the construction of a home for disabled persons.

"Unfortunately my department does not have such subsidies available."

In a previous Press release the same Minister announced that \$100,000 would be made available for the disabled in this financial year. The letter continues—

"Might I suggest to you that the Minister for Health, the Honourable B. D. Austin, Dip.C.E., M.I.E.Aust. M.L.A. would have ministerial control over such matters.

"Perhaps the committee in your electorate would care to place a full proposal before the Health Minister."

After receiving that knock back I thought I should write to the Minister rather than get the committee to make a submission. I wanted to find out what was available. The reply was in these terms—

"I refer to your letter of 11th February, 1981 concerning an approach by a committee in your electorate concerning subsidies which may be payable towards construction of a home for the disabled.

"It is advised that conditions under which capital subsidies are provided for the construction of homes for the disabled are set out in the Aged or Disabled Persons

Homes Act. The committee could be advised to direct its enquiries to the Commonwealth Department of Social Security, Commonwealth Government Centre, 295 Ann Street, Brisbane, 4000."

I have since written but so far have not received a reply.

In the Governor's Opening Speech reference is made to people doing something for themselves. This organisation calls itself Handihome. In a well set out pamphlet reference is made to the problems that arise when a disabled child is born. They say, naturally, that the home life has to adjust, that the parents love the child but, with advancing age, they can no longer do all the things necessary for an older child. The idea is to build a fully equipped home so that people in wheelchairs can have convenient access to shower rooms, toilets and so on.

The idea is also to use the home when mum and dad, particularly in their older years after not having had a holiday for many years, want to get away for a little break. The handicapped people can then be looked after in the home by those whom they have got to know.

It is a worthy cause. The committee is raising money. It does not need a great deal of assistance or hand-outs from the Government. It wants to make sure that Handihome becomes a reality in the electorate of Murrumba.

One of the leading lights in the organisation is a man who did a lot to form the ambulance in the district—a man who has done a great deal of other work for the community. I refer to Mr Tweedale, who made his swimming-pool available to the children at the opportunity school at Petrie for many years. That school is now a special school. Mr Tweedale has been very helpful in his dealings with people with problems in the area. I would like him to get an even break on this occasion.

If no money is coming from the Federal Government, I wonder about the sincerity of the statement made by the Governor in his Speech that it is the International Year of Disabled Persons and that we will do something for them, provided they help themselves. All I have seen come forward is the statement that we should recognise the existence of these people. We want money, not just talk. This is a very important matter, and I hope that all goes well for that organisation.

The foreshadowed legislation that is of the greatest interest concerns a land data bank. It is well overdue. We should be looking at getting the very best out of it. I have spoken, and I know that a few other members have spoken, about the way in which Governments tend to bring in legislation and leave the local authorities to pick up the tab. Local authorities should be a part of this data bank. The Government has to carry

the banner. The legislation will be welcomed but the local authorities must be connected with the scheme because their rate departments have possibly not the easiest-to-find records but the most local and down-to-earth records on land-ownership in their areas. If some of these things had been done in the past, we would have a better knowledge of who owns what and how many foreign owners there are in Queensland. We would have a real check on the ownership of our land.

An article which appeared in "Sunday Sun" on 10 December 1978 carries the headline, "Land owners' register urged." Keith Wright made reference to this matter back in 1978. He said—

"Many foreign concerns hid behind a multitude of so-called pastoral companies.

"Last year the Government made an abortive attempt to investigate foreign ownership of State land.

"The Lands Minister (Mr Tomkins) and the Justice Minister (Mr Lickiss) set up a committee to find out what foreign-based companies owned land.

"However, this was thrown back in the too-hard basket on the ground that the exercise was too costly and records were inadequate."

We have taken almost three years to reach the stage where we are having another look at it. We should have done something when we realised we were getting into trouble. If we had, we would have all land-ownership on computer so that we could merely touch a button and know who owns what and where it is located. We would know what was going on if there were a foreign takeover.

This is another case of the Government delaying and not getting on with the job. I have quite a few articles with me but I am fast running out of time. For instance, the Russell Island scandal would never have happened if correct records had been readily available. The people who were doing the surveying were able to cover up and do things that they could not have done if there had been proper records.

Mr Burns: They are still covering up.

Mr KRUGER: Of course they are still covering up and they will continue to cover up if the Government does not do something about it.

The same applies to Stradbroke Island, which I mentioned before. Until this information is available, these things will occur. The same also applies to the matters that Mr D'Arcy has raised concerning the mining tenders. If the Government cannot be honest and come out into the open, it should not be entering the deal. If it is acting honestly, that can be seen by everybody. The land data bank will be the very thing to keep land transactions honest.

I am interested in a couple of sections of an article written by Mr Peter Meeking, who was the city valuer for the city of Berwick. He said—

“Let us assume firstly that prior to the implementation of the proposal, the Government will have ensured that each of the 211 municipalities will have on line computer facilities or the like, as at the present time over 50% of our municipalities have no such facility.”

What he is saying is that local authorities or municipalities have to be involved so that there is a direct feed through of information. As soon as there is a change of ownership, the information is fed into the bank and everybody is aware of what is going on. He speaks of the flow of information to which I have just referred, keeping things up to date and in a checkable form.

He continued—

“By so utilising local government, the system could gain a bonus by incorporating rate certificate information, which will provide some warning of a pending sale.”

In his conclusion he said—

“There is, it would seem, an opportunity for local government to be a central force in any proposal to construct a central land information system.”

So I am saying that local government ought to be encouraged to be part of this scheme and not just left to carry the cost within their own local authority areas. I trust the Government will take notice of my remarks and possibly give them some consideration.

Quite a few things have concerned me in my first term in this Parliament, so I hope that some of the legislation proposed by this Government will in fact be introduced and be an honest attempt to give the people the treatment they deserve. I hope that the Government allows this State to continue to prosper, and stops attempting to hoodwink the people as it has done recently.

Mr TURNER (Warrego) (3.51 p.m.): In rising to speak in this Address-in-Reply debate, I wish to express my loyalty and that of my constituents to Her Most Gracious Majesty Queen Elizabeth II and to her representative here in Queensland, Sir James Ramsay. Both Sir James Ramsay and his good wife are highly respected and have been well received by Queenslanders for the magnificent job they do. They have travelled extensively throughout the length and breadth of the State since being appointed to that high office.

My congratulations also go to the mover and seconder of the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply for the capable manner in which they performed that task and for the honour of being chosen to fill that role. It was my privilege to move the

motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply some years ago, so I can understand how they felt.

It is an honour for me to be returned to this Parliament to represent the Warrego electorate, an honour that I do not take lightly. I think it should be remembered that prior to 1974 the seat of Warrego had been held by the Australian Labor Party right from federation. Naturally the ALP tried very hard to retake the seat of Warrego in the 1977 election and again in the last election. The Labor Party succeeded in having removed from the roll a number of known National Party voters who in fact had not left the district or even the address at which they were registered as residing. This was achieved under the Electoral Act by action taken against people in the two weeks prior to the election.

The Electoral Office sent notices to these people saying that within 14 days they had to state reasons why they should not be removed from the roll. Naturally in many remote areas of the State it is impossible for people on properties to receive mail from the Electoral Office and reply to it within 14 days. If they happened to be away on holidays, the mail just might sit in their post-boxes. As a result of this action, people were disfranchised.

That was a terrible state of affairs, and I was amazed to see the Labor candidate on ABC television boasting of having done this. Many people have fought and died for the right to have a democratic vote, and it should not be taken away from them in such a manner.

Mr Hooper: You shouldn't have phantom voters on the roll; you would admit that?

Mr TURNER: The honourable member would be the expert on that subject, I would imagine. I will get some advice from him.

The ALP also boasted of having enrolled an extra 500 voters prior to the election. I also lost somewhere in the vicinity of 200 or 300 postal and absentee votes for various reasons on which I will not elaborate on this occasion. In spite of that, I won by 388 votes. I think I set some sort of a record, because that was exactly the same number of votes by which I won on the previous occasion. In essence, I neither won nor lost any particular vote.

I also take this opportunity to thank my campaign director, Mr Vic Calcino, who has now conducted three election campaigns for me, the National Party organisation in my electorate, which did a fantastic job in the recent campaign, my supporters and the electors of Warrego.

Last, but not least, I take the opportunity to thank my wife and family for the job that they have done over the six years that I have been a member of Parliament. I

do not think I need remind any politician of the sacrifices that his family goes through, particularly if he comes from a remote area.

I take this opportunity also to congratulate Mr Speaker on being re-elected to the high and important office of Speaker of this Parliament. I believe that he brings to the job a sense of fairness and decorum, and I look forward to the reforms that he has promised will be introduced during the life of this Parliament.

I also congratulate the various members who have been appointed as Chairmen of Committees and to other jobs in this Chamber. My congratulations also go to the new Ministers and to all members of Parliament who have been elected to represent the various electorates in this State. I hope that they will have a satisfying time here and that it will be rewarding for the people in the electorates that they have been chosen to represent.

Although flood rains have occurred in many areas of this State, drought conditions still prevail over vast areas of Queensland, particularly in my region. I take this opportunity to refer to a statement that was made by the previous speaker in this debate, the member for Murrumba. He said that mulga country was being turned into desert in the western regions. I happen to come from a western region, and I have cut and pushed a lot of mulga.

I think the honourable member should be aware that after cutting, pulling or pushing, the mulga does regenerate and actually comes back thicker than it was previously. It is very hard to kill it out. If he would like to come with me, I could take him to areas of country where the mulga has been cut or pulled and it has regenerated even heavier than it was previously. I take this opportunity to clear up that fallacy.

Even if beneficial rains are received in the very near future it will be too late for many primary producers in my region, because it is too close to winter. These primary producers have suffered drought conditions for many years. Being a western primary producer myself, I believe I can appreciate the problems that these producers have to face. I sincerely hope that the Government will continue the program of drought relief to these people. I appeal to the Minister for Primary Industries (Mr Ahern) to constantly keep this matter under review and to upgrade the level of assistance, because I can assure him that these people are in desperate circumstances.

I also believe that Cabinet should constantly look at the need to provide assistance through remission of rents and rates in drought areas, because it is of tremendous benefit and is necessary to enable many people to meet their commitments. The Minister for Primary Industries has the Agricultural Bank (Loans) Act Amendment Bill currently before the House, and I commend him for

introducing it. It will give to small businesses in drought and flood areas the same access to funds as primary producers have.

This is something that I have advocated over a considerable period, because drought affects all people in western areas, not just primary producers. When an area is in the grip of a drought, stock die or are sent away on agistment or sold. This results in less shearing and in less money going into the little country towns. This has a catastrophic effect on the business houses in such areas. I believe that local stores, hotels and garages are as entitled to Government assistance during periods of drought as are primary producers, because they are all, so to speak, caught up in the same web.

While speaking on drought, I take the opportunity to refer to dams that could be constructed in many areas. We cannot make it rain but we certainly can dam rivers where they lend themselves to that type of development. In this context I refer to St George, where fat lamb raising and cotton growing are undertaken. The effect on that town of the construction of dams has been tremendous. Although the total area may be in the grip of drought, one can see the benefits that accrue from irrigation in that area. They are tremendous. The Government should not overlook this fact.

It would be possible to construct a dam at a site on the Maranoa River at Mitchell. I asked the Minister for Water Resources (Mr Tomkins)—whose electorate adjoins my own and who is well aware of the benefits that have been gained from irrigation in the area—about the possibility of constructing a weir on the Maranoa River. In part he answered—

“During 1978 a preliminary office study was completed on a possible dam site on the Maranoa River approximately 25 km north-north-west of Mitchell. The preliminary study suggested that a dam 20 to 25 m in height could yield about 12 000 ML per annum.”

I appreciate that in irrigation terms that may not be large, but I hope that the Minister will look at the possibility of constructing a dam on the Maranoa.

Roma, which is in the Minister's electorate, currently has many Government departments that are not available in many other western towns. Branches of the SGIO, Workers' Compensation Board, the Main Roads Department, the Education Department and many other departments are situated in Roma. If the Maranoa River flowed through Roma I believe there would be a tremendous push for a dam to be constructed near there, where it would be of tremendous benefit. On that basis I once again ask the Minister to look at the proposal I have put forward.

I would like to devote a portion of my Address-in-Reply speech to one of Queensland's major growth industries. I refer to tourism. We now have a new, energetic

Minister for Tourism, National Parks, Sport and The Arts. At the present time tourism is a \$500m industry in Queensland, and it is growing all the time. Recently I attended a meeting in Blackall convened by the Western Queensland Local Government Association to attempt to form a regional tourist association. The meeting was well-attended by people from throughout the length and breadth of western Queensland. Mr Wakeling, a representative of the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation attended, as well as council representatives from throughout the region. I believe that at last the need to unite on this issue has been recognised, instead of an attempt to promote parochial issues. Thankfully at last the people have come to recognise that they must be united in one body to promote tourism in the Outback. They have now formed what is called the Outback Tourist Association, and all of the shire councils are paying a levy to it. In the near future a full-time officer will be appointed to promote tourism in western Queensland.

Inland Queensland has a tremendous untapped tourist potential. All tourists do not want to go to the cities, to beaches or to see concrete and bitumen. Inland Queensland has much to offer, including kangaroos, pigs, ducks—

Mr Burns: The kangaroos all come from Korea.

Mr TURNER: The ones I am talking of are the live ones. They are the ones the tourists really want to see. I appreciate the point made by the member for Lytton; I admit it is a very valid one.

I will get back to my point: we have so much to offer such as brolgas, wildlife, Aboriginal artefacts, bora grounds and places of historic interest throughout the region. If one goes to Blackall one can see the historic wool scour. I suggest that in the very near future the Minister responsible bring in a Heritage Act to preserve that type of building because it is part of our history and heritage. People often speak about conserving city buildings but it should not be forgotten that western Queensland has many historic buildings that must be preserved in the national interest.

Some weeks ago, when I visited the Carnarvons with the Minister for Tourism, we flew to Mt Moffat National Park. One might say that is the home of the infamous Kenniffs, where the shooting of Doyle and Dahlke took place and where the Kenniffs' cave is located. There is great potential for promoting tourism in that area, which adjoins the Carnarvon Gorge. Only two days ago I was at the gorge with a touring party of children from the Morven State School. They are still there. One could only describe the scenery as fantastic, and the tremendous potential for tourist development is virtually untapped.

Let us consider what happens in other countries. Early this year, I went to New Zealand with my wife. We travelled from Christchurch across to the west coast and through the mountains to Queenstown. The tourist takes away nothing but an impression or a photograph. He should leave only his footprints behind. But the traveller leaves a great deal of money behind, and tourism should be promoted more. People should be enticed to leave Brisbane and visit places such as the Jondaryan Woolshed, which is in the electorate of the Minister for Tourism, travel on to Roma to see the historic vineyards or the natural gasfields, and then to places such as Blackall or the opal fields at Yowah in my electorate. There is much to offer in all those places.

Mr Hooper: Eulo?

Mr TURNER: They could go to Eulo. I do not know whether the member for Archerfield visited there.

Mr Hooper: I was in Eulo last year.

Mr TURNER: That might be one reason why I got such a good vote in Eulo.

Tourists should be enticed to visit all of those regions. They could go as far as Roma and then up into the national park at Carnarvon and on to the mining fields. In my opinion, we are only just starting to open our eyes, so to speak, to the potential of tourism.

While speaking about the national park at Carnarvon, I should like to mention briefly the fantastic job done by national parks officers. The camp site at Carnarvon is maintained in a spotless condition. The tracks are well laid out. I compliment the officers on the job they do. However, I wish to speak particularly about one national parks officer—Graham Walsh of Injune. He has a wealth of knowledge of aboriginal culture and artefacts and an extensive collection of aboriginal art and mummified bodies from thousands of years ago. Many people would not be aware that he has what might be described as a private museum in Injune. He is preserving part of our history, heritage and past culture. Whether we like it or not, a country that has no history has no hope. We should recognise that and preserve our heritage. Future generations will thank us for doing so.

A museum should be established at Injune, or preferably at the Carnarvon National Park, from which most of the aboriginal artefacts and relics have come. They should be laid out so that visitors may imagine what happened in the days when that part of the country was inhabited by Aborigines. I do not know what the best method of funding such a museum would be. Possibly one of the major companies such as Utah could provide money. If not, the Government should make a grant available so that our history and past culture are not lost forever.

Still speaking of tourism, I should mention that during the recent visit of an all-party delegation to South-east Asia—it visited Singapore, Japan, Manilla and Hong Kong—I was amazed to learn that Singapore has about 2.5 m tourists a year, or one tourist for each member of the population. That gives some idea of the magnitude of tourism in that area. If we can entice more people to visit this great State, tourism will develop into a tremendous industry, not only for Queensland but for the whole of Australia. It will be significant, too, in regions such as those that I represent.

For people who live in the remote areas of the State, the provision of ordinary amenities such as electricity and television seems to be almost an impossibility. Facilities that are accepted by the majority of people in Queensland, particularly those in the urban areas, as being basic are placed beyond the financial capacity of people in rural areas. If rural properties do not have the benefits of television, 240-volt power and educational opportunities for children, they have little chance of attracting or holding workers. I do not blame the workers. As soon as anyone applies for a job in the West he asks, "Do you have television? Have you got 240-volt power?" Those amenities are very important to the workers, whether they are cooks or other types of workers.

Mr Burns: Why not?

Mr TURNER: My word! Why not? I have battled to have electricity connected to fettlers' cottages. The Government should not overlook the contribution made by fettlers and other people in western areas, whether they be the grazier or the worker. In those regions electricity is not a luxury; it is a necessity.

Mr Burns: The UGA fights against decent working conditions for workers on properties.

Mr TURNER: I am not responsible for what the UGA fights against. I am fighting in the interests of the people in my area.

I have referred to television. It is, of course, a Federal responsibility. To the credit of the Federal Government, it is gradually expanding television coverage in western Queensland. This is being achieved by the use of satellites and the construction of stations like those at Tambo and Injune. Television coverage is progressing.

As I have said on earlier occasions, the standard of TV coverage of sporting events is inadequate. Thankfully, the most recent Melbourne Cup event was covered, but other sporting events, such as cricket, football and tennis matches, are not transmitted to the West. Those telecasts are controlled by other channels in the city.

In my area the high price of fuel is a matter for concern. In Charleville, for example, petrol costs 41.9c a litre at the bowser, or 6c a litre above Brisbane prices. Earlier I referred to New Zealand. No matter where

a motorist travels in New Zealand, he pays exactly the same price per litre for fuel, whether he buys it in a major city or in a remote region on the west coast—not that I would like to see Australian motorists charged the same price for petrol as is imposed on New Zealand motorists. Nevertheless, a standard fuel price scheme should be investigated with a view to introducing it throughout Australia and particularly throughout Queensland. People who live in remote regions are already disadvantaged by long distances, without having to pay up to 50c or \$1 more per gallon than Brisbane people pay each time they fill their tank.

Sales tax on freight is another issue that is an indictment of the Federal Government. I should like to see this iniquitous tax eliminated. It is wrong that people who live in the West should have to pay a tax on the freight levied on goods.

I strongly advocate a vast increase in the taxation zone allowance. Such an increase would be of tremendous help to people in all remote regions. I am not a great advocate for cheaper fuel for primary producers; I have never been. Cheaper fuel should be made available to everyone, not just to one section of the community. The taxation zone allowance should be increased dramatically to allow all people in the remote regions to benefit. But, of course, that, too, is a Federal issue.

One State issue that concerns me is the cost that prospective electricity consumers in my area are asked to pay to have rural power connected. We should not overlook the contribution that people who live in those regions make to this nation's living standards and export-earning income. People in the Paroo Shire have been offered power under various schemes at figures ranging from \$8,000 to as much as \$27,000. One scheme even went as high as \$37,000 by way of capital contribution to the cost of connecting rural power. The Government and SWQEB should look at the remote, isolated regions with a view to subsidising the cost of connection to individual plants powered by solar energy and fuel. Such a scheme would greatly reduce the use of liquid fuel.

Last week a property manager told me that the fuel bill for a homestead with two outstations was \$500 a month. If we are genuine in conserving fuel we should subsidise these people into solar or other types of fuel plants. Insufficient money is being spent on solar research. Perhaps we should have closer co-operation with the various States and other countries in the world. Much more research into alternative fuels has been done in America. I hope that we can benefit from research undertaken in other places.

Many problems arise when 240V power is connected to rural areas. There have been tremendous delays and a lack of follow-up meetings. People with old plants and run-down batteries are concerned about putting

in a new 32V plant and rewiring. If the Government offers them power six or 12 months later that money is virtually down the drain.

The problems I cited concerning Paroo are not peculiar to that area. They are common to other parts of the State. The problem was first brought to Mr Camm's attention. A deputation from Cunnamulla then visited Mr Sullivan, who was the Minister for Mines and Energy. People travelled 1 000 miles for that meeting to try to get the cost of connecting 240V power reduced. In the last few months the present Minister (Mr Gibbs) has visited Charleville to meet deputations from the region. People made round trips of over 500 miles to discuss their problems with him.

The electricity equalisation legislation benefited these regions tremendously. Generating costs in places like Charleville and Cunnamulla are so high today that people could not afford to pay for electricity if it were not for electricity equalisation. A debt of \$500,000-odd was taken over from the Paroo Shire electricity undertaking. A charge of about \$40,000 for connecting electricity is just not on. In some circles reference has been made to time to pay. Anyone who advocates that is unaware of the financial plight of many of these people. No matter how long they are given, \$40,000 is far too much.

Electricity connection fees are now tax deductible. I hope that the Federal Government will allow the tax concession to apply from the time of connection, not the time of the signing of the contract, which would preclude some people. Power should be offered to people in remote regions at a connecting cost between \$5,000 and \$8,000, as the top of the range. If necessary, other connection fees throughout the State should be increased to allow electricity to be distributed throughout those regions. That is certainly justifiable, as is greater Government participation.

Several days ago I asked the Minister for Mines and Energy (Mr Gibbs) a question. He said that, as a result of representations I had made, and my bringing it up in the joint party room, he had had a series of discussions with the State Electricity Commissioner. He said that, in that week, he took a submission to Cabinet outlining a number of possible pathways aimed at assisting prospective electricity consumers in remote areas of the State.

Mr Davis: I am told that Mr Gibbs said he did not have the authority to check it out.

Mr TURNER: The honourable member's informant may have it wrong. He should ask his informant if he has the correct information.

The Minister then said—

"Following the Cabinet discussions I met with the Honourable the Deputy Premier and Treasurer and the Honourable the Minister for Lands and member

for Gregory to further refine the policy options available. As a result of these discussions officers from both the Treasury and the State Electricity Commission have been directed to cost certain proposals and to investigate the viability of possible amendments to the scheme.

"I expect this work to be completed within five weeks when it should be possible, in conjunction with the Honourable the Deputy Premier and Treasurer, to place a further submission before Cabinet."

I certainly hope that it is no longer than five weeks because there has been far too much procrastination over the connection of power to people in south-western areas. I will be following the matter up to see that a decision is made. Hopefully the decision will be beneficial to the people and will be made in the not too distant future.

The problems with the dingo barrier fence, which was built to protect the sheep lands in South-west Queensland, are still with us. The new Minister for Lands and Forestry, Mr Glasson, who is charged with this responsibility, is a primary producer. I feel sure that he has the knowledge and ability to find a solution to the problem.

There are two different lines of thought within the industry. One advocates the retention and repair of the dingo barrier fence and the other supports the proposal to abandon the fence. Originally, dogs were trapped out of that region and people in the area that I come from completely netted their properties. Then the dingo barrier fence was constructed. It is now falling into a state of disrepair. It is worth mentioning that nearly all of the internal netting fences right throughout western Queensland have collapsed. Not one property owner could afford to buy the netting; the whole value of his property would not net the property.

The alternative is to leave it to "1080" to control the dingoes. The conservationists are lobbying for the banning of "1080". It would only require a fatality or an unfortunate accident to happen. I believe it was reported that recently the water supply of a town in New South Wales was poisoned with "1080" and water had to be carted from another centre. It only needs that sort of thing to happen for "1080" to be banned, and then there would be nothing to stop the dingoes, because the internal fences are not there. Very few people have the necessary knowledge to trap dogs. Dogs will travel right through the sheep lands. If that happens, it will have a devastating effect on the shearing industry and the small country towns. The dingo barrier fence is vital to the industry in Queensland.

Unfortunately, the Stock Routes and Rural Lands Protection Board receives undue criticism at times. The board is not a Government instrumentality. It is composed of

industry leaders, members of the Local Government Association of Queensland, grain growers, graziers, representatives of the Cattlemen's Union, cane growers, etc. Those people are truly representative of the whole region.

In answer to a question I asked, the Minister for Lands and Forestry said that within the next three months he expects the board to be in a position to submit a detailed and costed proposal to implement the recommendations for the retention of the fence. I hope that that will be a solution to the problem. One thing that concerns many people in the area, including the local authorities, is the method of funding.

I want to raise briefly a point mentioned earlier by the honourable member for Lytton, that is, living conditions of people in remote areas. I was successful in getting 240-V power for a small fettler's camp at Yalleroi, and with it came television. I pay a tribute to the former Minister for Transport, the late K. W. Hooper, whom I approached on that matter. He saw fit to have it provided. He tried to tell me that I should come back in future years. I pointed out that the cost was nothing and that people could not be expected to live in and service those regions if their amenities were not improved.

Mr Burns: And get lousy wages for doing it.

Mr TURNER: That is right, and they work hard, usually in the heat.

Mr Booth: That man is a professional grumbler.

Mr TURNER: No. He comes up with some fairly sensible stuff at times.

There is a tremendous need there for the installation of a septic system. It has been delayed because of cost. I mention it in the Chamber because it is vital that it be provided.

I wish to refer briefly to the Augathella swimming-pool, a project which appears to be tangled up in red tape. I would like the Minister for Works and Housing to see if anything contravenes the specifications laid down by either the Works Department or the Education Department, and if not to give the project the go-ahead.

Mr Austin: How's your new hospital?

Mr TURNER: In reply to the interjection from the new Minister for Health, I am pleased to say that the Cunnamulla Hospitals Board has been given approval to commence the construction of the much-needed hospital in that area. The board has raised \$1.5m towards the overall cost of \$2.5m. Cabinet was delaying construction until the board raised the other \$1m, but following representations by me it has agreed to allow the board to commence construction. I thank

the Minister for that. The people in the area are also very thankful that construction will now begin.

Approval has been given for the borrowing of money to construct a new hospital at Mitchell. A new hospital is needed in Tambo, and I would invite the Minister to come to Tambo to have a look at the derelict old hospital. Something must be done to upgrade it. The other day I asked a question about staff to relieve overworked matrons in hospitals such as Tambo, Morven and Isisford. Those matrons are on call 24 hours a day. They are called out at all hours, so relief staff is very important.

I will now touch briefly on the need for additional police in my area, although I know they are required everywhere in the State. Because it has a large area to cover we need additional men in the Stock Squad. The prosecutor in Charleville has been transferred, so we need a replacement there. A new police station is required in Tambo. It has been gazetted, but I do not have a time-slot for its construction. A new station is also required in Charleville. The original station was an old residence, and 20 or 30 police are now working out of it. I think it is high time that the Government constructed a new police station in that centre.

I now want to deal briefly with the Young Farmers Purchase Scheme, which is a much-needed and worthwhile proposal. Many applications have already been received for financial assistance. Many young men and women desire to work on the land, and we cannot afford to lose them. They should be given the financial support necessary to set themselves up. I realise that funds will be a problem, but as long as a start is made that will be a step in the right direction.

In conclusion I want to deal briefly with the roads in my area. More funds are needed for road-works. Over the years the Federal Government has not come to the party. Thankfully the Cunnamulla-Wyandra road will be completed this year, and work on the Augathella-Morven road will be commenced. An increase in registration fees or the imposition of a State fuel tax was mooted recently. In western areas fuel is too dear now, and I believe that any State fuel tax would detrimentally affect stock and general carriers, and the cost of living would naturally rise. I could not support the imposition of a fuel tax that would detrimentally affect my area.

Once again I take the opportunity to congratulate the mover and seconder of the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply.

Mr WARNER (Toowoomba South) (4.29 p.m.): In joining this debate today I firstly want to congratulate Mr Speaker on his re-election. He has a very important role to play in the future Government of this State and, as do many others, I have every confidence that he will administer his high

office with the dedication he has shown in the past. I congratulate the honourable member for Itacha on his elevation to the position of Chairman of Committees. I also welcome the new members to this House.

I take this opportunity to congratulate the Premier on his outstanding leadership, and I personally thank the people of Toowoomba South for the support they gave me in the last election and assure them that I will continue to work on their behalf to the best of my ability. I again pledge through you, Mr Deputy Speaker, to His Excellency the Governor, my loyalty to Her Majesty.

I take this opportunity to thank my campaign chairman (Mr Charles Counsell), my son Simon, and the whole of my committee. I also record here my thanks to my hard-working wife, who has stood behind me in the elections.

It did not surprise me to note in the Toowoomba Press that the Toowoomba City Council had carried a motion to have the next mayor of Toowoomba elected by the aldermen of the city council. This move, if approved by the Government under the Local Government Act, will allow the elected aldermen at the next election to choose their own chairman, and that chairman will then become the city's mayor. For a considerable time the people of Toowoomba had the right to elect their own mayor, and I believe very sincerely that it should remain that way.

I do not suppose it is really strange that the proposal was put forward by an alderman who stood as a Labor candidate at last year's State election, or that this proposal should have been put forward close on the heels of the new guard Labor Party's decision to plan a major assault on local government throughout Queensland. I have no idea whether the old guard intends to do the same. If it does, no doubt they will clash.

Nominations have not as yet been called in Toowoomba, but it is quite apparent that the Labor Party will contest positions on the Toowoomba City Council—no doubt as a bloc, as it tried to do previously, and I suppose it will be just as unsuccessful. So it is all so much poppycock for any Labor spokesman in this House or in local government to suggest any more that local council elections should be free of politics.

I believe that some consideration could be given to changing the system so that an alderman standing for mayor, if defeated, could be re-elected to council. There would be definite merit in such a change, and I put the suggestion forward right now. I have said before that I can see no reason for a change in the election of mayors and would oppose any such move in Toowoomba or elsewhere.

Any decision to introduce frozen foods into the Toowoomba General Hospital must surely meet with opposition from anyone who knows the position in Toowoomba at

present. It amazes me that a decision to introduce frozen foods into hospitals was taken at all; but seeing that a decision has been taken by the Health Department and Cabinet to introduce frozen foods into hospitals in Brisbane and elsewhere, I can only say here in this House that I completely disapprove of their introduction to the Toowoomba General Hospital and the other hospitals in that area. Not only would the costs be very high, but that system, when compared with the present food system at the hospital, where fresh food is used daily, is just not on.

Costs do not seem to deter some people, and the cost of such a move to the taxpayer will be enormous. I am quite prepared to believe that many people prefer frozen foods, and no doubt if such frozen foods were to be manufactured locally they could possibly be tolerated. But, as it is, the food that is to come to this hospital will be manufactured in Brisbane.

In this day and age of continual industrial strikes, distribution must be taken into account. Also, if any food of this kind is subject to the risk of never reaching its destination because of a strike or any act of God in transit, then the system should never be introduced to hospitals such as the Toowoomba General Hospital. There must also be a risk of contamination under this system. If frozen foods are introduced, local employment will be affected adversely, and there is far too much unemployment now.

The other point that I wish to bring to the notice of the House is this Government's policy to promote decentralisation wherever possible. The manufacturing of fresh foods in the suburbs of Brisbane will not aid decentralisation in any way whatsoever, especially when the company involved is to import its products for processing from New South Wales. That the Minister has refused to take the Toowoomba General Hospital off the distribution list is to be deplored. He is presently in the House and I ask him, especially in the light of the opposition from the Toowoomba Hospitals Board and myself, to have another look at this matter.

Mr Davis: Are you against an increase in fees?

Mr WARNER: I am very definitely against it, yes.

When one compares the maintenance staff at the Toowoomba General Hospital with other such staffs at hospitals of the same size elsewhere in this State, the Toowoomba staff is seen to be inadequate. I bring that to the Minister's attention while he is in the House. Much of the maintenance is presently carried out by the engineer in charge of the boilers, who has more to do now that there are three large boilers in operation. Much of the maintenance at the Toowoomba General Hospital is presently carried out by private firms. This approach can only be described as time consuming and costly.

Mr Hooper: Why don't you support the Works Department?

Mr WARNER: The member for Archerfield is always interjecting and he knows full well that his interjection is complete nonsense.

Having private firms always in attendance at the hospital can only be described as costly. It seems obvious that permanent hospital maintenance staff would have a considerable advantage over outside firms, especially when faults are suspected or when machinery breaks down, which occasionally occurs.

Mr Austin: Especially when the plumbers go on strike.

Mr WARNER: Yes, that is true.

The maintenance of machinery should be an on-going thing and I believe it would be a great saving to the hospital if extra maintenance staff were appointed as soon as possible.

The hospital urgently needs a workshop so that repairs to machinery can be carried out quickly and efficiently on the spot. In the light of the expected increase in patients this year from an area that has approximately 200 000 people, it is obvious that the new services block, which was approved by the previous Minister, is needed urgently. Together with the building, there is a need for extra staff and equipment.

Apart from the extra buildings needed—the Minister knows what I am referring to—it is imperative that the hospital receives enough equipment to meet its responsibilities. Heading such a list would be more three-sorb system dialysis machines. Replacement parts are needed urgently. These are already listed with the department and should be sent immediately; they are long overdue. Additional equipment has also been listed with the department and should be sent as soon as possible. Last but not least on the list of requirements is that staff relief problems be looked into.

The Minister for Health has assured me that a new dental clinic will be built in the near future. The clinic is long overdue, with the backlog for dentures, because of the lack of staff, at more than 14 months. Although the Minister believes everything is being done to help people out, many people are still bringing their problems to me and I believe they still exist. The quicker the clinic is built, the quicker the problem will be cured.

The construction of a school dental clinic at the Harristown Primary School is long overdue. It has been under consideration and construction has been promised repeatedly since 1973. I have been told it has received top priority and will be built some time in the future. It would solve not only the problems of the Harristown Primary School, but also those of St Anthony's Primary School, the Concordia Lutheran

Primary School, the Hamewith Sub-Normal School and the Darling Heights Primary School. It is putting it mildly to say that the construction of that clinic is long overdue and I ask the Minister to look at this matter urgently.

The Harristown State School Parents and Citizens Association believes that it has been put off for too long, and I agree. We now await a decision whether it is possible to proceed with this project, in view of the limited Commonwealth funds provided this year. That seems to be so in every department, and I feel sorry for the Minister in his new portfolio because he has to face this criticism from me and many other members. As I said earlier, I ask the Minister to recognise the urgent need for this clinic, which is important to so many children.

I shall now make a few comments on the importance of upgrading the rail line to Toowoomba.

Mr Austin: I thought you were going to say something kind about me.

Mr WARNER: I cannot say much that is kind about the Minister at present.

As I said, I wish to comment on the importance of upgrading the rail line from Helidon, in the Lockyer Valley, up the range to Toowoomba.

Mr Moore: Tell them about your tunnel.

Mr WARNER: Very well, I shall. As the member for Windsor has implied, I have proposed the upgrading for some time. A tunnel through the range should be considered. I hope that the inquiry that I understand is now taking place will not be afraid to consider tunnels, which can only be described as providing a service to the people of Queensland. I am hoping that those in charge of the survey will soon make a decision, as contracts worth many millions of dollars are being held up because of the present state of the railway line. Any proposal to bring coal from areas west of Toowoomba and not bypass Toowoomba would have to be rejected outright, as any increase in traffic on the existing line would completely disrupt the flow of road traffic through the city of Toowoomba.

Mr Moore: What length would the tunnel be?

Mr WARNER: 2½ miles. Toowoomba must be bypassed in any future development of the western line. It seems sensible for any realignment to bypass the city and link up with the western line through tunnels or some other means down the range.

No doubt the inquiry will consider a tunnel beneath the range, as this is the method now used in virtually every other part of the world to get from one place to another. Those who know anything about mole tunnelling machines know that they are used extensively throughout the world, and also here in Australia. They can bore a hole

36 feet in diameter through sandstone, rock and earth at up to 7 feet an hour. Other machines now available in America have been tested and used in tunnelling to achieve a higher rate than that, so my proposition is quite feasible.

Mr Moore: From where to where would the tunnel go?

Mr WARNER: It would go from one side of the range to the other, and it would be 2½ miles long.

Mr Moore: It's got to be more than that.

Mr WARNER: No, it would be 2½ miles long.

It may be interesting to those who are sceptical of tunnels—and there seem to be a few of them—that in 52 AD, at Lake Fucino, it took 30,000 Romans 11 years to drive a tunnel 10 feet high by 6 feet wide a distance of three miles. Hadrian's aqueduct to Athens, which is 15½ miles long, took six years to complete without any of the modern tools now available. The aqueduct has lasted 1800 years and is still in use.

I believe that comparative costs would favour a tunnel through the range and, naturally, I hope that the idea will be considered by those who are making the inquiry, especially as there would be very little difference between the height of the range where the railway would enter and where it would come out.

No doubt you have driven up the range to Toowoomba, Mr Deputy Speaker. If you have done so lately, you would have noticed the enormous increase in heavy transport using the highway to Brisbane. I understand that the volume increased by 25 per cent in one year, and no doubt it will continue to increase at that rate. Apart from the inevitable over-commitments of the highway through Toowoomba, it must be apparent that a new highway should be constructed to bypass the city as soon as possible. I suggest that an immediate inquiry be held into the re-routing of this very important highway to follow the proposed new route of the railway line up the range. If the proposed highway from Goondiwindi to Millmerran is constructed, thereby re-routing New South Wales traffic into and through Toowoomba, things will really be gummed up. The construction of a ring road is nearly as important as the realignment of the railway line, especially if road transport is allowed to continue to compete with the railways on long-distance runs.

Something else that is really gumming things up is the dangerous situation confronting interstate motorists and visitors from Brisbane—and Toowoomba motorists, too, for that matter—at the completely mystifying roadway access to Toowoomba on the Brisbane side of the city. It is considered to be one of the most poorly designed sets of traffic islands in Australia and needs to be

completely redesigned following the introduction of the new traffic regulation applying to T-junctions. What was previously described as a horror stretch is now even worse as the result of the new regulation. It is essential that the Main Roads Department rectify the problem, which creates a hazard for motorists travelling up and down the highway.

Time and time again I have drawn to your attention, Mr Deputy Speaker, and to the attention of other honourable members, the enormous responsibility that is placed on the Toowoomba City Council to supply water at reasonable cost to the ratepayers. This needs repeating. On numerous occasions in this House I have stated that Toowoomba is the fastest growing provincial city in the State. It has a population growth of approximately 2.3 per cent. Nobody can accurately predict what the city's population will be in 20 or 30 years' time, that is, at the turn of the century. It is impossible to make an accurate prediction in view of the probable establishment of massive projects, such as the proposed liquefaction plants in the Millmerran area. Experts have forecast that approximately another 30 000 people will need to be housed in the area. No doubt the vast majority of those people will want to live in Toowoomba. At present there is a shortage of land in the Millmerran area.

I remind the House that any such development will be for the benefit of Queensland as a whole, not merely for the benefit of the city of Toowoomba. Therefore, I suggest that it is the responsibility of the Federal Government and the Queensland Government to grant extra funds for projects such as water storage, which are necessary to cope with increasing development.

Ratepayers can be burdened just so much. The people of Toowoomba should not be burdened with a further indirect tax—that is what it is—to cover the cost of the future water supply at Cressbrook. Today's ratepayers will have to pay for future generations' water supply, which, by the turn of the century, will only just be adequate for little more than the present population.

Another point worth noting is that landowners and irrigators below the dam are rightly demanding riparian rights to water from the dam. Many farmers believe that the dams have seriously affected the flow of water, as they have.

It must not be forgotten that Toowoomba has a growing demand for water and that the ratepayers are bearing heavier burdens by way of rates to try to meet the cost of providing water. This must be avoided as much as possible by the provision of additional funds from this Government.

The demand for irrigation water by farmers below the dams and for those irrigators who now use the water from the supply pipeline is the best possible argument I can put forward in calling upon the Government to recognise that the two-thirds of the cost that the council has to find is too high.

I do not believe that I need point out to any honourable member that water is the most precious and finite commodity that we have. Those people who are still in the grip of drought—they are many in number—are only too well aware of how finite water is. It was heartening for me to hear Doug Anthony say in Canberra that he could not understand why any Government in Australia would put forward proposals for the holding of the Olympic Games, at enormous cost, when Australia does not even have a national water conservation scheme. Just when will we wake up to the fact that this State and nation will not be able to progress without adequate water, that we will not be able to convert coal to oil without water and we will not be able to become immune to droughts? Without a massive water conservation plan there will be no progress.

As we know, in the North millions of gallons of water from the Burdekin system go to waste in the sea. Likewise, from the Clarence River catchment system in northern New South Wales, millions of gallons of water are discharged into the sea.

Many years ago Dr Bradfield prepared a proposal with diagrams and everything else necessary to show that water could be diverted to the inland. The present proposal is that Burdekin River water should be used to generate hydroelectric power, but I still believe that it should be diverted back through the range to the inland.

Mr Katter: Do you know that the Burdekin Dam proposal is to water only 40 000 acres and that the Bradfield scheme would water 1m acres?

Mr WARNER: I have just said that it should be diverted.

In the early days Bradfield recognised the tremendous importance of diverting that water. Today, most people say that it will cost too much and therefore it cannot be done. It is ridiculous to make such statements. I believe it can be done. And it should be done! A national water conservation scheme should be set up immediately, and it should never cease to operate. It is a pity that we didn't carry on from the Snowy River scheme.

In recent months all sections of the community and members of this House have referred to the establishment of a water conservation scheme in Queensland, and the question of whether it is possible, in the engineering sense, to divert river systems such as the Burdekin and the Clarence into inland river systems. I am particularly interested in the diversion of the Clarence River. The honourable member for Warwick keeps reminding me that this is a matter that I should look into further. For some years I have been looking into the diversion of the Clarence River into the inland river system in northern New South Wales and South-west Queensland. Every year, as our population increases, all water supplies are becoming further depleted.

Doubts have been expressed in this House and elsewhere about the quantity of water that would be available to Queensland. Doubts have also been expressed as to how diversion would take place, what method would be used, the cost of such a project and who would be responsible for it. Of course, questions have been asked about who would be responsible for the project.

Mr Hooper: Tell us?

Mr WARNER: I will.

My information from eminent engineers is to the effect that the Clarence Valley scheme is second only to the Snowy in its potential for generating hydroelectric power and storing irrigation water. For those who are concerned about the actual supply of water needed to maintain the diversion scheme, let me assure the House that the average flow in the Clarence River upstream from Grafton exceeds 2.5m acre/ft. a year. That is a considerable volume of water when compared with the quantity of water now diverted into the Murrumbidgee and Murray Rivers. The average diversion of water into those rivers is 1.9m acre/ft. a year. The Grafton area exceeds that water supply by nearly 50 per cent. The Clarence River catchment area has a very high rainfall. It has an overall average of some 65 in. a year, but it also includes the Dorrigo Plateau, where the average rainfall exceeds 70 in. a year. It has the highest rainfall in the State.

All this information I am submitting has been verified. I have no reason to believe that the figures given to me are not correct. The foregoing indicates the great potential for diverting water without interfering in any way with requirements of the Clarence water users for a very long time. Concern has also been expressed about how enough water can be diverted into Queensland to give an ongoing, adequate supply to the Condamine Basin and storages that would have to be built. The point of course, is most important because without sufficient water being available from the upper reaches of the Clarence, it would not change the present position.

One scheme worth investigating is the interception of the Upper Maryland River in the upper reaches of the Condamine River which flows past Warwick. This scheme would not involve any pumping, but merely aqueducts and tunnels. I recall that, some 30 years ago, a proposal which included the Maryland River scheme was put forward to dam the Condamine River between Warwick and Killarney with a huge dam at Elbow Valley. I merely mention this project as it was then envisaged as one which could be incorporated in the Clarence Valley scheme, and as one of several regulation conservation dams for Queensland. This, of course, would have included the Leslie Dam.

This interception of water in the upper reaches of the Condamine River would, as I have said, involve aqueducts and tunnels,

and no pumping would be required. But because of the undoubted limit of supply, other avenues have to be considered to increase the supply to Queensland. There are, of course, many other feasible alternatives now available, simply because of hydroelectric power and its possibilities, which include the combination of schemes that are in fact existing elsewhere in the world.

One very practical scheme, which I viewed in New Zealand, is the cascade development of hydro works which takes water from Lake Taupo, which impounds melting snow from Mt Tongariro and other large areas of mountains, and passes it through numerous power-stations before it reaches the sea. This layout, applied in New Zealand, would without doubt fit the nature of the Clarence River with its falls and narrow gorges.

The water from the first elevated storage in the Clarence River would be pumped a second time to a higher regulated storage where it would intercept tunnels or aqueducts to be fed by gravity through the range into Queensland and northern New South Wales. In short, and to put it more simply, the energy of falling water is used to raise water, and there are endless varieties of hydroelectric schemes moving surplus of water to higher levels in operation all over the world.

Supplies of water are diminishing and the Clarence River is a source of water supply which requires consideration from the point of view of conservation just as much as if it were a flowing river. I am suggesting, have been suggesting for the last six years and will keep suggesting for the next six years that a comprehensive scheme be based on a new development conception that will give a national overall benefit to Queensland and New South Wales as a whole.

Water from that area, whether it be diverted into Queensland or New South Wales, would of course end up in South Australia. The untold benefits that would accrue from water being able to flow into western Queensland and back into the Murray River are enormous. Of course that goes for the Burdekin River as well. It is important that this Government, the New South Wales Government and especially the Federal Government recognise the importance of the Clarence River scheme, and begin to investigate not only this proposal but also other proposals where rivers run into the sea and water is wasted, so that valuable time and valuable national resources are not allowed to continue to run to waste indefinitely.

I believe that a good Government and good parliamentarians should listen to the Opposition. In this particular case I listened intently to the speech of the honourable member for Brisbane Central. I must say that I was truly amazed to hear him say in his speech that there may be isolated instances of strikes that appeared to be unjustified. That is quite a statement,

especially in the light of the constant strikes which are paralysing this nation one way or another from time to time.

As a one-time unionist of some responsibility, and I repeat "some responsibility", the member for Brisbane Central must have made the statement either because he has a complete lack of understanding of what is going on—and that is really hard to believe—or because he does not intend to recognise what union leaders are doing, and has turned his back on this terrible situation. Of course, unions in the past have striven for better living conditions.

Mr Davis: Would you repeat that? I was talking to my friend and colleague and I missed it.

Mr WARNER: The honourable member for Archerfield cannot interject from that seat.

Mr Hooper: I have not interjected. I am sitting here waiting for a bus.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Powell): Order! The honourable member for Archerfield is interjecting from a seat other than his own.

Mr WARNER: In the past the unions have striven for better living conditions and have been successful, and so they should have been. Of course, they should continue to attempt to gain better conditions. As a responsible member, surely the honourable member for Brisbane Central cannot be siding with those unions which are disrupting this country and, in particular, doing nothing for the interests of their members. I believe elected members such as the member for Brisbane Central are powerless to stop this chaos of strike after strike. All they can do is talk about it.

Mr Vaughan interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Nudgee is not in his correct place.

Mr WARNER: Today we have no guarantee that electricity will not be cut off at an inconvenient time, that the public can catch a plane to a certain destination at a certain time, that a train will even run or, far more seriously, that few can plan a routine operation in a hospital. If any member of the Labor Party, or anybody else for that matter, believes that this is a situation which comes under the heading of "isolated instances of strikes" then they have no idea of what is going on. The situation in Queensland and elsewhere has become chaotic, and there is no reason to believe that any Government or Minister has the solution to this problem. Certainly the honourable member for Brisbane Central hasn't.

Mr Davis: If you are such a smart Alec, we have the answer. This party has the answer.

Mr WARNER: I think the honourable member should put it on record then. The public are being forced, with a fatalistic

shrug, to accept as normal the crippling, long-lasting effects of strike after strike. It is evident that the public have come to regard strikes that cause great hardship, disruption and economic disaster to this nation as the order of the day, and nothing could be more unfortunate than that.

Mr Vaughan: The public are the working people of the State.

Mr WARNER: Hear, hear! Union leaders quite openly say that if the Prime Minister, the Premier or even the Government itself decides to use legislation enacted for the purpose of settling strikes they will bring the country to its knees. I believe that is a peculiar attitude, and I hope that the honourable member for Brisbane Central does not agree with it.

I venture to say that it would be as certain as the sun comes up that if any Government caused our present industrial troubles, and then sat back as the unions do and said it could not care less about the effect it was having as long as it was in that Government's interests, there would be uproar and the people would take to the streets and demand action. And they would get it! If none was forthcoming every effort would be made to bring that Government down. People are sick and tired of the situation created by strikes, and the time has come for us to stop this movement towards industrial anarchy.

Mr Davis: Can I take it for granted that you are anti-union?

Mr WARNER: I am all for unions. If the honourable member takes heed of the member for Archerfield, he will tell him a little story about how my grandfather was instrumental in making the unions' position more tenable.

A few months ago this Government was returned with an overwhelming mandate to govern this State, and try as Opposition members might to discount such an overwhelming mandate, their's is an argument that can only be described as very foolish. The coalition Government received 54.88 per cent of the vote, and that is history. The Leader of the Opposition will not face that fact. He has stated that this coalition Government was returned with a vote of only some 27 per cent. That statement is recorded in "Hansard". It is hard to relate that figure of 54.88 per cent to the figure used by the Leader of the Opposition. He said that 73 per cent of the people of Queensland did not support the campaign for change, nor did 73 per cent of the people vote against the Premier or the National Party for a change of Government. They returned a Government with 54.88 per cent of the vote. That is why the Labor Party is still sitting over there and not on this side of the House.

I believe that it is unworthy of the Leader of the Opposition to try to hoodwink the public into believing his argument about 27

per cent, which also involves the rigging of boundaries, etc. Apart from its being as far from the truth as one can get, it does not go down with the public any longer. One can look at one example after another in electorates previously held by Labor and see that Labor's vote is slipping in each of them.

Mr Fouras: That's not true.

Mr WARNER: It is true. The honourable member can look at the position in my electorate, in Toowoomba North or in any other electorate.

The recent statement of the Leader of the Opposition that the ALP is in danger of collapsing is certainly true. So why he continues with such an argument is impossible to tell, and I believe it is only confirming what the electors already think of the Labor Party. The Labor Party in this State has been slipping for a long time, and will continue to do so. In short, it is where it belongs.

Mr BURNS (Lytton) (5.6 p.m.): Liberal and National Party politicians seem to hate the average worker, especially if he seeks a decent living wage for his wife and kids. To listen to the Tories in this Parliament, one would think that all bosses are benevolent, law-abiding citizens who are interested not in making a fast buck but only in looking after the worker and his family.

The average Liberal or National Party member of this House lives in a business and industrial world where the only "baddies" are the workers. In fact, as far as the Liberal Party is concerned, I call this place "a wonderland in Alice Street"—not "Alice in Wonderland". When we listen to members like the member for Toowoomba South, we realise why we have to have unions and men and women in those unions who are prepared to stand up not only to the bosses but also to the forces of reaction that make up the Government in this State.

But Labor men and women know that this Tory paradise in which everything that the bosses do is OK does not exist. If all bosses paid the right wages and did not victimise the weak and sack without reason, there would be no need for unions, industrial inspectors, the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act, the Industrial Commission or strikes. Unions grew out of the need for workers to get together to protect themselves from the boss. There are some very good bosses, but there are many others who evade their responsibilities and the law to make extra profit by bludging on the workers. They also bludge on their business competitors by obtaining an unfair commercial advantage over those who pay the correct wages and provide decent conditions.

Today there is a very obvious anti-union campaign led by Mal and Joh for political reasons and promoted by those who would profit by a move to outlaw unions. These are the people who would profit: those who would like a return to the days of sweated child labour—and, if one looks around, one

can see that today in this city; those who believe they should be able to force people to work whenever they want them for as long as they like and pay them what they like; those who believe a worker should not have annual holidays or be allowed sick leave—and there is plenty of evidence to indicate that that is the case; those who oppose a worker's being compensated for an injury caused by a negligent boss; those who believe old age pensions and social welfare are an unfair impost on their taxes and want old age pensions abolished or at least reduced, forcing widows, the elderly and frail to seek work generally at below award rates in an effort to exist; and those who believe that a worker who cannot get a job is what Liberal politicians call a "dole bludger". They are the people who do not want unions. They are the people who attack the right of the average worker to have a say and to stand up for what he believes in.

I would like to remind that ultra-conservative element in our community, and the "business mafia" that supports it, that the world's most highly respected Conservative leaders have strongly supported unions and the right to strike. Winston Churchill defended the right to strike in a memorable policy speech at Wolverhampton for the 1952 election campaign. It would be worth while for those honourable members opposite who keep mouthing these anti-union sentiments to read what Churchill himself said.

I will quote General Eisenhower who, when he was American Republican President, said—

"The right of men to leave their jobs is a test of freedom. Stalin suppressed strikes. Hitler suppressed strikes, but each also suppressed freedom. There are some things worse than strikes—one of them is the loss of freedom."

That was General Eisenhower. He cannot be called a Left-winger. Compared with some Government members he could probably be called a Red-ragger. Eisenhower and Churchill were right, of course. The right to withdraw his labour is the one thing that distinguishes a free man from the slave. For the worker, the strike is the last resort. When men and women cease work their wages cease—but the need for wages does not cease. The landlord still holds out his hand for the rent and hire purchase companies still demand their weekly instalments. The grocer, baker, fruiterer, butcher and milkman must be paid. The family must still eat and live. A long strike means hard-earned savings disappear to pay basic living costs.

Let me remind the House of the statements of the Premier's heir apparent, Mr Russ Hinze. He said—

"All Australians should have a number, wear it on a disc around their necks or have it tattooed on their wrists."

Remember that statement by the member for South Coast. He is the fellow who came within one vote of being the Deputy Leader

of the National Party and who skites that he will be the Premier in two years' time. He said it would "stop the Federal Government being ripped off by dole bludgers and social security crooks". He added that it would defeat massive social service payments.

Did honourable members notice he was worried only about social services recipients—the unemployed, the old age pensioner, the widow, the invalid pensioner, the supporting mother? They were a danger to the honourable member for South Coast. He said not one word about the giant tax evaders who steal thousands and millions of dollars a year from the public—and me—as the Government raises our taxes to cover lost income from their immoral schemes. There was not a word from him about the thousands and thousands of needless work days lost and men and women crippled for life through industrial accidents that could have been prevented.

For big business, there is no profit in safety. But, more importantly there was not a word from Mr Hinze about the known weakness in our State's laws and the Government inspection system that allows his friends and Government donors to rip off the worker.

Let us look at some facts. Last year Chilla Ingram retired as Chief Inspector of Factories and Shops. He was appointed by this Government to enforce the industrial laws of this State. On his retirement he said—

"For political reasons and fear of loss of votes, the Factories and Shops Inspectorate has been kept understaffed making it impossible to police registration, awards, conditions and trading hours."

In other words, the Government deliberately kept down the number of inspectors so the workers of this State could be robbed.

Mr Greenwood interjected.

Mr BURNS: He said this last year—

"Thousands of the State's workers are paid below award rates and are forced to work long hours and carry excessive work loads.

"Each week at least one worker is sacked because he or she is close to the 10-year qualification period of long service leave which companies don't want to pay.

"Some companies discreetly tell employees to trade out of hours or lose their jobs. Once caught the companies have a legal defence by proving that they officially told staff to obey the law.

"Behind the scenes some firms make it plain to employees that unless they work out of hours they won't have jobs."

This is the Government's chief inspector speaking—

"In Brisbane there are hundreds of unregistered shops and throughout the State, thousands of unregistered businesses.

"These businesses do not comply with required standards of working conditions. Sometimes they do not have toilets and as a rule these amenities are inadequate.

"The State Government is losing hundreds of thousands of dollars because these businesses do not apply for registration.

"There are hundreds of thousands of dollars not being paid to workers who are entitled to the money.

"Workers are afraid of lodging a complaint for fear of doing their jobs."

Mr Greenwood interjected.

Mr BURNS: Listen, Billy Bunter, I am trying to get this in within my allotted time. I cannot afford to put up with your inane interjections.

Now that last point is very important. Do you know, Mr Deputy Speaker, that inspectorate staff levels are so low that this department, set up to see that our State awards and laws are enforced, does not make routine inspections of time and wage books; it only acts on specific complaint, and not by phone; it must be in writing. So a poor worker who is ripped off in this State cannot phone in with his complaint; he must write it out and send it in. The books are never checked unless a complaint in writing is received.

Mr Greenwood interjected.

Mr BURNS: I will have to get this interjection otherwise the honourable member will mumble all day. What is he saying?

Mr Greenwood: I am saying if there were any truth in that, the unions would be on to it first and you know it.

Mr BURNS: I will quote the unions' work for the honourable member. He has just opened his big mouth and put his foot in it again, which is not unusual. I will quote the member chapter and verse, letter after letter, and tomorrow I expect him to apologise.

With all these restrictions mentioned by Mr Ingram—and not denied, I might add—the factories and shops inspectors do a good job. In the last three years, over \$1.5m in wages legally owing to workers has been recovered from bludging bosses; yet the annual report issued under the Factories and Shops Act covers only one foolscap page! There are fewer than 100 inspectors in Queensland. They are not allowed to make the point that they track people who are delivering ice cream around the suburbs robbing their men of \$11,000, and of others in motor services, \$7,000. There are amounts of thousands and thousands of dollars. Why can't we name those bosses? Why can't we publish a list of them so everyone knows they are bludging on their workers?

What would the amount be if Mr Ingram and his team had decent staff numbers and a Government that supported them and did not protect the boss? The money collected

by the industrial inspectorate is just a drop in the ocean. Unions report case after case of bosses refusing to pay the correct wages. For example, the Transport Workers Union last year obtained \$92,481.87 for members whose bosses had short-paid wages or over-time. The TWU also collected a further \$77,284 in connection with disputed compensation claims, making a total for the year by one union of \$169,766. Since 1965 the union has collected \$1,640,485 from bosses who failed to pay correctly.

Government members asked: What are the unions going to do? I told them not to open their mouths. These are not over-award payments or extra wages sought. These are workers asking to be paid what the law says they are entitled to. The boss who robs them of their just entitlements is a robber and a thief. He only ends up giving back what he has illegally taken, and only because the union has done its job. I listened the other night to this song—

"Poor Ned Kelly

It's easier to do today.

Poor Ned Kelly

They don't even have to run away."

It is true here in Queensland.

I have just read the report covering activities of TWU officials in 1979. As well as recovering wages due and compensation disputed, the report covers many startling matters—overloading, for example. At BHP wharf—these are Quince owner-drivers carting gypsum—one truck was found to be 27 tonnes overloaded and unregistered. What sort of danger would that be to the kids on the road? Another was 15 tonnes overweight, another 10 tonnes overweight and another 12 tonnes. I ask the member for Ashgrove: What has his Government done about it?

Let us look at another frightening case. During a visit to Alltrans on 17 July 1979 the TWU official noticed a semi-trailer carrying 40 tonnes of sand plus 14 tonnes of general cargo. The legal carrying capacity of the vehicle was 18 tonnes; so it was 36 tonnes overloaded. Two months later the report talks of a driver consistently overloading by 40 to 45 tonnes. The bosses and the Government know of this highly dangerous practice and they do nothing about it. It is the Government's responsibility to stamp it out, but it does not, because the bosses who donate to the Liberal Party profit from it. The owners should be charged with an industrial charge. And not only that—with a criminal charge. In New South Wales recently an owner was gaoled when his overloaded, unroadworthy vehicle killed another person.

In February 1979 a report showed that a right-hand front tyre had blown out on a suburban private bus—causing the driver to swerve to the right and, in so doing, collide with an on-coming vehicle, killing the driver. The union blokes went and asked the company to fit new tyres on the front of all buses instead of using retreads. Mr

Deputy Speaker, do you know what the boss's reaction was? It was not a matter of urgency. He said he would see the company directors about it. That is how much they are worried about the safety of people on the road.

During August 1979, Queensland Van Lines (Gladstone and Rockhampton removals) were found to be operating a Bedford, registration No. OGD-098, the registration of which had been cancelled on 6 June 1978—over 12 months before. Nothing was done about it. A Bedford, OTM-813, had not had its registration renewed in June 1979. The vehicle had been registered for another purpose, but nothing was done about it. There were no records of hours worked, no time and wages book was kept and no tax stamps were shown. The owner paid \$2,140 to his workers when the TWU took up the wage claims. Another victory for the unions doing something when the Government didn't!

The Tories talk of stand-over union bosses, but what of the other side of the coin? In July 1979 a worker complained that De Winter Transport of Coopers Plains had refused to pay him for work done. Finally some books were found and Mrs De Winter said there was \$280 waiting for the member. The TWU official asked if he could take the money to the member. Mr De Winter said, "No." The member was told not to go alone to pick up his pay. He took two mates along and De Winter threatened him with a rifle. He did not get the money. The next time he asked for his money De Winter said he would pay the award rates and asked him to sign for his money. When the worker signed for his money, De Winter refused to give it to him. That's the bosses at work in the State of Queensland today!

The reports speak of bosses hiding tape-recorders under tables and of another who took out a union ticket and said that he would attend union meetings and sack anyone who spoke out about conditions on the job.

Now for one last transport case, that of Gonancos Transport, in September, 1979. The boss said that a certain worker was paid \$240 a week. The worker said, "I only get \$180." The boss told the union that he paid the worker \$180 by cheque, and another \$60 in cash so that he could avoid paying income tax. The boss's wife said that the pay was only \$180. She said that the driver started work at 5 or 6 o'clock at night, loaded his truck and went to the Brisbane markets. She said he worked at the markets unloading until midnight or later and then slept in the cab of the truck until next morning, when he did the pick-ups around Brisbane, then returned to Nambour to finish about 10 a.m. For that he got the princely sum of \$180 a week.

After union action the Transport Workers' Union received a telegram saying that Gonancos had been advised by the industrial

inspector that, "We have been short-paying wages and we are prepared to make adjustments for the last 12 months."

The Transport Workers' Union has shown why we need strong active unions. Many other unions, too, are standing up on behalf of their members. Let us take John Murphy and Mel Francis of the Federated Liquor Trade Employees' Union and look at some of their cases. They are interesting and I have the letters here. Later I shall table them for the benefit of honourable members.

During August 1980 the union wrote to the then Minister for Labour Relations, the Honourable F. A. Campbell, complaining that the Living Room Theatre Restaurant and Penny Farthing Restaurant and various other restaurants were not paying their employees the normal hourly rate.

As for the Penny Farthing Restaurant—I have no doubt that honourable members have seen the ABC television program entitled "Dial a Butler". The name of the program should be "Dial a Bludger". The restaurant proprietor, Brian Pozzi, went into liquidation to avoid paying his workers their correct wages. He is well known as an anti-union fellow who will not pay, yet he appears on TV in a program titled "How to Cook". It should be titled "How to Crook".

To get back to the Living Room Theatre Restaurant—as part of the unions' responsible attitude to their members' safety, they drew attention to the fact that the Living Room Theatre Restaurant was a fire hazard and sought action to remedy the situation. That was in August 1980. On 5 December 1980 the Liberal Minister replied that an industrial inspector had found that Mark Twain Pty Ltd, trading as the Living Room, had short-paid existing workers \$2,226.46 and former employees the sum of \$3,672.29. The company agreed to pay the existing workers but refused to pay its former workers. I hope that those workers contact the shops and factories inspectors so that court action can be taken to get their money.

The Liberal Minister, in replying to the union's claim that the Living Room was a fire hazard, advised that the restaurant complied with the requirements. Yet the restaurant has since burned down, in an amazing fire. If the investigation really found that the Living Room was not a fire hazard, an investigation after the fire should bring out some very interesting facts. Perhaps we could talk about "Fire-stick So-and-so".

It is not only the boss who exploits the workers; sometimes the employees' workmates, if given the opportunities, are just as bad. The Darra RSL Club, for example, was found to have underpaid its workers by \$6,082.05. As I said, I shall table all the letters so that honourable members can read them. They all concern cases that arose about Christmas-time and in the past couple of months.

It is not only in Brisbane that these cases occur. Saturday's "Courier-Mail" carried a report on the registered clubs association's involvement in a bowls club case in which a State Industrial Commissioner has recommended that a woman employee be reinstated on a minimum of 10 hours' work a week on a casual basis. For the benefit of those honourable members who think that the Industrial Commission is the bee's knees, I point out that a State Industrial Commissioner's recommendation apparently does not have any legal standing and is not binding on anyone.

On the question of a woman's right to work, the club is to act on the advice of an association that was taken over last year by a small band of failed Liberals and southern poker-machine manufacturers' stooges of questionable reputation. The club is used mostly by retired ex-workers and workers, who should tell the association that bludging on a worker is not the way to make the club profitable or to give it a club spirit.

Let us leave the city and deal with Caloundra. There, Lifroc Pty Ltd, trading as Saru Receptions, was found to have underpaid its workers by over \$2,000. At Surfers Paradise, the Surfers International Hotel, in Trickett Street, had underpaid its workers by \$1,464.

The United Services Club, where Mal and the Liberals met last week, underpaid one lady by \$587, and another casual employee who worked for the club for 23 years and retired late last year was thanked very much and shot out the door with a week's pay. Miscellaneous Workers' Union activity enabled the lady to receive her just payment in lieu of long service leave, which amounted to more than \$2,000.

Those places that I have mentioned have paid up. However, the Wayamba Holiday and Convention Centre at Wirraway Street, Alexandra Headlands, was found by an industrial inspector to have failed to pay the correct wages. It refused to comply with the award and refused to pay. Anyone who has ever worked there should contact the industrial inspector in Nambour so that court action can be taken on his or her behalf.

I turn now to the united grumblers and groaners association—the UGA. It is an arch-conservative anti-union organisation. It is always against country workers. It has a National Party mouthpiece called "Country Life". It has spent a life-time keeping rural wages down and trying to stop workers obtaining their just rights. This anti-union organisation is a miserable exploiter of our out-of-work young Queenslanders, especially girls.

On 15 January this year, "Country Life" carried an advertisement from Georgetown which sought, "A qualified teacher or tutor to teach two boys—must have experience—light household duties, wages \$80 per week." They would say, "Oh, we keep her." Keep,

under the industrial award, is worth \$8.50 a week. This Tory rag regularly carries advertisements for young girls to do outside work, general household duties and, in some cases, office work—work for more than 40 hours a week with pay of \$70 a week.

The October 1980 edition of the "Grazier" reported that during August/September 1980 the UGA had stopped a station hand from obtaining his full entitlement of \$1,133 for underpaid wages by negotiating an out-of-court settlement of \$650. A shearer's claim for \$335 was settled out of court for \$118. Again the worker lost out. Obviously in both instances the case was proven or the UGA and the grazier would not have agreed to pay anything—but only about half was paid.

The paper also reported that a Government industrial inspector had requisitioned new quarters for an employee, but after UGA representation the Department of Labour was not pursuing the requisition. Obviously the worker will be required to live in accommodation that the Government inspector thought was bad. The UGA did its job; it stopped the worker getting decent conditions. The UGA does not have to talk strike to achieve its aims; it goes direct to State Cabinet.

In its July 1979 issue, the UGA's "Grazier" said, "The UGA has succeeded in persuading State Cabinet to direct the Department of Labour Relations to review the entire Workers Accommodation Act." If anyone wants to argue about that I will table the paper. The UGA has used its political influence to stop many rural pursuits from being covered by awards, thus making it impossible for a worker to obtain adequate wages.

The State Government itself is not loath to threaten strikers or to use the big stick of the sack. I am sure we all remember the National Party Premier's threat of a few weeks ago to sack 25 000 railwaymen. Just think of that for a moment! Imagine the chaos that would have caused in the accounting office if the State had to pay long service leave, annual leave and wages in lieu of notice. That would have been mild indeed compared with the chaos that there would have been if the Premier had tried to run the railways with volunteers, as he promised. Can honourable members imagine volunteers driving the electric trains, shunting goods wagons or working the signalling system? What a shocking idea! But that is industrial relations in Queensland in 1980.

If honourable members want concrete proof of Government inaction while crooks manipulate weak company and industrial laws, I will refer them to the case of the thieving Olsen family. A lady from my electorate started work for Olsen Pty Ltd, of 711 Ann Street, on 12 April 1966. On 10 October 1977 the company went into liquidation and for a period of about three weeks she worked for Olsen Pty Ltd under their

liquidators Geo. Rees & Rees of Constance Street, Valley. They then became Olsen Clothing Company. Mr Olsen said he was employed as manager—with the same equipment, the same premises and the same boss. Prior to joining Olsen Clothing Company she was asked to sign a form waiving three weeks holiday pay for that year but sick pay and long service would continue, so she signed. She was working for the same firm under the liquidators.

She found out through the Department of Corporate Affairs that she was now working for Elizabeth Anne Olsen and Otto Peter Olsen of 1272 Waterworks Road, The Gap—the son and daughter of Mr Lou Olsen, the original owner—now trading as Fencam Pty Ltd.

On Thursday 6 December, 1979—surprise, surprise!—Mr Olsen called the staff one at a time into his office and said that the directors had had a meeting and they had gone into liquidation. He was aware of it coming but had not informed the staff. He had gone to the bank the previous day and drawn out wages for that week. For three days she got \$78.

The union told the lady in question that Olsen owed about \$20,000 in tax alone, plus other moneys. She finished work after approximately 13 years with no long service leave, no holiday pay—only \$78 for three days' pay.

We then found that Mr Lou Olsen carried on business the next day, but not under Fencam Pty Ltd. In essence he entered liquidation on Thursday, 6 December, and started up again on 7 December, admittedly not under the same company name, but the same man doing the same work on the same machines in the same premises. The woman was robbed! She went to the industrial inspectors who told her that they would do what they could to help her. The Minister in charge of our company laws said

that "insufficient evidence" was obtained to enable any prosecution action to be taken by his office.

An Opposition member: Who was it—Doumany or Lickiss?

Mr BURNS: It was Lickiss.

The Government had done nothing to stop this recurring, immoral practice. Olsen should have been gaoled for robbery. I do not intend to have a go at Mr Lickiss because there are a few others from Mr Doumany since.

At 5.30 p.m.,

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Under the provisions of Standing Order No. 17, I propose to permit the honourable member for Lytton to complete his speech.

Mr BURNS: Thank you, Mr Speaker.

Olsen and his family robbed these women just the same as if a robber had stuck a gun in their backs and taken their wages.

Let me deal with how some of the problems have been ignored. It is amazing how fires occur in many business premises after visits from industrial inspectors or demands for payment of moneys due. I spoke about the Living Room Restaurant and the issue there, where the union said that it was a fire hazard and the Government said it was not. But it burnt down after the inspectors had been down and it was found that over \$6,000 was due in wages.

Let me take the example of Colin Michael William Street of Daymar Street, Burbank. On 11 February 1980 the industrial magistrate at Dalby heard five complaints relating to unpaid long service leave due to five employees from C.M.S. Pty Ltd of 54 Kingston Road, Underwood. These complaints were taken out on behalf of the five employees under the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act 1961–1980. At this hearing the Industrial Magistrate made orders as follows:—

Employee	Ordered To Pay	Payment For
	\$	
James Edward Reilly	1,890.03	Long Service Leave
Theodore Neville Holden	2,370.42	Long Service Leave
Kevin Stanley Andrews	1,738.31	Long Service Leave
Roderick Waugh	1,215.95	Long Service Leave
Lillian Olive Waugh	1,075.72	Wages
	106.29	Holiday Pay
	2,044.90	Long Service Leave

These workers worked for a long time and lost a lot of money. The industrial magistrate ordered levy by distress on the defendant company on all five complaints should the above amounts not be paid.

I then wrote to the Magistrates Court seeking enforcement of the orders made by the industrial magistrate. He replied—

"That these warrants were returned unexecuted by the Woodridge Police

together with a report of an interview with the principal of the company, a Mr Colin Michael William Street of Daymar Street, Burbank.

"In this report it was stated that he had no monies to satisfy these Warrants and no goods on which to levy. A search was made at his place of business at 54 Kingston Road, Underwood, and he stated that all of the property located there belonged to another company, Phillipine Imports of which he is a Director.

"The premises at his place of business were destroyed by fire earlier this year and the defendant company has made a claim on its insurance which has not been paid as the insurance company is of the opinion that the fire was the result of arson."

That is a statement from the clerk of the court in relation to Mr Street. What can be done about it? He will just go broke again, have another fire and rip the workers' wages off. And the Government will do nothing about it. It has done nothing about it over the years.

I am told that the Theatrical and Amusement Employees Union receives little help from the Government in policing its awards, especially on the Gold Coast. The union reports that Hoyts is trying to replace adults with junior labour because it is cheaper. Birch, Carroll and Coyle has changed from a policy of co-operation to one of increasing opposition to award matters.

Already up to 50 per cent of shop assistants are working casual or part time. The large southern companies dominating retailing want to make it a casual industry with resultant savings to them on long service leave, meal breaks, holiday pay, etc. The union reports—

Staff being dismissed at the ripe old age of 18;

Employment being terminated whilst staff are on compensation;

Staff being dismissed and not given pro rata holiday pay;

Employees being worked overtime and told not to sign the overtime book, but being denied overtime rate;

Employees being paid over the award and then reduced to award rate just prior to annual leave (so that they do not have to be paid the higher rate whilst on holidays);

Staff dismissed when it is found that they have reported industrial breaches to the union; and

Personal belongings of staff being checked without their consent.

Mr Speaker, I made arrangements with you to have incorporated in "Hansard" a letter from the Musicians' Union, which I now table. I ask leave for it to be incorporated in "Hansard".

(Leave granted.)

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

Mr. Tom Burns, M.L.A.,
Parliamentary House,
George Street,
Brisbane, Q. 4000.

Dear Tom,

Further to our telephone conversations concerning the problems of this Union I offer the following comments for your information:

1. The Brisbane Branch of this Union has approximately 1,000 financial members and has never, to my knowledge, been involved in a strike of its membership.
2. From the Union's researches it has concluded that there are about 3,500 musicians who are offering for employment or hire, mostly on a part time basis in Brisbane alone.
3. There are approximately 1,500 jobs offering for musicians on Friday nights in Brisbane, Saturday night engagements would run close to this figure, any other day or night of the week would offer substantially less than half of that number of job opportunities.
4. The Union is hampered in its endeavours to recruit members by an ever growing attitude in the community that union membership is not only not compulsory but that it is undesirable. That attitude seems to be encouraged by the media and by statements made by Ministers of the the Crown. This surprises me more than somewhat because, in my experience, membership of the appropriate union IS compulsory for employees of the State Government.
5. Outside the Queensland Symphony Orchestra and the Queensland Theatre Orchestra stable employment of musicians in this State is virtually nil. This is not because musicians are inherently more unstable than any other section of the community, it is simply because employers of musicians, i.e., hotels, restaurants, registered clubs, reception rooms, promoters and agents ALL refuse to directly employ musicians, preferring to contract or sub-contract their services.
6. The major reasons for this practice are, in the Union's view: Those who, but for the device of an alleged contract or sub-contract, would be employers avoid the responsibilities of payroll tax, payment of Workers' Compensation premiums, wages administration and award observance; those who would otherwise be employees, mostly part-timers in regular day time employment avoid the payment of income tax.
7. Quite apart from the fact that this widespread practice is in breach of the Musicians' Award—State and, in

many instances, of the provisions of the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act, 1961-1980, there are two related problems. These are, in the order of their importance to this Union:

- (i) The industrial rights of bona fide members of this Union offering for employment are prejudiced and frequently negated by the practice and
 - (ii) Both State and Federal taxes are avoided, if not defrauded, with a concomitant increased tax burden on the community at large, in which are included the officers and members of this Union.
8. In illustration of the latter point one chain of hotels in this city has an annual entertainment budget in excess of \$600,000.00, virtually all of which is paid to "contractors" in lieu of wages. At current rates the Union estimates that the company which operates those hotels would pay an additional \$30,000 per year in payroll tax and approximately \$6,000 per year in Workers' Compensation premiums if these "contractors" were added to their wages payroll. Neither the Union nor the Deputy Commissioner for Taxation have any means of assessing the amount of income taxes which are avoided or evaded in this fashion. The Union can conservatively estimate that the total value of musical sub-contracts in Brisbane alone exceeds \$6,000,000.00 per annum.
9. These matters have been drawn to the attention of the appropriate Departments, Ministers, Industrial Commissioners and etc., with varying degrees of success. Copies of letters and, where received, replies, are enclosed for your information. It is worth mentioning two matters in isolation. The Union has been informed by the Workers' Compensation Board that "musicians are not workers in the terms of the Act and are therefore not entitled to Workers' Compensation benefits" and, in an interview with the Under Treasurer that "if employers wish to so order their affairs as to avoid payment of payroll tax that is their own affair and in keeping with the policy of the present Government which is committed to reducing and eventually abolishing payroll tax." In further discussion with that gentleman I asked what would be the position if the Union itself, through some agency, directly employed its members so as to entitle them to award protection and Workers' Compensation benefits and was advised that the Union, or its agency would be required to pay payroll tax and that no concessions could be made.
10. The industrial problems of the Union are not isolated to "fly-by-night" operators. The Union is currently in dispute in the Federal jurisdiction with the Australian Hotels Association and its members in respect of failure to observe the terms and conditions of an Agreement award which applies to members of that organisation; it has successfully concluded proceedings in the State Industrial Commission with Sunnybank Properties Pty. Ltd., a wholly owned subsidiary of Carlton and United Breweries and is still attempting to get the Registered and Licensed Clubs' Association to the conference table, despite a Commission direction to that organisation to confer. A settlement of \$1,400.00 was negotiated with P & O on behalf of four members employed by them on a resort island operated by that company. Subsequently the Union was advised by the advocate representing the company that the claim was "out of time". In all these matters the Union has pursued no claims for over award payments nor was it demanding concessions or considerations for its members which broke any new ground. It simply sought, in each and every matter, observance of consent awards of the State and Federal Commissions made in 1973 and 1972 respectively.
11. The Union has been forced, in some instances, to take civil action on behalf of its members for recovery of "fees" at substantially less than award rates. This has been necessitated by the difficulties of producing evidence before an Industrial Magistrate where no time and wages records are kept. It is a breach of the Musicians' Award—State to fail to keep time and wages records and repeated complaints have been made to the Factories and Shops Inspectorate in this regard. To my certain knowledge not one single complaint has resulted in a prosecution. The Union, despite its limited resources, now contemplates taking its own prosecutions in this area.
12. This Union is typical of many Unions in Queensland, i.e., it is comparatively small in numbers, has great difficulty in recruitment of members, finds repeated obstacles in its administration of and attempts at policing its awards and has no industrial muscle to enforce any requests it might make of employers. I could not bring myself to use the word "demands" which is so favoured by the press and the Government, the term, in my situation, is ludicrous. About the only threat I am able to muster is that if employers do not observe the terms of an award that I will notify a dispute to the Industrial Commission. If this

can be construed as blackmail then I am guilty of it. It has generally proved to be an insubstantial threat.

In conclusion, and in reference to our telephone conversations, I can advise the Parliament that any contemplation of legislation to curb my "powers" so as to protect the public is totally unnecessary. Current measures have proved so effective as to render any further restraint a matter of massive overkill. Given the current gross exploitation of musicians I shudder to think what the effects of future "curbing" might be.

Perhaps the time is appropriate for the Parliament of this State to take a more balanced view of industrial relations legislation and look closely at its primary purpose. I contend that that purpose should be the protection of the basic rights of the workers who make up the bulk of our citizenry and the regulation of their relationships with the minority who are their employers. It seems to me that current legislation is probably adequate, for the most part, to achieve those goals if it were justly and equitably applied. It may even be that, if the Government of this State were to attempt to engender some confidence in the Rule of Law by applying it impartially, some of the current disruption would not occur.

I trust that the comment made herein will be of assistance in informing you and have no objection to your use of any of them in any fashion you see fit.

Yours sincerely,

C. D. GIBBONS
State Secretary.

Mr BURNS: Employers of musicians—hotels, restaurants, registered clubs, reception rooms, promoters and agents—all refuse to directly employ musicians, preferring to contract or subcontract their services. This widespread practice is in breach of the Musicians Award—State—and, in many instances, of the provisions of the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act 1961–1980. Cut-rate subcontracting prejudices the rights of those seeking award wages and defrauds the State and Federal Government of taxes.

One chain of hotels—it is the "green death", I'd say—in this city has an annual entertainment budget in excess of \$600,000, virtually all of which is paid to "contractors" in lieu of wages. At current rates the union estimates that the company which operates those hotels would pay an additional \$30,000 per year in pay-roll tax and approximately \$6,000 per year in workers' compensation premiums if these "contractors" were added to their wages pay-roll.

In an interview with the Queensland Under Treasurer, the union official was told that "... if employers wish to so order their affairs as to avoid payment of pay-roll tax, that is their own affair and in keeping

with the policy of the present Government which is committed to reducing and eventually abolishing pay-roll tax." Does that not really mean that the Government is saying, "If you can dodge it, we will condone it. Those other innocent souls who believe in the law and work according to their records have to pay."? That statement appears in the letter from the secretary of the Musicians' Union that has been incorporated in "Hansard".

The union is fighting to get the Registered & Licensed Clubs' Association to the conference table, despite a commission direction to that organisation to confer. Those members who talk about the commission should remember that many people do not take any notice of its directions.

A settlement of \$1,400 was negotiated with P & O on behalf of four musicians employed by them on a resort island operated by the company. Subsequently, the union was advised by the advocate representing the company that the claim was "out of time", so P & O robbed the workers by a smart legal move.

In all these matters the union has pursued no claims for over-award payments, nor was it demanding concessions or considerations for its members which broke any new ground. It simply sought, in each and every matter, observance of consent awards of the State and Federal commissions made in 1973 and 1972 respectively.

Surely one must ask why the Government will not enforce awards made by its industrial courts.

Many of today's employers prey upon the young unemployed. Fast-food chains skite about their employment of young people. But they don't let on that they only keep them whilst they can gain a Government subsidy over the first few months.

As soon as the Government subsidy runs out, the young men and women are sacked and replaced with more young people who can be employed under subsidy.

If a union acts to protect workers who are ripped off, the boss sacks them immediately.

Some hot-bread kitchens have a bad record. The Morningside Hot Bread Kitchen at 611 Wynnum Road, Morningside in my electorate has ripped off a group of local boys and girls for over \$2,800 in recent months. These youngsters had left school only a few months earlier.

Some young girls were found to be owed \$800 or \$900 each. I am told that whilst the boss paid up, most of the young people no longer work there.

The forces against trade unions are more powerful and more insidious than ever in our history. Our courts are stacked with representatives of the conservative classes. Our schools and their education program are the product of Government interference and control. Anyone who bucks the system

and the doctrine of the ruling political junta can expect trouble. True freedom has been eroded and destroyed. Unfortunately a media campaign by Government PR machines and the massive resources of big business has portrayed a false impression of the Australian worker. The trade union movement has failed to respond to the need for good PR.

Let us look at what happens to workers who have no union and are in a position where they must take any job at all to live. I am reminded of a case repeated a hundred times over on our waterfront. When he was WWF president the honourable member for Bulimba acted to help foreign seamen on a vessel called the "Al Sadiq", when it tied up in this port. Our unionists found men who had not been paid for up to five months. When they were ill, no medical aid was given. Men were asked to work with broken fingers, etc. The unionists were shown a wages sheet which they discovered was signed under duress, because no one had been paid for at least two months, and, as I said, some for up to five months.

What chance did these poor souls have when they were at the mercy of the ship's captain, with no union to turn to? Ron McLean and the waterfront unions checked what was owing, and when confronted with the evidence the captain and the ship's agents paid up US\$110,000 owing in back wages.

I am told that a fellow named Les Symes based in Sydney handles claims under the International Transport Federation agreement through waterside workers' branches in Australia. In 1980 claims won for overseas seamen for back pay, underpayment and overtime amounted to \$3.5m. That is the sort of thing that happens in countries where there are no unions and millions of unemployed.

Mr Vaughan: Ned Kelly was a gentleman.

Mr BURNS: That is right, Ned Kelly was a gentleman.

We must never allow these despicable conditions to gain a hold in Queensland. Without unions and with a Liberal/National Party Government, they would return. Iwasaki, Utah and Peabody Mitsui did not make this country strong; it was the ordinary man and woman in Australia who did. It is only a strong and vigilant labour and trade union movement that will ensure that all Australians benefit from our nation's riches. One only has to look at that shabby Winchester deal to realise that. I have tried to counter what I see as a deliberately devised campaign against unions and workers.

I know that there are weaknesses on both sides. When I look back into the history of the trade union movement, I am reminded of the fact that people say it would be better if the unions were like they were

years ago. They say "It is the good old unions we want back. These modern ones today are a mob of ratbags. We can't have anything like them." I looked up "Hansard" of the Legislative Council for 14 July 1891. That was a long time ago. It was the time of the shearers' strike that started the movement of which I am proud to be a member. I was not allowed to bring the "Hansard" into the Chamber because it is a bit old and fragile. I shall quote a speech from the Hon. F. T. Brentnall, who was a journalist, a one-time editor of the "Telegraph" and, in the words of "The Worker" of the day, a "champion of vested interests". He said—

"Whilst we would not on our side, I presume, say one word in depreciation of legitimate trades-unionism of the good old-fashioned sort—when men combined for the redress of actual grievances, when they united their strength for the purpose of working out their own deliverance from oppression, we must remember that the old unionism was a widely different thing from this modern unionism with which we have to contend now."

That was stated on 14 July 1891 in the Parliament of this State.

When he referred to good old unionism, do honourable members know what he was referring to? He was talking about a 56 or 60-hour week, kids crawling down mines and women starving when there was no unemployment relief. If one picks up the "Telegraph" or any other newspaper today one reads the same tripe. We are told that any unionist today who stands up for his rights and what he believes in is no good. Everyone wants the good old union from the past.

That editor of the "Telegraph" took violent objection to a poem that was printed in "The Worker" at that time entitled "Freedom on the Wallaby". It was all about the lads flying a rebel flag. It reminds me of the way in which this House performs over things such as the singing of "The Red Flag". I remind members in this House that "The Red Flag" was sung before there was a Communist Party and while the Tsars were still in control in Russia. The working men sung that song with some pride. Later, along came the Communist Party and leaders like Stalin who decided that red was their colour, and it was said that we should not denigrate our own songs and our own trade union movement by using the words "red".

Around this community today people talk with some pride of Henry Lawson and other great Australian poets. I can remember when he was blackballed and blackguarded because he was a Labor man and a unionist and stood up for what he believed in. He always said that there were some weaknesses in the trade union movement that we all profess to support. Government members support it, too, because they always say that they are in favour of unions—but they want only weak unions, not strong ones.

I quote from a poem by Henry Lawson entitled "Too Old to Rat!"—

"I don't care if the cause be wrong,
Or if the cause be right,
I've had my day and sung my song,
And fought the bitter fight.
In truth, at times I can't tell what
The men are driving at;
But I've been Union thirty years,
And I'm too old to rat."

Do honourable members know what he was talking about? He was talking about the days when one could not really understand why the boys were going on the grass or what they were up to. But there is a principle and belief in the union movement. Government members try to destroy the movement by using rather vicious campaigns against it, but they will never destroy it because it lives in the hearts of men who want to be free.

Mr Moore: They all support us now; they have given you away.

Mr BURNS: The honourable member knows that that is not true. The facts of life are that while men want to be free and have a spark of decency in their bodies and a little bit of backbone, when they can't cop it any more, they will say, "I can't cop it any longer. I will throw down my tools." No Government will outlaw that. To do just that, all the workers would have to be gaoled.

This Parliament and this Government have a responsibility, more especially those very ultraconservative Tory members on the other side. The Government has to be taught to understand that others have a right to dissent from what it believes in; that there is a right to be a unionist, and to stand up for what one wants. Government members have to stop this campaign that is trying to destroy trade-unionism, because its destruction would create for the Government more problems than it has ever thought of.

The media have a responsibility to be impartial in their reporting and it is hoped that they will report the bosses whom I have named here this evening. I would like to see the time when once a month or once a year the Press published a list of bludging bosses who steal from the worker; who do not pay the correct wages or overtime; who sack the worker just before his annual leave or long-service leave is due; who get the young kids and offer them \$2 an hour when the award rate is \$3.29 and who sack them as soon as they complain; who use the Government subsidy to bludge on the young workers; and who set up their own awards called the "Surfers Paradise Awards".

I will table the letters that I have mentioned here so all honourable members can read about the bosses I have mentioned and check the facts. I ask honourable members

to seriously consider the stupidity of the rather Right-wing ultraconservative campaign designed to divide this nation.

Whereupon the honourable member laid on the table the letters referred to.

PETROLEUM ACT AMENDMENT BILL

SECOND READING—RESUMPTION OF DEBATE

Debate resumed from 17 March (see p. 293) on Mr I. J. Gibbs's motion—

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

Mr VAUGHAN (Nudgee) (5.46 p.m.): The Opposition has looked at the contents of the Bill and, as the Minister said, it is mainly a machinery measure designed to correct a number of anomalies. However, there are a few matters on which I wish to comment.

The Bill inserts into the Act a definition of "State Mining Engineer". I am amazed that it has taken such a long time for this amendment to be made. My attention has been drawn to this statement made by the Minister in his second-reading speech—

"Officers of my department and representatives of the petroleum industry meet regularly with a view to keeping the legislation abreast of modern requirements and safe practice."

That means that the definition of "State Mining Engineer", one of the most senior officers in the Mines Department, has to be inserted into this Act to correct the situation in regard to the application of regulations.

An analysis of the annual report of the Mines Department clearly reveals the extent to which the State Mining Engineer plays a part in the State's mining and petroleum industries. A perusal of the latest annual report of the Mines Department shows that three or four pages of that report are compiled by the State Mining Engineer. However, it is only now that this definition is being inserted into the Act.

Another aspect of the Bill is the increase of prescribed penalties. I think everybody would appreciate that penalties are necessary in legislation to ensure that people comply with its requirements. The Minister said that penalties were last increased in 1962, some 19 years ago. However, the Minister also said that there are regular meetings with the industry to keep the legislation abreast of modern requirements. In one case a penalty prescribed by the Bill is to be increased from \$400 to \$10,000. If that is keeping the legislation abreast of modern times through regular consultation, I am a Dutchman. In another section the penalty is to be increased from \$100 to \$2,000 a day for a continuance of the particular offence.

These are two points I am concerned about. I would hope that we do not see a repetition of this having to be done. The other aspect of the Bill deals with the insertion of a provision relating to standards. I concur with what the Minister has said. There is a need to have provision in our legislation to maintain the highest possible standards. If in other countries there are standards in the development of drilling for petroleum, we must adopt those standards.

I wish to make some other comments about the Minister's remarks when he brought the Bill before the House. The Minister dealt with the exploration side of the industry. He said that 24 wells were drilled in 1980, and he estimated that 100 wells would be drilled this year. I sincerely hope that the Minister is correct. However, I very much doubt that we will see 100 wells drilled in this State in the search for petroleum in 1981. An analysis of the history of oil-drilling in this State certainly does not indicate that 100 wells will be drilled this year.

I undertook a little research on what the Minister said. In August last year the Australian Petroleum Exploration Association estimated that 74 wells would be drilled in 1980 throughout Australia, 32 of which would be in Queensland. Let us have a look at the oil-drilling record in this State. Of course, we all know the world position of liquid fuel reserves. In 1975, four wells were drilled in this State—the sum total of four! In 1976 the number of wells drilled increased to 17. In 1977 not one well was drilled in Queensland. These are facts taken from the annual reports of the Mines Department. In 1978, 20 wells were drilled and in 1979, 25 wells were drilled. As I have said, it was estimated that in 1980 32 wells would be drilled. Of course, the annual report of the Mines Department for 1980-81 is not out yet. It will not be out until much later in the year, so we will not know until then.

We are supposed to be conducting a search for petroleum in this State and in this nation in an effort to overcome the anticipated liquid fuel shortage in 1985. Whereas at the moment we are 70 to 75 per cent self-sufficient, it is estimated that in 1985 the position will be reversed and we will be only 30 per cent self-sufficient. On my information, Canada has drilled at the rate of 3 000 wells a year and the United States, 51 000 wells a year. Since the introduction of import parity pricing of Australian-produced crude oil in August 1977—and we all remember how the Federal Government decided to increase the price of petroleum products to the motorists of this nation to a parity with world levels, to raise revenue and to encourage petroleum companies to explore for oil and to improve our reserves of liquid fuels—151 wells have been drilled in Australia. In three years, that is a drop in the bucket compared with the performance of Canada and the United States.

Since we are dealing with the Petroleum Act, I want to deal in passing with the big

announcement in the Press in the latter part of 1979, repeated early last year, that Esso was to spend a whole \$13m drilling for oil in the Longreach area of western Queensland. Let us analyse that in terms of how much the companies and the Federal Government are receiving from import parity pricing. In 1979-80 the Federal Government received \$2,000m from the motorists of this nation as a result of import parity pricing, whilst the companies received \$1,000m.

We heard the great announcement to the effect that Esso would spend \$13m in this State searching for oil. It is estimated that in 1980-81 the Federal Government will receive the sum of \$3,000m from import parity pricing. My information is that the Federal Government will not be spending that money for the purpose for which it was raised. That money was taken from the motorists of this State and nation to assist Australia overcome its liquid fuel supply problem.

The Minister referred to drilling in the Gulf of Carpentaria. When Mr Camm was Minister for Mines and Energy, I made a point of saying that I considered the real purpose behind the granting of authorities to prospect in the Gulf was to pave the way for drilling on the Great Barrier Reef. I still hold to that view. The Government is prepared to allow drilling off shore. It is only a hop, step and jump around the tip of Cape York to the waters off the east coast.

Last week the Press contained reports stating that the State Government was considering the introduction of a tax on petrol of 1c or 2c a litre in lieu of an increase in registration fees. As I have said, the Federal Government is ripping off this State and other States as well as the motorists. So I do not see why the State Government should find it necessary to impose a tax on top of the tax already imposed by the Federal Government.

I do not agree with the use of revenue obtained from import parity pricing for any purpose other than that for which it was introduced, namely, to encourage drilling for oil and oil exploration in an attempt to overcome our liquid fuel supply problem. However, if the Federal Government is not going to use the money for the purpose for which it was raised, some of that money should come back to this State and to other States to help them overcome the problems that confront them. If the Federal Government is not going to use the money for the purpose for which it was obtained, it is only right that the Federal Government give Queensland at least 1c or 2c a litre out of the revenue that it is receiving from import parity pricing.

I agree with the Minister that this legislation is a machinery measure. I wanted to make the comments that I made because I feel very strongly on the matter of drilling for oil in this State. I conclude by stating

that I firmly believe that both inside and outside this State there are people who know where oil can be found in Queensland. It is only a matter of time. The time will come when oil will be found and processed. However, until we reach the stage when our overseas sources of oil dry up we will continue to be faced with the present situation. Again I make the point that it is necessary to keep the legislation up to date. I would not like to see a situation in which it takes 19 years to keep the penalties up to date.

Dr LOCKWOOD (Toowoomba North) (5.58 p.m.): I rise to speak to the Petroleum Act Amendment Bill but first I wish to refer to some of the comments made by the honourable member for Nudgee.

Recent publicity has been given to a statement made by no less a person than Harry Butler to the effect that he considers that it would be safe to drill for oil on the Great Barrier Reef. However, in the very next breath he said that oil drilling on the reef would be politically undesirable. I think he hit the nail on the head.

Many people have claimed that the spillage of oil on the reef would not harm it. I completely dissociate myself from this statement. Thick smears of oil on the reef would not do the coral any good at all. Perhaps small traces of oil lying on coral for a fraction of time would not do the individual polyps any harm. However, I am sure that thick layers of oil on the reef would do it untold harm.

Perhaps developments in drilling techniques could allow the reef to be drilled, as long as the relevant department specified all the precautions that should be taken and the procedures that should be followed. Such steps would not, of course, protect the reef from dangers associated with oil spillage from the shipping of oil through reef waters. A bulk tanker poses a great threat to the reef. The reef waters are very shallow and ships should not be allowed to navigate them without being under the control of a Torres Strait pilot. In spells of rough weather, tankers, even under the control of pilots, should be kept out of reef waters.

[Sitting suspended from 6 to 7.15 p.m.]

Dr LOCKWOOD: Before the dinner recess I was speaking on the Petroleum Act Amendment Bill. The shortage of geologists, geomorphologists, geophysicists and technical staff is presently hampering oil search in this State, elsewhere in Australia and on the continental shelf. One of the things that need to be said tonight—and I think everyone will agree with me—is that this country needs a definite policy that will allow oil exploration to continue over a 10-year period.

An excellent illustration of the need for oil exploration to continue is the fact that the Roma/Surat Basin has recently been

re-evaluated. New drilling has discovered additional gas fields and even small quantities of oil. This has all been possible because of advances in technology, particularly in the field of geophysics. There are now higher-resolution seismic surveys that produce an answer in a digital read-out. The old type of survey was the sort of thing that people might have been accustomed to seeing on television. It involved a series of blasts laid out in a predetermined pattern and a number of recording devices which recorded squiggly lines that had to be interpreted. From this type of information, many of the wells that were drilled, even though they were productive, were considered by the oil exploration people themselves to be little better than wildcat wells. I think 25 or 28 wells that struck gas or oil in the Roma/Surat Basin were considered by scientists to be little better than wildcat wells. Certainly they were in an oil basin but, in the light of the information that the geophysical teams look for now, those old methods can be set aside.

We need to spend more money to encourage drilling teams to return to Australia. We must have definite plans for oil search. Both the Federal and State Governments must do all in their power to search for oil on this continent. I say that because, as I have said before, I do not believe the Australian Navy has the capability of defending our North-west Shelf oil facilities. I do not believe we can defend Bass Strait, either. As a nation, we are particularly vulnerable to sabotage and it does not need a major power to do that. Any country that can get a few fishing boats together could knock our oil industry right off the continental shelf. It would not have to be a major power. We are extremely vulnerable.

Mr Davis: That is because we have such brilliant people as Killen running the place.

Dr LOCKWOOD: It is a matter of money.

The new methods allow better penetration of underground coal. In many ways coal acts as an energy-absorbing sponge. The seismic blasts do not penetrate the coal to give an accurate interpretation of the different hard layers that lie beneath. Seismologists cannot tell if there is a chance of a pocket, a basin, an anticline, a sinecline, or a fault in which oil can be trapped. The new methods need to be encouraged and applied to all our known fields.

In 1973 and 1974 oil exploration fell away under the Whitlam Government. If it went down in 1973 and 1974, in 1975 there was an absolute slump. In Victoria, exploration was reduced to 12 per cent of its peak of the early 1970s under the Liberal-National Government, while Australia-wide oil exploration dropped to 60 per cent of its peak. We need policies which will guarantee that oil exploration in this State and nation will continue.

Mr Davis: They have had five years. What has been the increase?

Dr LOCKWOOD: There has been a lot.

One of the problems is that we have lost all our technology. We lost all the drilling crews to overseas. They went overseas for jobs. Even the honourable member did not stand at the gate of Parliament House waiting for a job in the years when he was not a member. He went elsewhere to get work, and that is exactly what the oil crews did when they were kicked out of Australia by his mate Gough Whitlam.

Mr Davis: That's wrong.

Dr LOCKWOOD: The honourable member can say what he likes. This debate is not finished yet and he can get to his feet and explain what Whitlam did to oil exploration in this country. We look forward to his comments.

Mr Davis: You always want to go back to Whitlam. What have you done in the past five years?

Dr LOCKWOOD: We have given encouragement, and exploration has been stepped up. If the honourable member looks at a few of the graphs he will see that.

The Bill will regularise the safety schedules being adopted and practised by the industry over the years. A great deal of consideration must be given to the safety of the people who are working on the oil rigs. The rigs can be 140ft high and the lengths of casing are very long, so there has to be a great deal of skill in carting them.

One of the most amazing things about the search for oil in this country is that it is undertaken in desert country, so that the people who undertake it have to be, and are, careful of life and limb. They consider their workers. A large number of the people who work on the rigs are fully trained in first aid. The work crews are not big enough to justify the services of a doctor, so they have among them qualified first aiders. The employers see that the staff is trained in first aid, and I congratulate them for taking this step. If there is not a first aider on the site and there is a major injury, there could be a problem as there is little hope of getting the injured person out, even by air, to a medical centre.

Those who undertake the exploration are extremely conscious of safety to avoid people becoming lost. They rely heavily on recording and checking every move and keeping in touch by two-way radio. If other people who ventured forth into the wild followed their excellent example there would be far fewer tragedies in the Outback.

The oil exploration industry is a very efficient industry. It is a very high cost industry. Australia still has room to expand in this field, and positive policies need to be put forward, particularly at the Federal level, to encourage exploration so that we can win back the crews that have been working

overseas for up to eight years—since they were virtually exported by the Whitlam Labor Government.

Hon. I. J. GIBBS (Albert—Minister for Mines and Energy) (7.23 p.m.), in reply: I thank honourable members for their contributions and their agreement with the introduction of the Bill. Some of the comments made by the Opposition spokesman questioned the number of holes that would be drilled this year and he referred to some past performances.

One of the major considerations is that between 1972 and 1975 we had a Whitlam Government. The graphs show the number of holes drilled during that period and the number of drilling rigs that were sold up and taken out of Australia when the encouragement incentive, through the taxation system, was completely cut out. Unfortunately, during a short period following that, we lost a number of drilling rigs to countries such as Brazil, Indonesia, Malaysia and Singapore. Allowing for the time it takes to build a rig, transport it to Australia from overseas and put it into operation, the graphs show an increase in the number of holes being drilled. It is important to remember that. I could name quite a number of the drilling rigs that left Australia. Quite a number of the French groups left. Unfortunately, that resulted in a great deal of unemployment and cost Australia a lot of time.

A few days ago I was out in the Cooper Basin, and it was very interesting to watch the drilling operation. The brand new drilling rig, which is working on its third hole in the oil and gas catchment area of the Cooper Basin, was assembled in Brisbane. It was interesting to see the large amount of Queensland-produced equipment there, and many of the trucks and other vehicles that I saw out in that desert country were made in Brisbane. It is very encouraging to think that the oil and gas industry might be centering its drilling operations here. Such a development could have some significance for Queensland industry and employment. It certainly shows that this State can produce equipment as good as that built anywhere else. It was very thrilling to see mainly Queensland workmen using that rig.

The number of holes being drilled in the Cooper Basin by Delhi Petroleum is very encouraging, and I am sure that the spokesman for the Opposition would be very interested in seeing them. I have no doubt that he shares my hope that the number of wells that are envisaged will in fact be drilled. The future looks very good.

The State Mining Engineer now comes under the ambit of this Act. He has always been involved in this field and has carried out his duties quite well. As the honourable member for Toowoomba North said, the industry has a great safety record. Most wells are drilled in such remote places that all aspects of safety have to be spot-on. Although the State Mining Engineer has

not worked under the authority of this Act, he has done his job very well. In fact, all that the Bill does is bring him under the authority of the Act for legal purposes. From the legal point of view, he is the person in charge, and the Bill also provides cover for a person who temporarily performs his duties.

Mention was made of seismic testing in the Gulf, and that is virtually what the Bill is all about. It sets the framework of safety standards within which those carrying out exploration must operate.

The honourable member for Nudgee intimated that the drilling in the Gulf was merely a practice run for drilling on the Great Barrier Reef. I was rather surprised to hear him say that, because he would, or should, know that that is incorrect. Statements on this subject were made as recently as last June, and I believe since then, by both the Prime Minister and the Premier. At the World Wilderness Conference held in Cairns, a statement was made that, as far as those gentlemen were concerned, there would never be any drilling on the Great Barrier Reef. That was a very clear statement. The honourable member for Toowoomba North referred to a statement made recently by Harry Butler that, in his opinion, it was safe to drill on the reef, but that it was politically unacceptable. That is the state of play as far as the Government is concerned: it is not on; it won't be on. So, next time the honourable member for Nudgee speaks, he will know what the Government's approach is, because he will have been able to read it in "Hansard".

Mention was made of the Federal Government's world parity pricing policy, which I believe has given the encouragement necessary for increased drilling operations. It is important that the parity pricing policy be maintained. Whether we like it or not, or whether we think it is good or bad, the overall effect of it is that in future we will become more and more self-sufficient in fuel.

I thank the two speakers in the debate for their contributions. As far as Queensland is concerned, and while I am Minister for Mines and Energy, we will be pushing ahead as hard as possible to encourage people to drill more holes and do the investigatory work as quickly as possible.

Motion (Mr I. J. Gibbs) agreed to.

COMMITTEE

Mr Warburton (Sandgate) in the chair

Clauses 1 to 5, as read, agreed to.

Bill reported, without amendment.

THIRD READING

Bill, on motion of Mr I. J. Gibbs, by leave, read a third time.

AGRICULTURAL BANK (LOANS) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

SECOND READING—RESUMPTION OF DEBATE

Debate resumed from 17 March (see p. 312) on Mr Ahern's motion—

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

Mr BLAKE (Bundaberg) (7.33 p.m.): The purpose of this Bill is quite simple. It has two main functions. It proposes to empower the Agricultural Bank to make advances to small businesses which provide goods or services to primary producers in flood or drought-affected areas, provided, of course, that the business's profitability has been affected by flood or drought. Secondly, the Bill validates advances proposed in the legislation which have been made by the Agricultural Bank in terms of a Cabinet decision on 21 October 1980. It is quite obvious that advances have already been made, or at least it has been agreed that they be made, otherwise this validating provision would not be included in the Bill. It is equally obvious that businesses do suffer greatly as a result of drought or flood.

I suppose in some respects this could be called enabling legislation because the Commonwealth Government has already agreed to provide loan assistance to locally owned small businesses in shires that have been declared drought-stricken. I do not know if there is any mention of flood in the Commonwealth legislation but there certainly is mention of drought. It is obvious that by accepting the Bill and legislating accordingly we are extending to small businesses in drought and flood affected areas of Queensland the same offer of assistance that has already been extended by the Federal Government.

When I say that it is obvious that small businesses in these areas do suffer from drought or flood, as do primary producers, I say it with absolute sincerity. I also say with absolute sincerity that there are circumstances in which they do not suffer from the adverse effects of drought and flood as early as primary producers. To illustrate that point I recall the years 1964, 1965, 1966 and 1967 when the sugar industry was adversely affected, particularly in the Isis area. 1964 and 1965 were drought years and 1966 and 1967 were years of phenomenally low sugar prices. I think at that time the then Minister for Trade (Mr McEwen) said that it was not possible to ship sand from our shores around the world and sell it at the London sugar price low of £12stg a ton. The 1964 drought in the Isis area did not greatly affect the local small businesses. In fact, there were the odd traders who thought it something of a joke that the farmers were experiencing drought after prosperous times. They illustrated that by saying, "It will do you cockies good to get a good kick in the pants. You've had it too good for too long."

After the 1964 drought came the 1965 drought, and the same odd people in small businesses continued with the same sentiments. The reason for that was that the primary producers were still viable. Although they were not getting a return from their crops, they had good liquidity at the banks which were accommodating their financial needs and thus they were able to buy normally. Then in 1966 the drought broke; there were crops that were not profitable and at that point the lending institutions, after three years of almost no return from primary producers, decided to reduce the credit available to them.

It was interesting for me and a lot of other primary producers to notice the smiles disappear from the faces of those odd people in business who had thought it was a great joke to see primary producers, as they put it, get a damned good kick in the pants. In fairness I must say there were only one or two such businessmen with that attitude and, quite frankly, they are not still in that town. But I mention that to illustrate the fact that the primary producer suffers from the first kick and the business people do not normally suffer until the primary producers' credit starts to dry up. That is not to say that there are not businesses in these communities that are deserving of assistance. There are. It is true that in many cases such businesses not only share the reduced income of the area but also try, in the old tradition, to extend credit to those primary producers who have been customers for a long time. Often families have been traditional customers over generations.

The Opposition certainly accepts the principle of the Bill. I mention these things just to prove that when somebody argues about where the money is to come from—whether small businesses are to take precedence over primary producers or have equal rights with them to available money—he is probably posing questions that deserve answers.

There are circumstances other than those I have mentioned, of course, where by attrition through extended drought or as a result of poor markets businesses go downhill financially at the same rate as primary producers. Whatever the rate, or whatever the circumstances, the fact remains that when these businesses have an equal justification for assistance there is no reason why that assistance should not be given. I very definitely say that I do not agree with those who will describe this as sectional legislation.

I have had a long period on the land, a long period as an Opposition spokesman and a lot of experience in all areas of Queensland. I must admit that there have been occasions in some drought-stricken areas when I and my colleagues have been criticised for going into those areas and assessing the assistance required for a district, its economy and its employment by approaching the local authorities (who are employers of labour), employers and primary producers (who,

naturally again, are employers of labour). I have been accused of talking to the wrong people. They say that when we are talking about assistance, assistance should go directly and primarily to the unemployed.

Although I accept that principle in terms of unemployment benefits, I cannot accept that principle in terms of putting money where it will do community employment at large the most good, or giving assistance to a community where it will do the most good. By the term "do the most good", I mean benefit the community at large and the employment of people within that community, irrespective of occupation. That is why I say that assistance to primary producers and assistance to small businesses is not the sectional legislation or the sectional assistance that some people would have us believe.

There is the matter of where the cause of financial hardship begins and where eligibility ceases. Although the Bill talks about areas of flood and drought, I have not been able to determine that with any certainty. I know that the effects of drought and flood extend over very wide areas. In fact, they extend into the metropolitan area. I am speaking, perhaps, of the economies of a past era to illustrate this point, but I remember some of the great droughts, when the metropolitan houses of business such as T. C. Beirnes and McWhirters had large country mail-order businesses.

Mr Kruger: "Female" orders, too.

Mr BLAKE: As the housewife would have done most of the ordering, that would be correct.

It is a well-known fact that in those days the effects of drought were not limited to the rural areas; they extended into the metropolitan area, too. As a result, orders fell off, packers were paid off and the number of employees was drastically reduced during those periods of drought. I mention this because, as I say, I cannot find either in the amendments or in the Act itself where assistance in overcoming the effects of drought and flood will end and with what businesses it will end. Perhaps the Minister might care to enlarge on that aspect in his reply.

The Opposition accepts that small business has a right to similar insulation or, shall I say, rescue from those circumstances, to what the primary producers in those areas have. We accept the principles of the Bill.

I understand that a limit of \$30,000 has been set for such assistance. I trust that the Agricultural Bank, in its wisdom, will make advances after a very keen analysis of the circumstances of the applicants and that the finance so allocated will go to the most deserving small businesses.

Mrs NELSON (Aspley) (7.47 p.m.): I rise to make some brief comments on the proposed amendments to the Act. I am in agreement with the basic proposal to assist

small businesses that are affected by natural disasters such as drought and flood. Specifically, I recognise the fact that small businesses in rural areas are more immediately and directly affected by such disasters.

I do not believe that this is sectional legislation; rather is it legitimate legislation. As the previous speaker has said, it is enabling legislation to assist in obtaining Federal money. However, as a result of the passage of this legislation the possibility of the citizen v. citizen situation recurring in Queensland arises. Many people do not understand the real problems that confront rural producers. They are certainly less inclined to be able to understand the special problems that confront the rural small businesses.

I have spoken to the Minister about this matter, and he has assured me that a full review of drought and other disaster procedures is under way in his department. I would simply urge the Minister to consider, when he is preparing further amendments, that urban and city small businesses can also be affected by natural disasters and that they should be given access to such financial assistance.

Mr Kruger: What about the workers, too?

Mrs NELSON: But for small businesses, there would not be any workers.

It is important that the Government be seen to be a Government for all the people. When we are spelling out this sort of legislation we should make very clear what the special conditions are. The onus is on the Minister to make it clear to the business community of Brisbane, for example, why it is important for rural small businesses to receive this sort of assistance while city small businesses do not receive it. I think he could argue the case convincingly and conclusively. Nevertheless, I urge him to consider city small businesses when he brings forward any further amendments.

Mr KRUGER (Murrumba) (7.48 p.m.): I rise to comment on the previous speaker's remarks concerning small businesses in the city areas. We on the Opposition side would not expect the persons who are responsible for bringing forward this legislation to be concerned for people in the city areas. We know that the Government receives most of its support in the country areas, which are, of course, the stronghold of the National Party.

The Bill talks about advances to small businesses that provide goods or services to primary producers in an area affected by drought or flood and refers to a reduction in profits by reason of the effect of drought or flood on the primary producers. That sounds fair and reasonable, and no doubt the reason for the use of those words is a legitimate one. Small businesses in country

areas depend largely on the primary producers. We must determine what will be classed as a primary producer and what will be classed as a small business. Some towns have quite large businesses supporting the primary producers while some are only subsidiaries or outlets for major companies.

If we are thinking of the normal, small corner store in country towns, the legislation is sound. Those people who give a service to the community should be looked after. I think the previous speaker was talking about exactly the same situation in town areas where the small corner shop is going down the drain because of the combines. Unfortunately she is connected with the side of the Government that is promoting that sort of business.

Mrs Nelson: You have enough chips on your shoulder to keep the problem going for years.

Mr KRUGER: I am not too concerned about the chips on my shoulder. I am talking about the way that the Government looks after the large businesses and tends to neglect the small corner shops and farmers. That is what I am trying to spell out.

Mr Akers: You should read the Bill; it specifically excludes companies.

Mr KRUGER: That is what the Bill says, but because of some of the things that have happened I am not sure when I read a Bill how it will be interpreted by those who administer the legislation.

This is one of the best safeguards that small businesses in the rural sector could possibly have. I am quite happy about it, but I am a little concerned in that it is validating legislation. Obviously the system has been in operation since 21 October last year. Because of problems in certain areas and the Federal Government's insistence, the State Government is falling in line. Too often we see a problem and then try to legislate to control it. If a natural disaster occurs why not look after it under the natural disaster assistance scheme?

The people of Brighton who thought that they had suffered a natural disaster did not get the assistance received by people in country townships when they are affected by a drought or other natural disaster. The Government rallies to people in the country at short notice.

On looking at the provisions, I wonder about the intention. The maximum loan of \$30,000 over seven years at 5 per cent seems reasonable, but I wonder how much work has been done to ensure that it is reasonable. I suppose that 5 per cent interest is a reasonable rate to advance money to offset problems that a small producer or shop owner might face. Irrespective of whether people say I have read the Bill or not, I think it ties in. If primary producers go down the drain then so do the shops. That is what the assistance is all about. I am concerned about the 5 per cent interest in relation to the inflation

rate caused by the general policy of the State and Federal Governments. Do we intend to make this a business enterprise or will we be giving people assistance that is beyond the means of the State of Queensland? All these matters must be looked into and I trust that the Minister will explain the situation.

I am concerned about whether the larger business section will creep in. That is what I was referring to when an interjection was made earlier. When we refer to small business I believe we must have some means test to determine what falls into that classification.

Mr Blake: There is no law that says a single person, not a company, cannot have a reasonably large business.

Mr KRUGER: That is right. I have seen some private enterprise operators who are generally accepted as small business operators but they are in fact operating in a very large way. It is very important to have a means test to determine who should be assisted.

It could be said that Government assistance is always available for primary producers and that there is nothing for the workers—they always miss out. In a way I tend to agree with that because sometimes assistance is given to the man on the land that others do not seem to be able to obtain.

On the other hand, we have to consider all sections of the community. The man who lives and works round Brisbane cannot survive without the primary producer, and vice versa. If the primary producer does not have the working man round Brisbane buying his products he does not do very well. If the primary producer is not producing, the people in the city are restricted in the operations of the work-force.

I am very concerned about this matter. I have seen no real attempt to tie this in. It is reflected very quickly in the smaller cities and particularly the small towns. If the primary producers do not purchase from the couple of shops that are locally based, the people who usually work there to load the few bags of fertilisers and other items used by the primary producers find themselves out of work. The loss of 20 or 30 jobs in a small town sometimes presents a bigger problem than the loss of 1 000 jobs in a city such as Brisbane. We must look at the balance.

Possibly it could be said and will be said that the farmers are given too much. We generally tend to think of pastoralists or big operators. This gets away from the small business that we are considering tonight. Many farmers who use only the members of their family to assist them live below the poverty line or are receiving less than the average wage earner in the city. They are the people we are concerned about and should be concerned about.

I am concerned also because the large company situation could prevail, and I want

to make sure—and possibly the Minister will enlighten me—where the cut-off point will be and who will be classed as a primary producer purchasing from the small business we are talking about. If, for instance, we are talking about Dalgetys and that firm purchases all its requirements in Brisbane and has them railed out to country areas, the Bill will not help.

Mr Ahern: Have you read clause 2 of the Bill?

Mr KRUGER: Yes, and I can appreciate what it says. But my earlier point was whether the Government will spell it out and stay with the intention of the Bill as contained in that clause.

Mr Ahern: We cannot do anything else if that is what the statute says, can we?

Mr Akers: That is what Parliament is all about.

Mr KRUGER: This is what I am worried about. That is the point I have been trying to get across to Government members. With this Government, God only knows what will happen.

Mr Moore: Did you just step into a dingo trap?

Mr KRUGER: At least the honourable member could not be caught by the hair in a dingo trap. If they relied on catching him by the hair in a dingo trap he would get away every time.

This is serious legislation. The intention contained in the Minister's speech is a very good one. I sincerely hope that the legislation will be administered as it appears it is intended to be.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Miller): Order! Before calling the honourable member for Maryborough, I should like to make a point. During the speech of the honourable member for Murrumba, both the Minister for Primary Industries and the honourable member for Pine Rivers asked the honourable member for Murrumba to refer to the legislation.

We have lost the introductory debate in this House and whilst I am in the chair as Deputy Speaker I will not confine the debate strictly to the legislation before the House. This is a forum where members of Parliament can speak on behalf of the people they represent and voice the concern of those people and their own concern. While we do not have an introductory speech in this Chamber, I will allow any member to voice his concern as long as his remarks relate to the legislation.

Mr HANSEN (Maryborough) (8 p.m.): The role of small business is well known to many honourable members. In rural communities it acts, in many cases, as a banker and provides financial and other material to people who

have been knocked back by their banks. It is sad that many of these businesses have collapsed, thus leaving a number of creditors in difficulties, or have shifted elsewhere in an attempt to get a better deal and have forgotten about the money they owe to people who remain. It is good to see that the services of the Agricultural Bank will be extended to small businesses in rural communities. As in most reconstruction cases, or where funds are made available in cases of disaster, money will be made available only as a last resort when normal financial facilities are not available. So a person has to be in a desperate plight before he becomes eligible. Is that right?

Mr Ahern: That is true. Elders and Dalgetys are no chance.

Mr HANSEN: The Minister says that the people who apply for such loans will have to be in fairly desperate straits, but does it also mean that they will have to prove their ability to repay the loan; to prove that they would continue to be viable if the money were advanced? Will that also be taken into account?

Mr Ahern: Yes.

Mr HANSEN: Small businessmen both in rural areas and in the cities are facing very real problems. Under this Bill funds will be available only to cover certain debts and will not be available for the payment of other debts. The actual amount of the loan, \$30,000 over seven years at 7 per cent, has been spelt out, and I take it that there will be no escalation in the rate of interest.

In reply to a question from me earlier today the Minister mentioned the case of farmers who were in a similar position, and I am pleased that he saw fit to reduce the rate of interest applying to those farmers to an amount similar to that applying under this Bill. I had intended to point out that there was a difference, but this is no longer the case.

I now want to refer to another primary industry for which the Minister has not altogether been responsible in the past, and that is commercial fishing. Commercial fishermen will now also be provided with funds for rehabilitation where, because of seasonal conditions, poor catches or increased costs, their income has dropped. However, in this case I understand that while an amount of \$30,000 will still be available over seven years, it will be at 10.125 per cent interest, which is a significant increase over what will apply under this Bill. I understand that commercial fishermen will also be limited as to the area in which such money can be spent. I do not see any great difference between their needs and the needs of small businessmen; they are all in need of assistance.

I am pleased to see the Government acting in this way. The fact is that this measure merely validates something that has already been approved by Cabinet. I take it that

the date mentioned, 21 October, is significant and that it would apply, say, to people in the township of Goomeri who were hit by severe flooding on two occasions at about that time. I hope that the situation of these people was taken into account. I have pleasure in supporting the Bill, but I draw the Minister's attention to what I consider to be an anomaly.

Dr LOCKWOOD (Toowoomba North) (8.4 p.m.): On hearing that a Bill to amend the Agricultural Bank (Loans) Act was to come before this Parliament, some of my constituents contacted me and expressed the hope that funds would be made available to farmers in order to construct earthworks and repair contour banks on their farms. They wanted to be able to restore the soil that had been flood damaged. I think they felt that farms on the Downs adjacent to Toowoomba should be included in any such scheme. They felt that this was worthy of inclusion in the Bill, but I understand that it is not included.

They felt that they should be able to engage earthmoving contractors to recover soil that was in ditches or, more importantly, on public roads. It must be remembered that much of this damage was done during torrential rain on 6 December or 6 February. Having experienced a drought for some time in Toowoomba, on the Downs and further west, the farmers are not blessed with a great deal of finance to enable them to do this sort of work out of their own pockets.

I am pleased to see that this legislation and the Commonwealth legislation is to take effect from October. Some people in this House would remember that in 1977 there were people in the Commonwealth Treasury who said that despite the drought, the collection of taxes would not be affected in any way. Of course, everyone in this House knows that that is absolute nonsense, because in any drought the primary producer is first hit, and one step behind him is the grocer—

Mr Tenni: Baker.

Dr LOCKWOOD: Baker and everyone else, including the candlestick maker. Since the last drought there has not been one candlestick maker active in the electorate of Barron River. Small businesses fall away. Farm machinery sales fall off. There is simply no way that any of the 1100 economists in the Federal Treasury or the Taxation Office could not be aware that drought causes a drop in income, and a drop in income causes a drop in taxes collected. I do not know whether those people make those statements out of spite or in an endeavour to create a public fuss. Nevertheless, the statements have been made.

I am pleased to see that although it might have taken three years, the Commonwealth has changed its attitude on the effect of drought as it applies to primary producers and the people who serve them.

In any drought it is difficult to obtain carry-on finance. I was in Durrinbandi during the drought and at that time it was something of a joke when some of the graziers started using prodigious amounts of thiabendazole, which is a sheep drench. They had reached the limits with their banks, local stores and local garages. Just where they would get their next beer money from was something of a mystery. So they started booking up thiabendazole and walking out of the store with Fourex. As the drought continued they had to book up fodder for their sheep—which never arrived, of course—and thiabendazole. Of course, all this went on with the types of companies that will not be helped by this legislation—Dalgetys and Winchcombe Carson. Despite the limits imposed by their companies, the Governments and the banks, these people continued to feed the man on the land and keep him there while he tried his best to keep his stock alive. That is the type of hardship that this country endured until the end of last year. It is not a minor thing that we are correcting here; it is a major thing.

Even as that happened, banks closed, Dalgetys and Winchcombe Carson agents were withdrawn, small businesses closed and limits were placed on all sorts of things, including overdrafts and unsecured credit which people could obtain in western towns. This Government will provide \$30,000 to help overcome the problem, but that is a mere drop in the bucket. When a man sets out to out-feed a drought, he does not know how much money he will need. Despite this legislation or any other legislation, there comes a time when there has to be a cut-off point, and I am afraid that in too many cases the cut-off point comes after a man has spent all the money that he can raise for his property in order to out-feed the drought. It simply cannot be done.

Half a million dollars can be spent in trying to out-feed a drought, but the farmer will still go broke. I know of expert property managers to whom it has happened. In all things there has to be a limit and that means that the finance has to be cut off at some stage. All stock has to be sold off, every last one of them, right down to the sheep-dog. Then the station has to close and the owners walk off. If that happens on a station property or a farm, it will happen in the towns, too. There comes a time in a period of drought when even towns will close, despite measures such as the one being introduced here tonight. Despite the efforts and despite the help offered there comes a time when a business cannot repay the \$30,000 and the business is no longer worth a crumpet and people have to go. I wonder if in those circumstances the debt can be waived.

Mr BURNS (Lytton) (8.10 p.m.): I welcome any moves to extend drought and natural disaster relief to small businessmen.

Those honourable members who have worked in country towns know that small businessmen in country towns over the years have extended credit to many farmers and graziers who were in difficulties. After the drought was over many businessmen were heart-broken to find that many of the people who had lived on their credit during the hard times went off to the bulk stores in Brisbane or Toowoomba to buy their goods or had them sent up by rail at discount prices. That happened after they had carried them through the hard times.

I want to talk about the need for extending drought relief and natural disaster relief to a few more people. There might be a problem in Quilpie or Roma, but that drought does not cause problems in those areas alone; it flows right throughout the State. Thousands of meatworkers in my electorate have not worked since last October. When Borthwicks closed its meatworks 550 people lost their jobs. Many of them were widows or supporting mothers who were raising their kids. That had been the only way they could earn a living and their only chance of getting a little bit more than the dole. In many instances those people have had to fall back on social services and social welfare payments to eke out a living until someone can tell them when the meatworks will reopen.

Mr Underwood: Some of them have lost their homes.

Mr BURNS: That is right. I was just about to get on to the fact that some of them have lost their homes and cars.

I am all for full equality. If a farmer in the West is affected by drought or flood and he is entitled to some sort of natural disaster relief, then my people working in the meatworks down here who are just as dependent on the primary industry are entitled to the same consideration. When honourable members speak of big graziers and little graziers, I ask them to remember the widowed meatworker in my electorate who is raising three kids. She is suffering more as a result of drought in the West than any one of those farmers. She has nothing to fall back on. Her hire-purchase company is still demanding money. She has no assets. Her landlord, because of increasing house values and land valuations, wants more rent. What does she do? The Government does not try to give her any aid at all. She is not mentioned in the list of people who receive assistance in times of natural disaster. She and people like her are just forgotten.

For a moment I will speak about meatworkers. A friend of mine who was born in 1920 started at the meatworks at the age of 15 years, and he retired the other day at the age of 60. He spent five years at the war. He has been one of those who do not believe in taking sickies. He was a good loyal worker. On his retirement he received \$6,000 in lieu of long service leave and

accrued sick leave. We in this Parliament speak of superannuation benefits of \$150,000 and more, yet we cannot introduce any legislation to assist that type of person.

I have had a look at what farmers and graziers are entitled to. As I said, I do not want these benefits taken away from them, but I want them extended in the same way to others who depend on rural industries. When I read of natural disaster schemes and I look through the tax-averaging systems and the other concessions that are given to farmers, I wonder who are the benefited citizens in this community. I will list some of the benefits that farmers receive. The rural adjustment scheme provides financial assistance for debt reconstruction and rearrangement and/or composition of debts when applicants have exhausted all avenues of credit. I have a few meatworkers in my electorate who have the same problem.

The scheme for farm buildup provides for amalgamation with an adjoining property to bring farming units up to an economic size. Grants may be incorporated to cover losses sustained through the acquisition of assets that are not useful. That means that if a farmer buys the property next door with a dip on it, and he does not need it, he can get a grant for it. There are no grants for the meatworkers in my electorate. There are no grants for the worker at this end, or for the ringer, the fencer, the stockman or the boundary rider at the other end.

Carry-on and development finance is available in respect of additional land if not available elsewhere, purchase of farm equipment improvement, purchase of livestock and equipment and carry-on expenses to restore an uneconomic property to economic viability. There is rehabilitation assistance up to \$5,000 for those obliged to leave farming and become established in another walk of life.

What about \$5,000 for meatworkers who have had to walk out of Murarrie and other places because they could not live there any more as their jobs had disappeared for six months? What about some rehabilitation assistance for them? They are rural workers. They are just as important to that meat industry if it is to survive. It has to have expert boners, expert slaughtermen and other experts who can work on the slaughtering floor after the drought is over or when the boom conditions come again.

Farmers and graziers receive carry-on assistance for essential carry-on business in specific rural industries suffering market downturns or similar circumstances. Isn't that what the meatworker is suffering—market downturns in his industry?

Household support is given to farmers to alleviate personal hardship while a person is considering whether to adjust out of farming. It is available to farmers: why not to meatworkers when they might be considering readjusting out of their trade? As

I say, they are just as valuable to the industry as the fellow at the other end of the scale.

Household support advances are paid at intervals less than three months and the recipient's net income may be subject to review at any time. Interim assistance may be granted where an assessment takes time. Where a genuine effort is being made to move out assistance may be provided up to two years. Where the applicant adjusts out of farming within three years after having first received household support the advances made may be converted to a grant. Should the applicant resume farming the household support received becomes a loan repayable with interest over seven years.

If a farmer is prepared to adjust out of farming he may receive a lump sum payment (not exceeding \$5,000) instead of the normal household support assistance. The applicant may also be eligible for assistance under the rehabilitation provisions.

Consider all the other assistance that the farmer gets—

Rail freight concessions of 75 per cent on the transport of stock to and from agistment, to forced sale or to slaughter and for restocking;

75 per cent in road freight concessions for both hired carriers and private farm vehicles;

Up to a maximum of 75 cents per kilometre on the transport of stock to and from agistment, to forced sale or to slaughter and for restocking and at the rate of 75 per cent to a maximum of 12 cents per tonne/kilometre on the transport of water and fodder;

Road and rail freight concessions of 50 per cent on the transport of machinery and equipment and equipment essential to drought mitigation practices, which includes equipment essential for the provision of water for drought-affected stock;

Droving concessions at the rate of 25 per cent of contract charges or \$15 per day per plant for family or hired labour;

Concessions agreed to by the Lands Department include the waiver of fees for permits to allow the depasture of drought-affected stock on stock routes and reserves; extension of time for the payment of Crown leases or rents, including reduced or waived penalty interest rates and instalment payments of arrears for individuals experiencing genuine hardship;

Drought relief loans through the Agricultural Bank: loans of up to \$20,000 (with provision for an additional \$10,000 if necessary) are available for carry-on purposes at the rate of 5 per cent. Repayment period is up to a maximum of seven years, with a provision for the deferment of interest and redemption up to three years.

There is nothing for my meatworkers.

Let us look at the taxation advantages, which are not available to the meatworker.

Others have tax-averaging benefits, an income equalisation deposits scheme, an investment allowance, the advantage of writing off water supply costs, the benefit of private company profit distribution, the depreciation of storage facilities, another form of double rate depreciation, special rates of depreciation, payments to relatives, the costs of arranging finance to be used in the business, repairs to business assets, the costs of leasing property to be used for business, bad debts, plus stabilised equalisation marketing pricing and protection schemes that we pay for, science and technology in the form of Government research information, and the Primary Industry Bank of Australia.

As I said, I do not want to take anything away from them. I want to know when those people who are just as much the backbone of the rural industries—I mean the workers—are going to receive those benefits. I do not know a property that can get along without the boundary rider, the stockman or fencer. I do not know how half of them would get along without the council worker who looks after the roads that allow them to get to their properties. If they are going to send their 5 000 or 6 000 head of cattle to be sold at the Cannon Hill saleyards—two days a week, to be slaughtered through Borthwicks, KR Darling Downs, the Metropolitan Abattoir Board and so on—they are going to need the meatworker. Their skills as boners or slaughtermen are important to that industry. Workers are going to get more jealous every day when they read the long list of what is available to the man at the other end and not to them.

Mr Underwood: They can't even get proper compo.

Mr BURNS: As my colleague reminds me, they cannot even obtain proper compensation. Meatworkers still are rarely paid compensation for contracting brucellosis. On the other hand, the meat inspector who is working beside them on the job is paid compo.

Dr Lockwood: They want compo for colds.

Mr BURNS: The honourable member is paid more money out of compo than any meatworker I know. Some doctors have been signing certificates and writing on the bottom of them, "This bloke might have hurt his foot at football," or something like that. Some doctors have been dobbing them in and been acting as police pimps on the side.

It is time that someone started to look at the whole of the rural industry, not just at those few primary producers who live in Roma or own properties as the honourable member for Yeronga does. I cannot see how he could afford to take drought relief; if he tripped over his wallet he would break his neck. A meatworker in my area who tripped over his wallet would not even stub his toe.

Earlier tonight I told Mr Deputy Speaker that I would be speaking to this legislation and he said to me, "What about some super-phosphate bounty for my tomatoes in the backyard?" It is time that someone in the city started to say, "We want a share of the goodies." I want a share of the goodies. I will not vote for this Bill until I start to see some of the goodies come to the people whom I represent.

Mr TURNER (Warrego) (8.22 p.m.): I rise to commend the Minister for the introduction of this legislation, which is designed to assist small businesses in drought-affected and flood-affected areas. It is worth mentioning that this legislation provides a means of last resort, as is also the case in relation to primary producer loans. The criteria that apply to primary producers apply equally to small businessmen. Firstly, their applications for finance have to be rejected by the banking institutions and their brokers.

Anyone who listened to the honourable member for Murrumba and the honourable member for Lytton would think that this legislation was "knock the primary producer" legislation. As for the claims about assistance for the man on the land and nothing for the worker, I suggest that that is a myth.

Mr Burns interjected.

Mr TURNER: If someone liked to remove all the assistance given to primary producers and secondary industries, the primary producers would be so much better off that they would be laughing all the way to the bank.

Mr Burns interjected.

Mr TURNER: As a primary producer, I point that out to the honourable member for Lytton.

Mr Burns interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Miller): Order!

Mr TURNER: If one takes the tariff protection that is given to secondary industries such as the motor vehicle and ship-building industries, and compares it with the small amount of protection that is afforded to farming industries, one would be the first to acknowledge that the primary producer is not afforded the protection that it has been claimed tonight he is given.

Mr R. J. Gibbs interjected.

Mr TURNER: I compliment the Minister on introducing this Bill, because I believe it is good legislation.

Mr Burns interjected.

Mr R. J. Gibbs interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Lytton has had the opportunity of addressing the House and informing honourable members of the problems as he sees them that confront either him or the people whom he represents. The honourable member for Warrego will be afforded a similar opportunity. I warn the honourable member for Lytton and the honourable member for Wolston that I will name them under Standing Order 123A if they persist with their interjections.

Mr TURNER: This legislation will assist small businesses in country areas. The reason for the introduction of this legislation is that in country areas many small businesses are affected because of the downturn in rural industries. Many stock have been sent away on agistment or have been sold or died as the result of drought. I have said before in this Chamber, and I say again this evening, that not only primary producers but also small businesses in those areas are affected by drought.

This legislation is good legislation and a step in the right direction. The workers should always be looked after. I have advocated that at all times. However, when the honourable member for Lytton stands up in this Chamber and attacks all primary industries for the so-called assistance that they receive—

Mr Burns interjected.

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

Mr TURNER: I feel that I must contradict him. As I said—

Mr BURNS: I rise to a point of order. I do so because the honourable member will not accept an interjection. That is a sign of weakness. My point of order is that I said I did not want them stopped from getting it; I wanted the other people to get their share. He is putting it the other way, which is untrue.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Is the honourable member asking for a withdrawal?

Mr BURNS: I am asking for the words to be withdrawn.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: What words does the honourable member for Lytton want withdrawn?

Mr BURNS: The statement that I said I wanted primary producers to lose their subsidies and assistance.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member for Warrego to accept the word of the honourable member for Lytton that he does not want country producers to lose any of the benefits that they now have.

Mr TURNER: If I said that and it offends the honourable member, I will certainly withdraw.

Mr Burns: Really, I am offended.

Mr TURNER: The honourable member was offended? I now want to take a point of order. The honourable member referred to my showing a sign of weakness. I take that to be an offensive statement and I ask him to withdraw it.

Mr BURNS: I withdraw it.

Mr TURNER: In conclusion, once again I support the legislation. It is legislation that will assist small businesses. It is good legislation, and I compliment the Minister on introducing it. It is not legislation brought in to support Elders or Dalgetys. They will never get a chop at it. It is hypocrisy to suggest that they will. The criterion in the means test will be applied. I repeat that it is good legislation and I support it entirely.

Hon. M. J. AHERN (Landsborough—Minister for Primary Industries) (8.27 p.m.), in reply: I thank honourable members who contributed to the debate. We have had a useful discussion tonight which afforded honourable members an opportunity to discuss the impact of the drought generally on this State. Honourable members have taken advantage of the opportunity to do that. That is a very real advantage that is gained by bringing in legislation such as this.

In summary, what I want to say about the legislation and the small amendment to take action in respect of one small component of the problem is that when one visits the drought areas of the State one cannot but be overwhelmed by the hardships suffered by the people. Irrespective of who we are or our political colour or calling, when we go out into the western areas and see the devastation that has occurred, with trees dying, it is absolutely overwhelming. Everybody to whom I spoke who had any contribution to make said, "Let us try to do whatever we can do to assist these people."

I think that is the attitude of Government members and Opposition members alike. The devastation in these areas is absolutely startling and overwhelming. I came away with two impressions, namely, that all that the Government is trying to do in the situation is very small indeed compared with the personal contribution made by those people who are suffering. What we are doing in relation to the problem really amounts to peanuts. The courage of the people and their optimism impressed me tremendously.

After my visit to the area—and I hope I have an opportunity to return—I determined that whatever I could do, any recommendation I could make to the Government for help, I would do. We have provided some help by lowering interest rates and

reviewing the schedule of small measures of assistance that we are able to offer. I only wish that we could do more.

Frankly, what we can do is clearly not enough. It has cost the State in natural disaster assistance, in co-operation with the Federal Government, \$20m so far. No matter how many millions of dollars we can give by way of assistance, it will not be enough. I am afraid that that is a continuing impression as the drought goes on in the very far south-western areas.

What has to be said about this piece of legislation is that it is validating a decision which a Government took, and which a Government has to be able to take when the House is not in session, to extend the natural disaster arrangements which were concluded with the Commonwealth and which are under regular review.

The Federal Government made an offer to us, on application from us, to assist small business by way of loans. It made an offer also to the Government of Western Australia at the same time. Of course, we readily agreed. At the time there was no machinery for it to occur and we decided, as a Government, because the people in that area were essentially surviving from the business of primary production, that it should be done through the Agricultural Bank.

Incidentally, in other areas under the national disaster arrangements, assistance to small business will not necessarily be given through the Agricultural Bank. For instance, the assistance that is now being given to those people affected in the Dalby area is being given through the Department of Commercial and Industrial Development.

It was decided that, in areas where the small businesses are principally dependent on primary production, it was appropriate to do it through the Agricultural Bank. So we took that decision at that time, knowing that we would have to introduce legislation to cover it. That is why the Bill is before the House at the moment.

I thank the honourable member for Bundaberg for his support of the legislation and compliment him on his understanding of it. He worried about the general conditions of eligibility. It might be an appropriate time for me to read into the record the terms of the Cabinet decision on eligibility under this program. The eligibility conditions are clearly laid down.

Mr Vaughan: It is not another leak?

Mr AHERN: This comes out of my Press statement when I announced the measures.

The eligibility conditions are that owners must be—

(1) Sole owners, partnerships or private companies. Public companies are excluded;

(2) Engaged in and deriving the major portion of their income from the business for which the application is made. Such business to be actively associated with primary production in the area;

(3) Unable to obtain sufficient finance through normal commercial channels; and

(4) Considered to have a potentially viable enterprise with the assistance proposed.

When that is understood, it will go a long way to answering the Opposition's concern about this matter.

The purpose of the legislation then is to enable small, locally owned businesses in shires declared drought-stricken on an area basis to meet carry-on requirements, including sustenance, essential business operations and the payment of rates and rents. So all the applications will be subjected to that keen analysis which the honourable member for Bundaberg sought, because they have to be under the terms of the Cabinet decision and under the terms of this legislative amendment.

The honourable member referred to some problems in relation to the scheme. They are well understood and acknowledged. Very clearly the situation arises where there are businesses that meet all of the other eligibility criteria but are not actually in the drought-declared area. Some of them might well be in Brisbane. So it is enormously difficult to devise a set of recommendations to cover that sort of situation; in fact it cannot be done. The facts are that, to my knowledge, only one other State has accepted the Federal Government's offer of help in this regard, because of those problems. Because of what we saw in the very far south-west of Queensland, we thought the situation was serious enough to be tackled, problems and all.

I want to assure honourable members that every effort has been made by my officers to administer the scheme equitably and fairly within the terms of the Cabinet decision and, now, the statutory requirements included in this Bill.

I also want to assure the honourable member for Aspley that we have a review of the drought strategies under way. It would be helpful to us if the drought would cease to enable us to properly get on with the assessment of the problem. Unfortunately, it is worsening in some areas and the prospects at this time of the year are not good. But that full review is taking place, and the comments she made will be taken into consideration.

I was disappointed, and in fact made some reference by way of interjection, with the comments made by the honourable member for Murrumba. I think he made some effort to imply that this measure was in some way designed to assist large businesses, and that we were in some way going to plunder the public purse to line the pockets of some large corporations. I do not know if he

used the word "multinationals" but I expected him to do so. I asked him to read clause 2 of the Bill, and I incurred something of a rebuke from you, Mr Deputy Speaker, when I did that.

I want to assure you that what I was doing on that occasion was trying to clear up a misunderstanding or a misconstruction which the honourable member was making of the whole intention of the legislation. I was not trying to restrain him in any way. I am quite happy for him to raise whatever matter concerns him. I would be more than happy for him to discuss dingoes or whatever else he wants to discuss, but when he tries to totally misconstrue the legislation and suggest that we are somehow going to pay an enormous amount to Dalgetys or someone else, then it is totally false and wrong. He has misunderstood or has not read the legislation.

Frankly, clause 2 makes it absolutely clear to any primary schoolchild that large corporations could not qualify in those circumstances by any manner of means. They would be specifically excluded. The motives of the Government in bringing this legislation forward are of the very highest order. It is determined to channel the assistance to those who need it most. There is no question at all that big business can participate. As the honourable member for Warrego rightly said, it is last-resort funding and, with all of those other conditions that are laid down, it is a very strict schedule indeed. There is no way in the world that the construction used by the honourable member for Murrumba could in any way apply to this piece of legislation. His contribution was nothing but nonsense.

The honourable member for Maryborough sought to debate the question of differing interest rates offered under the natural disaster arrangements to various parties under various schemes. The plain fact of the matter is that after each disaster Cabinet first receives a report from the Co-ordinator-General on its severity. Reports are received from whichever Government departments are interested; specifically my department where a primary industry is concerned. The measures which it is decided to submit to the Commonwealth Government for approval are determined on those reports, and the severity of the disaster determines the generosity of the arrangements. That is the rationale for the differences that might apply throughout the State.

I want to assure you, Mr Deputy Speaker, and all honourable members that absolutely every effort has been made to be even-handed in dealing with all of the natural disasters that have occurred this year. Natural disasters have occurred everywhere this year: on the Granite Belt, in the far South West, on the Darling Downs, in the Goomeri area and in North Queensland. I believe they have all been dealt with in a completely

even-handed manner, and that includes the Brighton disaster. Frankly, in my opinion they have all been dealt with equitably.

The honourable member drew specific attention to the interest rate offered to fishermen. I have to say—I said it here about a week ago—that it is my intention, now that fisheries are under my administration, to deal as quickly as possible with the fishing industry on exactly the same basis as other primary industries in Queensland. That will occur as we make those appropriate arrangements from time to time.

When the fishing industry was placed under my administration, we looked at trying to provide some carry-on assistance for it. I took to Cabinet a proposal that \$500,000 be made available to the industry. Cabinet accepted the proposal on the basis that it would be submitted to the Commonwealth Government for approval under the natural disaster arrangements. The simple truth is that the Commonwealth Government has rejected that proposition.

Mr R. J. Gibbs: You knew it would be rejected when your Cabinet put it up.

Mr AHERN: So the \$500,000 that is being made available for carry-on purposes is being provided at the normal Agricultural Bank interest rate of 10.125 per cent, and we can do nothing else. The honourable member for Wolston said that I knew at the time that it would be rejected. I did not. He should know, if he was in the Chamber when I spoke about the fishing industry recently, that I have had my officers discussing with the Federal Government in Canberra the plight of the fishing industry in this State in an endeavour to get more sympathetic consideration from the Federal Government towards the fishing industry in this State.

I am quite certain that we will eventually succeed; we intend to continue. That is the rationale behind the different interest rate at present. I regret that it is there. The proposal that I make would have resulted in the fishing industry being offered an interest rate similar to that offered to others in the State. Regrettably, that did not happen, so the interest rate of 10.125 per cent has been applied.

I thank other honourable members for their contributions. The honourable member for Lytton made a rather excited contribution tonight. What he did not really say was that social security, which is available to unemployed people, is not generally available to people who participate in these schemes. The honourable member read out a schedule of assistance, and I am very proud of that schedule because I contributed to it, as have other honourable members. I believe that it is little enough in the circumstances. But if honourable members look at it fairly and reasonably they will see that probably more than 95 per cent of the assistance has been provided on a loan or

subsidy basis. That is, a farmer has to outlay a dollar in order to get assistance, or the loans have to be repaid. That does not apply to social security payments.

Certain grant moneys are made available under the Rural Reconstruction Assistance Scheme, but I would like to see other programs made available for people who are affected in some way by the slump in the meat-processing industry. I do not believe that the sort of emotional argument that the honourable member advanced tonight was in any way balanced. I would have liked to hear him thank me for what I have done for the metropolitan abattoir at Cannon Hill, to make sure that in these difficult times it has been kept viable so that his constituents could work. Many other abattoirs throughout the State have simply closed down. The Cannon Hill one has not, and I assure honourable members that it will not while there are remedies available to me. We have had a big battle to keep that enterprise in business, and the fight will continue.

Tonight's discussion has been useful, and I thank all honourable members for their preparation for and contribution to it. The suggestions have been helpful, and there seems to be a consensus in the House relative to the legislation.

Motion (Mr Ahern) agreed to.

COMMITTEE

Mr Akers (Pine Rivers) in the chair
 Clauses 1 and 2, as read, agreed to.
 Bill reported, without amendment.

THIRD READING

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

AGRICULTURAL STANDARDS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

SECOND READING—RESUMPTION OF DEBATE

Debate resumed from 17 March (see p. 313) on Mr Ahern's motion—

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

Mr BLAKE (Bundaberg) (8.47 p.m.): The present Agricultural Standards Act is a consolidation of former Acts, all of which were of considerable importance to primary industry. Consolidation of the Stock Foods Act, the Fertilisers Act, the Seeds Act, the Pest Destroyers Act and the Veterinary Medicines Act in the present Act indicates the wide spectrum of important agricultural activity and products encompassed and controlled by that Act.

The 60 matters listed in the analysis of the Bill to amend the Act indicates the scope of the amendments proposed. I suppose it is fair to say that perhaps they also

indicate that there has been no major amendment to the Act since 1953, and that has contributed to the great number of amendments now deemed necessary.

At first sight, the number and scope of amendments provided for in this Bill were quite daunting. However, after studying the Bill in detail, the Opposition is satisfied that, in the main, the many amendments listed are machinery in nature and are designed not to alter greatly but to facilitate the processes of the present Act. By and large, these have stood the test of time and have provided effective control over a very wide, varied and essential range of products that service the rural sector.

It is absolutely essential that the desired standards of stock foods, stock medicines, fertilizers, herbicides, nematicides, pest destroyers and other agricultural chemicals be supervised and maintained. It is equally essential that supervision of the packaging and of the description of the contents of these products be scrutinised in the public interest. That is essential to ensure the efficacy of the products and, where potentially dangerous chemicals are concerned, also the health and safety of not only the user but also the consumer. I say that because some people might misconstrue the purpose of the present Bill when I talk about the value of the packaging and the correct description of these products catered for in the Bill.

I make it quite clear—it is something that I myself had overlooked—that the correct description and correct directions for use on any package do not necessarily contribute to the correct use of the product by the user. I had a complaint made to me some time ago—actually it was an inquiry in the first instance—concerning whether or not DDT or DDT products were outlawed for pest control or use on food crops in Queensland. When I inquired of the correct department and was able to inform the person that it was not outlawed under our laws, he said, "Why doesn't the Government provide supervision whenever such a dangerous chemical is used?" I had to explain to him that it would indeed solve the unemployment problem if we could appoint sufficient people as agricultural inspectors to see that every potentially dangerous chemical was used correctly. It is just not humanly possible to do that.

Dr Lockwood: Would you have them killed by the dangerous chemicals?

Mr BLAKE: No, not at all. So many people would have to be appointed as inspectors to cover every occasion on which a dangerous chemical was used that the unemployment pool would be wiped out once enough people had been trained to carry out that supervision.

I had to explain to him that it was not what was on the label that determined the use of the chemical: it was what the person who had control of the chemical decided to do in practical use. Departmental control

exists within the Health Department to inspect produce periodically and see whether or not it contains dangerous residues or dangerous concentrations of any such chemical. That, I think, is something that many people overlook.

The important thing is how much of the chemical gets into the product and becomes a danger to the consumer. The basic essential for this necessary scrutiny and control to maintain agricultural standards is the requirement that all such products be registered. The Opposition accepts the amendments designed to update and streamline the registration procedures. The alteration of reregistration of the same product (or the insignificantly altered product) to triennial registration is also accepted in the interests of administration and common sense, subject, of course, to Agricultural Requirements Board approval.

Many of the amendments are devoted to updating and adding to modern definition. The addition of camel, buffalo and deer to the list defined as "stock" is illustrative of the point I am making. Understandably, those animals escaped attention in the original Act; but undoubtedly they rank as stock now. The occupation of deer farming—should I say the preoccupation of deer farming—puts deer well in the forefront of stock. Camels were used extensively in the past in the arid centre of Australia. The way things are going, there will be a lot of dry gullies to cross, not only by members of the public but also by politicians. Politicians encounter many dry gullies in the course of their careers. I might go so far as to say that if the Fraser Government stays in power we will probably all be reverting to camels to cross the many dry gullies that will have to be negotiated in the near future. If that eventuates, I would not be surprised, either, if a tax on camels was introduced in the Federal House.

The Opposition accepts the amendments designed to update and streamline these registration and reregistration procedures. The Bill provides for better definitions of chemicals such as weedicides, herbicides and insecticides, and a relatively new term, nematocides. It provides also for a better definition of the officers engaged in the investigation and maintenance of present and, we hope, improving agricultural standards.

The definition referring to changes in personnel is more in keeping with today's departmental structure and with departmental and industry nomenclature.

Further delegation of powers by the Minister, the board, the standards officers and others is understandable, particularly in view of the proliferation of products and the growth of departments. By that I mean the size and expanded function of departments. I am not referring to any proliferation of departments.

We sincerely hope that the delegation of powers to less-senior officers will not result in any less-stringent investigation with

respect to the efficacy of agricultural requirements. It is essential that the need for inspection of products for registration purposes be stressed. The need for continuing inspection of products in use must be emphasised and such inspection must be foolproof in screening out false claims by people who submit agricultural products for registration.

I notice that the penalties have been increased considerably. The increases vary from double to fivefold. I do not know whether the increases in penalties are related to inflation or to the increased cost of enforcement of the provisions. Perhaps they have been worked out as the result of a greater number of people submitting products to the market. In any event, the Opposition accepts that it is necessary to increase penalties in the interests of maintaining agricultural standards and avoiding any deterioration that might occur in relation to them.

Mr Ahern: Thirty years is all it is. Thirty years is the review.

Mr BLAKE: I realise that, but I notice that the multiplication factor varies greatly in relation to the penalties. That is what gave rise to some speculation on the part of the Opposition.

It is essential that this screening continue. With the chemicals that are available today, perhaps it will become even more stringent than before. That is in the best interests of the user and also the consumer. Their health and safety must be assured.

I have spoken about the need to prevent deception in the formulation and presentation of such essential products. I know that it becomes more difficult to perform those functions and that their performance requires more personnel, particularly more skilled personnel. However, the necessity for those functions will become greater with the wider use of what I would term more complicated materials and chemicals in the products that are now used in pest control, growth stimulation, growth inhibition, herbicides and so on. If any deception in the formulation or preparation of products essential to production, pest control or disease control is allowed, the results of such dishonesty could be enormous for both the primary producer and the consumer. The Opposition supports the principle of the Bill.

Dr LOCKWOOD (Toowoomba North) (9.1 p.m.): Some of the provisions in the Bill are long overdue. I wish to refer to the accumulating number of products on the market for which there is no accompanying instruction as to the precise treatment or first aid in the case of swallowing. The number of drugs is accumulating at such a rate that even a paper-back handbook on poisoning cannot include all those in use. In our part of the world, the Wheat Board, in its search for perfect pesticides, is using some that are not included in the book. It is

difficult to obtain swift and accurate reference to the toxic effects of the insecticides used. I would like to see all products used with prior approval labelled with a list of the known acute and chronic side-effects.

Mr Moore: And the symptoms.

Dr LOCKWOOD: And the symptoms.

If that were done, workmen could quite readily establish whether they were suffering from side-effects from using the poison. One case in Toowoomba springs to mind. A man had a crop of vesicles on his skin for which there was no apparent medical cause. He had quite an extensive period on workers' compensation. The best it could be put down to was contact with a chemical he had been using. But that chemical was not included in the booklet. Some of the past effects of the haphazard use of chemicals have led to death. The parathion sandwich was one that caused a great hue and cry. Parathion was an extremely effective insecticide for tomato crops. When it first came out workers who handled it were not warned individually of the dangers. If they took a sprayed tomato for their lunch they could be dead within 20 minutes. The whole point is that there was little any doctor could do to assist those who were affected. They would soon use up all of the atropine that a doctor would carry in his emergency bag but still be in severe respiratory trouble.

Mr R. J. Gibbs: You won't tell them that about uranium, will you?

Dr LOCKWOOD: No, I won't tell anyone, but the honourable member can refer to it in his speech.

Mr R. J. Gibbs: Of course you won't; you like the dollars instead.

Dr LOCKWOOD: The honourable member can go out and lead a march now on the highway.

Mr Hooper: It is too dark.

Dr LOCKWOOD: He can put on his dark suit when he does it.

Over the years these products have been refined to the stage where a much lower toxicity can be used. That can only be commended. We must be sure that the people who use the products referred to by the honourable member for Bundaberg know what they are handling. They have to know exactly how to use them. I do not doubt that employers of people in the West knew what to do with diazinon dusting powder that is used on lambs when they are marked. The powder was put in Pablo coffee bottles, and six or eight large holes were punched in the top with a screwdriver. The dust was then shaken onto lambs after they were marked. In the course of days the dust would spread over the men's skin. They worked in shorts in hot weather and the dust was absorbed through their skin. They also inhaled it. It would get onto their

waterbags and be absorbed through the waterbag. In a small country hospital I saw workmen as white as a piece of paper, short of breath and sweaty. The number of cases ran the hospital out of atropine.

Mr Hooper: Was that at Dirranbandi?

Dr LOCKWOOD: That was at Dirranbandi. Even in places like Dirranbandi the hospitals carry a large quantity of atropine.

Mr Booth: It is necessary that hospitals in those places do so.

Dr LOCKWOOD: It is necessary that they have a lot of atropine if these conditions are to continue.

In those days people who knew little about products were allowed to use them. A recent practice that must be encouraged—and perhaps the Minister would consider including it in the regulations—is that adopted by some of the better known suppliers of chemicals who attach to the side of the package a booklet setting out the precautions that must be taken, whether it be a mask, protective clothing, or gloves, the precise mode of administration of the toxic product and something about the nature of the poison.

Mr Moore: You talk about advertising. They advertise Baygon and spray it all round a kid's cubby-house. That is the last thing that anyone would want to do with it.

Dr LOCKWOOD: That is the point. Baygon is toxic and the responsible people in the chemical industry are concerned about it. A lot of people are concerned about its toxicity. Its use should be more restricted than it is.

I return to my point. If responsible manufacturers attach a booklet to the side of the package, it is available to the person who actually uses the product. I commend to the Minister the introduction of that practice.

Hon. M. J. AHERN (Landsborough—Minister for Primary Industries) (9.7 p.m.), in reply: I thank the honourable members for Bundaberg and Toowoomba North for their contributions to the debate. As I said during my second-reading speech, the amendments before the House are the result of a major consultative review which has been going on in respect of this legislation. Such a review has not been conducted since 1953. There has been quite a deal of consultation with Federal and State officers and those who are affected by the legislation. It is interesting to note that, after almost 30 years of the operation of the legislation, the amendments are so few.

The major amendment enables the Agricultural Requirements Board to take into consideration matters other than the efficacy of the requirement concerned when considering the registration of the requirement. That will widen the powers of the board tremendously. It will enable the board to consider matters such as the effect on the environment and the other effects which,

to date, it has not been able to consider, because of the strict nature of the definition of the board's powers. The board was restricted to determining the efficacy of the chemical concerned. I think that is the widest amendment contained in the Bill. I believe that it will be well received in the community. It has been sought by various groups.

The honourable member for Bundaberg raised his eyebrows about the penalties. Frankly, there is no problem here. The penalties have not been reviewed since 1953, and they were reviewed in the light of comparable penalties in other statutes. It was decided that, because of changes in the intervening 30 years, those penalties are appropriate today.

Both honourable members who participated in the debate said quite rightly that the main problem with agricultural requirements or chemicals that are distributed for one reason or another—for agricultural or any other purpose—is not the constituent at all; that it is the distribution, the use, of the particular chemical that is the problem.

So that all of the hullabaloo about the danger of various chemicals is really not the point at issue. The point at issue is the way it is used, the strength at which it is used, and so on. Very dangerous chemicals can be used quite safely under certain conditions if they are used by trained operators under strict control. The community generally gets emotional about this matter from time to time. It does not really assess the situation sensibly. It looks at some chemicals, alleges that a deleterious effect is created by them, and then determines that their use should be banned completely. If there is a problem, and it is demonstrated, then it should be tackled in relation to conditions concerning its distribution. Both honourable members highlighted this particular question. In fact it is true, and therein lies the problem. It was good to see it canvassed in this way as this is where sensible, rational people who are considering these problems have to settle it. It is pertinent to the problem of distribution and to the problems of the people involved.

I point out for the benefit of the honourable member for Toowoomba North that the actual labelling of agricultural requirements is a matter that is covered by the Poisons Regulations administered by the Health Department. The honourable member for Bundaberg indicated Opposition support for the amendments. I think there is general support in the House for the review, which has not taken place since 1953. I thank honourable members for their co-operation.

Motion (Mr Ahern) agreed to.

COMMITTEE

Mr Powell (Isis) in the chair; Hon. M. J. Ahern (Landsborough—Minister for Primary Industries) in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 11, as read, agreed to.

Clause 12—Repeal of ss. 16, 17 and 18 and new ss. 16, 16A, 17 and 18—

Mr SCASSOLA (Mt Gravatt) (9.12 p.m.): I move the following amendment—

“At page 9, line 39, after the word ‘accordingly’ add the words—

‘and shall, at the request of the applicant, furnish him with the bases on which the recommendation was made.’”

The proposed new clause enables the board, amongst other things, to have regard to matters other than matters of efficacy, as the Minister has already pointed out. In making that determination under clause 18 (3), the board can have regard to opinions or to reports from other bodies which, in its opinion, it considers competent to furnish an opinion or make a recommendation, so that becomes a fairly subjective matter.

It seems to me that, if that clause were to remain as it is, coupled with subclause (6), the applicant, who would be the person affected by a determination not to grant registration, would not have the basis of the decision and could be prejudiced in that respect in that he may be precluded from access to the ordinary courts of law.

The proposed amendment, in my view, does two things. Firstly, it gives him the basis of the decision of the board, and to that, I suggest, he would be morally entitled anyway, and it would certainly cement, as it were, his right of access to the courts. So it is really a technical amendment.

Mr AHERN: Since the printing of the Bill, I have had an opportunity to discuss this amendment with the honourable member. To date, it has been the practice of the Agricultural Requirements Board to supply reasons when a registration is refused. The honourable member's amendment is designed to give legislative backing to that practice. He rightly points out that where the Agricultural Requirements Board decides, for whatever reason, that it is not going to supply reasons, that will interfere with the applicant's legal remedies. Whilst it has been the practice of the board to supply reasons to date, it is reasonable that that provision be included in the legislation so that those remedies will be available to any applicant who is aggrieved by the board's refusal of his registration.

I propose to accept the honourable member's amendment, and I thank him for his consideration of the matter. I believe that the amendment will improve the Bill.

Amendment (Mr Scassola) agreed to.

Clause 12, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 13 to 60, as read, agreed to.

Bill reported, with an amendment.

THIRD READING

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

QUEENSLAND TOURIST AND TRAVEL
CORPORATION ACT AMENDMENT
BILL

SECOND READING—RESUMPTION OF DEBATE

Debate resumed from 17 March (see p. 329) on Mr Elliott's motion—

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

Mr **WARBURTON** (Sandgate) (9.19 p.m.): The Bill now before the House seeks to amend the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation Act 1979 in order to overcome what the Minister has referred to as a deficiency in the Act regarding a possible employment situation. Honourable members will no doubt recall that the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation Bill, which was introduced into the Parliament by the then Minister for Maritime Services and Tourism (Mr Max Hodges) in April 1979, was the subject of a very lengthy debate.

The principal issues raised by the Opposition at that time related to the merit or otherwise of the establishment of the corporation and the protection of the rights of employees. The subsequent legislation, which the Government now seeks to amend, saw an end to the Queensland Government Tourist Bureau and the Department of Tourism in the forms that they had taken over a period of many years and the coming about of a further statutory authority known as the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation.

We are now debating unique and extraordinary proposals destined to become part of this State's legislation. The Minister stated in his second-reading speech that the purpose of the Bill is to safeguard employment rights for those public servants who, after 1 August this year when the corporation operates as an independent employer, may be dismissed or retrenched by the corporation. Foremost in the mind of the Minister would no doubt be the difficulties that both he and the Government would face if on 1 August there was a mass exodus of employees from the corporation. By Cabinet decree the corporation's staff ceiling is currently 259, and one could imagine the Government's dilemma should a sizeable proportion of those 259 opt to stay with the Public Service.

So it is reasonable that the Minister and his Government should take steps to ensure that the public servants now with the corporation, and who wish to stay with the corporation after the cut-off date of 1 August, have their superannuation and other employment rights well protected. It needs to be said that the Minister who introduced the original Bill in April 1979 assured this Parliament "that the rights and privileges of public servants will be handsomely protected under the provisions of the Bill." When Mr Hodges outlined the main provisions of the 1979 Bill he mentioned the fact that public servants

working in what was the Department of Tourism were to be transferred to the corporation on secondment for a period of two years during which they would have the opportunity to make an election as to whether they wished to remain in the Public Service, otherwise they would become employees of the corporation at the expiration of the two year period. He then said, "The rights of public servants involved in the rearrangement in respect of leave and superannuation will be fully protected." So at that time the Minister left no doubt in anybody's mind that the public servants involved in the change-over had no need whatsoever to be concerned about their employment rights. Now the present Minister admits that a deficiency exists in the Act and that there is a need to amend the current legislation to protect the superannuation and employment rights of employees who may, after the cut-off point of 1 August 1981, be retrenched or dismissed by the corporation.

I said previously that this was an extraordinary proposal under debate in that any subsequent legislation will provide that an employee who elects to be employed by the corporation shall be readmitted to the Public Service if at any time up to the day of that employee's retirement at 65 years of age the employee is either dismissed or retrenched by the corporation. So in that respect it is unique and extraordinary. To the best of my knowledge the Government has broken new ground with this proposal. It should be noted that the employee is not being given the right of choice in this matter. In other words, the employee cannot chose of his own volition to leave the corporation after 1 August and join the Public Service; his return will completely depend upon his being sacked or retrenched by the corporation. So we will no doubt see a number of the present employees of the corporation, whether it be in five, ten or twenty years' time, taking advantage of the proposed legislation and returning to the Public Service. This is, of course, a very acceptable and noticeable precedent in industrial relations. Obviously it will be expected—certainly expected by the Opposition—that the Government will agree to similar provisions on future occasions when similar circumstances arise.

It is interesting to note that the Government did not see fit to apply the same benefits to those public servants who were required to make the same type of employment decisions in the electrical industry in 1976. Honourable members will recall that State electricity employees—public servants—were in the very same boat, but they were not given the same opportunity, following the cut-off point, to decide to return to the Public Service upon dismissal; nor have public servants who were required to make a choice of employment when colleges of advanced education became autonomous been given the opportunity to automatically return to the Public Service upon retrenchment or dismissal. So it is something like

fish of one and fowl of another on the part of this Government. Thankfully, a precedent has been set. We hope that in the future we will see this type of provision adopted.

While the Minister is no doubt pre-occupied with the worry of keeping employees with the corporation, I would ask him to give some thought to the possibility of the corporation's going overboard with retrenchments, as it is in the fortunate position of knowing that retrenched employees will be automatically taken back into the Public Service, with no chance whatsoever of industrial backlash. The Minister may like to comment in his reply on his reaction to what some of the corporation employees fear as a possible weeding out of those people no longer required because of age or other reasons. In other words, the Government has given this right to the corporation—a right the corporation obviously believes it has, in any case—and having exercised that right on a few occasions so far, the Public Service is bound under this proposed legislation to take those employees back immediately. I have no argument with the provisions of the Bill, although the Queensland State Service Union and the corporation's welfare committee were hopeful that the Bill would go further than it actually does.

We hear much from this Liberal-National Party Government about the importance of good industrial relations and of consultation between interested parties. It is a great pity that on most occasions this Government does not practise what it preaches. The Queensland State Service Union and the welfare committee of the corporation heard of the Bill's being introduced into the Parliament because of my advice to them last week by telephone. Fortunately, that telephone communication allowed the union's officers to hold urgent discussions with the corporation's welfare committee. It would be a bitter disappointment, I would suggest, to the Queensland State Service Union that the Opposition spokesman for Tourism and not the Minister for Tourism was the person who conveyed to them the advice (for which they were very grateful) which allowed them to discuss the proposed legislation that will have a very marked effect upon their members' conditions of employment.

Whether the proposal will bring about the Government's desired result remains to be seen. There is a very strong opinion that it will not. In its own words, the union considers that the proposed changes will not be sufficient to retain those existing staff who are public servants on secondment and that a great majority of those experienced officers will be applying to the Public Service Board for reappointment to other Public Service departments.

I suppose it is reasonable for me to say that we would hope that that would not

happen. Nevertheless, it is certainly a fear in the mind of the State Service Union and it has been the subject of a good deal of discussion amongst certain sections of employees of the corporation.

To give an example of one matter that was raised with me and concerns the employees—as I have said, some employees are of the opinion that the move made by the Government on this occasion will not solve the problems as they see them—some of the employee disenchantment with the corporation stems from the appointment of outsiders to plum positions. That is what I am told and, in my position, I must take note of such complaints. It has been indicated to me that officers of the corporation were advised about a position as Queensland representative in the Australian Tourist Commission office in Los Angeles. I suggest that that is the type of job that a career employee in the corporation would look to. Subsequently, no applications were called from within the corporation and it was learned that the position had been filled by an ex-TAA employee.

I have raised those issues because we believe they are important. The Opposition hopes that the Government's move will be successful. We do not intend to oppose the Bill in its present form.

Mr JONES (Cairns) (9.32 p.m.): During the passage of the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation Bill in 1979 I acted as Opposition spokesman, so I am mindful of the fact that this is the first Bill brought forward by this Minister. I think I should remind the House of the climate in which the previous Bill was introduced and of the warnings that were issued on that occasion by the Opposition and apparently not heeded.

If the Minister does not want an exodus from the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation back to the Public Service, he should take not only this corrective action but also steps to overcome certain problems to which the honourable member for Sandgate has referred.

To hark back to the climate that prevailed in the Chamber when the original Bill was introduced—I want to quote some of the comments made by the then Minister during the second-reading debate on 26 April 1979. These passages can be found in volume 277 of "Hansard" at pages 4308 and 4309. On that occasion the Minister said—

"Several honourable members expressed concern regarding the fate of public servants presently employed by the Queensland Government Tourist Bureau."

He went on to say—

"They (those members) will see that their fears for these public servants were unfounded; they are handsomely protected."

That comment referred to the employees of the Tourist Bureau.

Later the Minister referred particularly to my remarks and those of the then member for Southport. He said—

"The staff of the Queensland Government Tourist Bureau will get the best of both worlds. For two years they will have a rare opportunity to try out a new career in a private-enterprise atmosphere without detriment to their Public Service rights and privileges."

In the initiation stage, at page 4037 of the same volume of "Hansard", the Minister said—

"Honourable members can be assured that the rights and privileges of public servants will be handsomely protected under the provisions of the Bill."

Later on, he said—

". . . and the right of appeal in respect of appointment to other Public Service positions will be maintained . . . will also be able to continue to participate in the State Service Superannuation Scheme."

On that occasion I said—

"I draw attention to superannuation, employment and promotional opportunities and the placing of these employees outside the Public Service provisions for leave."

I referred to the vagueness in these matters, but the Minister, in reply at page 4309, said at the second-reading stage—

"The rights of public servants involved in the rearrangement in respect of leave and superannuation will be fully protected. They will also have the right of appeal . . ."

The right of appeal was apparently only until such time as their period of secondment finished—two years, or until August this year—and that is what we are trying to correct tonight.

If the then Minister, the Government and the Governor in Council had accepted our point of view and suggestion on that occasion to have an employee and/or a member of the State Service Union (an employee of the Government Tourist Bureau) on the advisory committee or the board, perhaps the situation we are trying to correct tonight would not have arisen. The predicament we are trying to overcome may not have occurred.

At page 4331, in Committee, we debated clause 7 relating to the composition of the board. What we said then still stands. The employees should have the reassurance that the rights to which they thought they were entitled when the legislation was first introduced will now be statutorily established. In other words, the Government is now doing what we told it to do at that time. In his introductory speech the Minister said that while employees are to continue as

contributors to the Public Service Superannuation scheme, the Act does not cover that situation.

The Minister is concerned mainly that the corporation could well lose the services of over half its experienced officers. That is taken from the Minister's speech. He also indicated the problems that would occur in the Public Service, namely, the problem of redeployment in other departments in the service and the situation in which the corporation would be left.

As I said at the commencement of my speech, other corrective action will have to be taken if the Minister wants to fulfil the Government's obligations to these people and to ensure that there is no mass exodus from the Tourist and Travel Corporation to the Public Service. There are apparent anomalies in the new award. The State Service Union has been informed of the situation by the Opposition. It is aware of the problems and it has told us what it thinks could happen. All people working with the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation could be affected by these anomalies.

I cite one of the minor examples. Under the new award, employees required to be absent from their normal place of duty will be remunerated for actual and reasonable expenses incurred during the performance of their duty. Under the old award a rate fixed by the Public Service Board was claimed by the employees. They received so much a day, not the actual expenses incurred. The system was the same as that which applies to a member of Parliament.

That might not sound important, but the corporation designates where the employees stay. For example, employees have to stay at the Canberra Hotel in Brisbane where, I understand, the corporation is entitled to a 50 per cent concession on accommodation. The Canberra Hotel does not provide the most salubrious or modern accommodation and having to use such accommodation is not an inducement to employees to remain in the employment of the corporation.

The new award prescribes for all employees 20 working days' annual leave for each year of service. The old award provided, particularly in the area north of Rockhampton, 25 working days' annual leave. Employees in interstate branches received 25 working days' leave, provided 10 days of the leave were spent in Queensland.

One matter that I raised particularly when the original legislation was being discussed was leave of absence to attend training camps for naval, military or air force service. The new award provides for only two weeks for this purpose in each financial year. The old award provided for four weeks on full pay. These people are expected to attend two camps each of two weeks' duration in each calendar year, so they need the four weeks of leave if they desire to improve their status or keep up with the training program.

An employee of the corporation might be required to serve in any part of Australia or overseas where the corporation has branches or offices. Public servants have the right of selection, to make their own application to go overseas; they cannot simply be drafted to an overseas position.

Some concern has been expressed about using the new award conditions as a lever against employees to force them to resign. That may sound a little extreme but if an employee has a personality clash with someone else or is not the type of employee that the corporation wants with its new image, it is a way of selecting him out. Claims have been made of vendettas being conducted to get rid of the former staff of the Queensland Tourist Bureau. The honourable member for Sandgate cited an example of the fellow in Los Angeles. Another example is the manager at Townsville who was sent to Brisbane against his wishes. Another is staff being asked to submit deployment notices.

Most of the employees of the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation have come from private industry, and the former employees of the Queensland Government Tourist Bureau have not been considered for positions in the higher echelons of the corporation. I again emphasise the point I made in the debate when the corporation was first set up, that there has been nothing done by the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation that the old Queensland Government Tourist Bureau did not do. Of course, the Queensland Government Tourist Bureau was starved for funds.

The problems confronting the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation will have to be resolved. When the corporation was originally set up, we warned the Government that these problems could, and probably would, arise. The Government is now trying to correct the problems by legislation, and I hope it is successful. But it will have to look very closely at the award conditions to ensure that there will not be such a contrast of employment as presently prevails and that employees will be able, without fear, to remain within the service and serve as they wish to serve without losing any of those award conditions that they apparently will lose if they remain within the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation.

Hon. J. A. ELLIOTT (Cunningham—Minister for Tourism, National Parks, Sport and The Arts) (9.46 p.m.), in reply: Firstly, in answer to the honourable member for Sandgate, I think he has to realise that the Government is now leaving absolutely no doubt that the rights of public servants will be handsomely protected. That is the point he was making. When the legislation was first introduced, the former Minister made basically the same point as that made in this debate by the honourable member for Cairns, that is, that at the time the corporation was

set up the officers probably did not recognise the problem either, and as soon as they saw the circumstances that were envisaged in 1979 they then approached the corporation. The Government has now moved to correct the situation that arose.

I do not really see the position of the Port of Brisbane Authority as being very significant, as the two authorities operate in a completely different manner. The Port of Brisbane Authority, or any other authority of a like nature, is a rather conservative body and its employees have fairly secure tenure, whereas one could say that the Tourist and Travel Corporation is involved in a fairly volatile industry and its employees, through the introduction of new technology such as computers, could be retrenched.

Mr Jones: Who raised the matter of the Port of Brisbane Authority?

Mr Warburton: I raised the matter of the State Electricity Commission.

Mr ELLIOTT: I am giving an example. I am trying to point out that the electricity authorities and the Port of Brisbane Authority employ people under very different conditions from those applying to the Tourist and Travel Corporation. Employees of electricity authorities are in what could be described as fairly safe and secure positions and, given the present growth of the industry, this can mean only further opportunities for employment, whereas, because of the nature of the industry, employees of the Tourist and Travel Corporation could, by reason of the introduction of computerisation or for other reasons, find their positions in jeopardy, particularly those lower down the scale. The suggestion is that there will be retrenchments, but I do not think there will be any dismissals except when an employee goes right beyond the charter under which he is employed. I feel that we should look at that situation a little further.

It has been suggested that the corporation's staff, who formerly belonged to the Queensland Government Tourist Bureau, will somehow or other be given fewer opportunities for advancement than other staff. That is really not the case. I believe that there is only one criteria that we can possibly look for, and that is ability. Obviously the person who has the greater ability to take on a job must get any advancement that is offering in the service.

In summing up the Opposition's comments—I obviously played no role in formulating what the previous Minister put forward. I think it is fair to say that none of us envisaged that this problem would arise. It is also fair to say that the union did not recognise the problem at that time. I repeat what I have said: as soon as this problem arose, the union discussed it with the corporation, and I have introduced this Bill into the House in order to overcome the problem.

As has been rightly pointed out, it would be most unfortunate if the majority of the former members of the bureau left the service. That would create two problems. Firstly, we would have to replace very able and capable officers in the corporation. Secondly, because of staff ceilings, the Public Service Board would find itself in a difficult situation. It would have to try to find other positions in the service for these officers. Obviously that would have been an embarrassment.

Now that we have introduced this legislation, I do not believe that large numbers of employees will leave the corporation. In fact, I believe we will find that these people will be to the fore. Some 190 officers on the corporation's staff were previously with the Queensland Government Tourist Bureau. They are some of our most able and capable officers. It is totally without foundation for the Opposition to suggest that they are all in the lower grades.

Mr Jones: We did not say that.

Mr ELLIOTT: The Opposition made that insinuation.

Mr Jones: Come off it!

Mr ELLIOTT: That is what I understood the Opposition to say.

Mr R. J. Gibbs: You never understand very well. We never thought you were over-bright, anyway.

Mr ELLIOTT: I would be a little brighter than the honourable member, but that would not be hard.

As to the suggestion that no-one talked to the union about this problem—my co-ordinator and also senior officers from the corporation discussed with the union the matter that the honourable member has raised.

Mr Warburton: That would be after I had told them the Bill was coming to the House.

Mr ELLIOTT: The representatives from the union were the ones who raised the anomaly with the corporation in the first place. How does the honourable member think that the Bill came to the House if someone did not talk to someone else? I think that that is a rather pointless comment.

Motion (Mr Elliott) agreed to.

COMMITTEE

Mr Row (Hinchinbrook) in the chair;
Hon. J. A. Elliott (Cunningham—Minister for Tourism, National Parks, Sport and The Arts) in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1, as read, agreed to.

Clause 2—Amendment of s. 16; Engagement and employment of staff—

Mr JONES (9.55 p.m.): It is all very well for the present Minister to say that the former Minister was responsible. As Minister for Tourism, he is responsible for the administration of the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation, and he is also responsible for the success or failure of this legislation.

If I interpreted the Minister's second-reading speech correctly, it means that he is concerned about the employment of disgruntled employees who are not suitably placed in the two-year interim period. One can imagine the difficulties that the corporation would face if a great number of employees needed to be so placed.

One of the Minister's considerations must be that people who elected to go to the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation from the Queensland Government Tourist Bureau or the Department of Tourism are now deemed to be new appointees. That is the first thing that must be considered. It has an effect on allowances, and it is one of the reasons why recreation leave has been reduced from five weeks. Some of the employees are aggrieved and there is dissension among experienced officers of the Queensland Government Tourist Bureau.

The honourable member for Sandgate touched on some of these matters. For example, the jobs in Los Angeles and Auckland were not advertised throughout the corporation. The appointee to the job in Los Angeles came from outside the Queensland Government Tourist Bureau.

Mr Elliott: One hopes that the appointee had the greatest ability. I believe that to be the case.

Mr JONES: I do not know the appointee.

All I say is that some people within the Queensland Government Tourist Bureau feel aggrieved and there is dissension within the corporation. The new Minister should make himself aware of that. The appointee to the Auckland position had little more than 12 months' experience in the Queensland Government Tourist Bureau. A job such as that would have been much sought after, and the Minister should take into account the current dissension when dealing with the problem of people who choose to return to the Public Service because they are not "happy in the service", as the saying was a long time ago. The Minister should make himself familiar with what is occurring and ensure that everybody within the corporation has a fair and equal opportunity when appointments are made to such positions. The most efficient and experienced officers should then be appointed. After all, people who have worked for the Queensland Government Tourist Bureau are not simply clerks. They are specialists, and

that is indicated by their classification. Their experience and special ability has enabled them to gain higher classifications. In effect, the staff have to be diplomats, salesmen and personal advisers to travellers. Over a period, they must gain a great deal of experience and knowledge of the country in which they serve and of the State that they have served for a long time. If one fellow has only 12 months' experience and several officers have been there for 25 years, their experience and seniority ought to be taken into consideration.

I know that the Government is looking for bright types with business acumen in the Tourist and Travel Corporation, but the Minister for Tourism has to produce results. In the engagement of staff, I hope he makes sure that he gets the best qualified people and the most acceptable people, taking into consideration the fact that he has to know his troops and keep up morale within the corporation so that staff members do not feel denigrated and inclined to desert him and leave him in the lurch.

Mr ELLIOTT: Obviously, I fully accept that I am responsible. I accept also that responsibility will fall on me for any deficiency in the Act or this amending Bill. I do not duck that responsibility in any way.

I think I answered by interjection the objection to the appointee in America. The honourable member for Cairns suggested that the appointee to Auckland had only 12 months' experience in the Tourist and Travel Corporation. The relevant question is: What experience did the officer have prior to coming to the corporation? It could well be that he had had a wealth of experience in the tourist and travel field with another body or company.

What has to be remembered is that the object of the exercise is to set up the corporation on the most efficient basis—on a private enterprise basis, basically—to allow people to compete in the open marketplace against all the other travel operations in business. The object of the exercise is to sell holidays—in Queensland, in particular—and to put runs on the board. Since the corporation has come into existence, the figures—the runs on the board—show that it has achieved its objective. In fact, the results in February this year were up 32 per cent on those of February last year. Because of the attitudes and the methods being used in the corporation, that is the sort of result we are getting.

The employees have had a unique opportunity to test the water, as it were, for a period of two years until 1 August 1981. Having had that opportunity, if they do not like the terms and conditions of that employment, they may opt out if they so desire. All we are seeking to do is to cover those people who, through no fault of their own, are retrenched or dismissed for some reason. This will ensure that they are retained under the Public Service Act on the conditions of their prior employment.

Clause 2, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 3 and 4, as read, agreed to.

Bill reported, without amendment.

THIRD READING

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

RECIPROCAL ENFORCEMENT OF JUDGMENTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Hon. S. S. DOUMANY (Kurilpa—Minister for Justice and Attorney-General), by leave, without notice: I move—

“That leave be granted to bring in a Bill to amend the Reciprocal Enforcement of Judgments Act of 1959 in certain particulars and for a related purpose.”

Motion agreed to.

FIRST READING

Bill presented and, on motion of Mr Doumany, read a first time.

SECOND READING

Hon. S. S. DOUMANY (Kurilpa—Minister for Justice and Attorney-General) (10.8 p.m.): I move—

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

The purpose of this Bill is to overcome a situation which has been existing for some time, in that Australian expatriates have avoided taxation due to the Papua New Guinea Government by returning to Australia with large sums of money on which the appropriate taxation has not been paid.

As the law presently stands, a Papua New Guinea creditor or plaintiff in a civil action has two possible courses of action open to him when attempting recovery from a debtor who is resident in Australia. Firstly, if the cause of action on which his claim is based arose within Papua New Guinea, he may commence proceedings in the National Court of Papua New Guinea. He would then proceed in the normal manner and, if successful in proving his case, he would obtain judgment. Relying on the provisions of the court rules, the judgment could then be enforced by the courts of the relevant jurisdiction in Australia. That is, under the Reciprocal Enforcement of Judgments Act, the judgment could be registered and enforced in the State or Territory where the defendant was resident.

Alternatively, if the cause of action did not arise in Papua New Guinea, or simply as a matter of choice, the same plaintiffs may commence proceedings in the courts of the jurisdiction where the defendant resides. The court would then apply the rules of

conflict of laws to determine the applicable law. Whichever course the plaintiff chooses, his claim can be scrutinised by the court in which he seeks to recover.

The important point of law which this Bill deals with is that, if the Papua New Guinea plaintiff happens to be a revenue authority, his claim will not be allowed irrespective of which of the above methods he adopts. If he obtains judgment in Papua New Guinea and seeks to enforce it in one of the Australian courts he will be met by section 4 subsection 3(B) of the Reciprocal Enforcement of Judgments Act, which specifically excludes claims "being a sum payable in respect of taxes or other charges of a like nature or in respect of a fine or other penalty."

If he adopted the second approach and sued directly in an Australian court, the claim would be met by the rule of common law, given statutory recognition in the Reciprocal Enforcement of Judgments Act, that one State will not enforce another State's revenue laws.

This problem was first raised by Papua New Guinea at the meeting of the Standing Committee of Attorneys-General held in Perth in November 1977. The problem then received detailed consideration by the members of that committee.

As a result of that consideration, the Parliamentary Counsel's Committee was instructed in July 1979 to draft legislation suitable for use as a model by all Australian jurisdictions to give effect to the decisions of Ministers in this matter. The draft legislation, after having been considered in detail by the Standing Committee of Attorneys-General, was limited specifically to taxes on income.

Under the Bill, recoverable tax is defined as tax payable under the laws of Papua New Guinea relating to taxes on income but does not include additional or other tax payable, by way of penalty, interest or otherwise or tax of a class or description for the time specified by the Governor in Council by Order in Council not to be a recoverable tax.

The Bill also provides that the Governor in Council may by Order in Council vary or revoke the class or description of tax defined as a recoverable tax. This provision is necessary as there may be some objection in the future if a tax were applied which was regarded in Australia as being either harsh or oppressive. At the present time there is substantial similarity in relation to taxation between Papua New Guinea and Australia.

A further point which I would like to draw to the attention of honourable members is that the provisions of the Bill will apply only to those revenue judgments given in Papua New Guinea after the coming into operation of the Bill.

As honourable members would realise, this Bill has been thoroughly scrutinised by all the appropriate Governments, and it is agreed that this legislation is highly desirable and necessary. Similar legislation is currently being introduced in all Australian States and Territories and has already been passed in Tasmania and Western Australia.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate, on motion of Mr R. J. Gibbs, adjourned.

APPEAL COSTS FUND ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Hon. S. S. DOUMANY (Kurilpa—Minister for Justice and Attorney-General), by leave, without notice: I move—

"That leave be granted to bring in a Bill to amend the Appeal Costs Fund Act 1973 in certain particulars."

Motion agreed to.

FIRST READING

Bill presented and, on motion of Mr Doumany, read a first time.

SECOND READING

Hon. S. S. DOUMANY (Kurilpa—Minister for Justice and Attorney-General) (10.12 p.m.): I move—

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

The Appeal Costs Fund Act which came into operation on 1 July 1974, established an Appeal Costs Fund in Queensland. The Act provides for the issue of an indemnity certificate by the court. This certificate entitles a respondent in the circumstances provided for in the Act to be paid certain costs from the Appeal Costs Fund.

Section 16 (1) (a) of the Act provides that a respondent to an appeal that has been granted is entitled to be paid from the Appeal Costs Fund an amount equal to the appellant's costs ordered to be paid and actually paid by or on behalf of the respondent.

The regulations provide that an applicant under this section shall lodge with his application, where the applicant's costs have been ordered to be taxed, the certificate of taxation.

In instances where a respondent applies for payment of an appellant's costs from the fund and where the court has ordered that the appellant's costs be taxed, a payment can be made only if the costs are taxed. This procedure could prove expensive and cause considerable delay.

In most appeals, solicitors for the parties agree on the costs without the necessity for taxation. This Bill therefore proposes to

amend section 16 (1) (a) to enable the Appeal Costs Board to pay the respondent an amount equal to the appellant's costs as taxed or agreed upon by—

- (a) the board;
- (b) the respondent or the respondent's solicitor; and
- (c) the appellant or the appellant's solicitor,

and actually paid by or on behalf of the respondent.

The proposed amendment will involve a considerable saving of expense and thereby assist in the preservation of the Appeal Costs Fund itself.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate, on motion of Mr R. J. Gibbs, adjourned.

AUCTIONEERS AND AGENTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Hon. S. S. DOUMANY (Kurilpa—Minister for Justice and Attorney-General), by leave, without notice: I move—

“That leave be granted to bring in a Bill to amend the Auctioneers and Agents Act 1971–1980 in certain particulars.”

Motion agreed to.

FIRST READING

Bill presented and, on motion of Mr Doumany, read a first time.

SECOND READING

Hon. S. S. DOUMANY (Kurilpa—Minister for Justice and Attorney-General) (10.17 p.m.): I move—

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

The purpose of this Bill is to amend the Auctioneers and Agents Act so that court bailiffs appointed under the Sheriff's Act of 1875, the District Courts Act 1967–1980 or the Magistrates Courts Act 1921–1976, are excluded from the definition of “commercial agent” as defined in section 5 of the Act.

Under the present provisions of this section, it appears that a court bailiff who serves any writ, summons or other court process in a private capacity, is required to be registered as a commercial agent. The present exclusionary provisions of the section do not apply.

The general practice throughout the State for some time has been that solicitors requiring service of a plaint and summons in a foreign court could, if desired, file the documents in a home court, withdraw the service copies for private service, and then forward them direct to a process-server. Should the process-server be the bailiff of a court,

arrangements are made direct with that person including the payment of service fees. Such practice obviates the necessity to record the service of such process in the records of a magistrates court and also eliminates correspondence between the registrar and the solicitor.

It is not proposed that the present long-standing practice of private service by a court bailiff be discontinued. However, it is considered that a court bailiff should not have to register as a commercial agent when serving process in a private capacity.

Finally, the Bill amends section 92 of the Act which deals with entries in a licensee's books deemed made by him. This amendment is purely a drafting amendment which does not alter the effect of the section but simply clarifies its meaning.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate, on motion of Mr R. J. Gibbs, adjourned.

SELECT COMMITTEE OF PRIVILEGES

Mr WARNER (Toowoomba South) (10.18 p.m.): I move—

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

(2) That the committee consist of the Honourable J. W. Greenwood, Messrs Hansen, Innes, Neal, Powell, Prest and the mover;

(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."

The Opposition indicated a desire to debate my notice of motion for the appointment of an all-party Select Committee of Privileges to consist of members appointed by the three parties involved. Why such a debate is to take place tonight will be revealed only when Opposition members speak in the House, and I can only guess their motive.

If members of the Opposition intend to take this opportunity to again bring disrespect to this House or try to damage the good name or reputation of anyone, I believe they should be brought to order.

Let me remind members that if such a course is followed Mr Speaker has the absolute discretion to judge the merits or otherwise of such a debate, especially if the reputation of a member of this House is involved. Unfortunately past performances of some members of this House have damaged the stature and credibility of the Parliament, and this must no longer be tolerated. I hope that will not happen tonight.

It is of the utmost importance, of course, that this select committee be re-established for the life of this Parliament. I do not believe that any further comment is necessary at this time. I commend the motion.

Mr HANSEN (Maryborough) (10.20 p.m.): The Committee of Privileges is very important because it safeguards the rights of members as well as the rights of those outside the House. It has a very important role to play in ensuring that the privileges of the Parliament are not abused. We see the need for an additional Opposition member on the committee so that the Opposition

and the Government have equal membership. Equal membership would reflect the equal importance of the Government and Opposition in the House. At the same time the Government would have the majority in the person of the chairman.

The committee should be non-political in its deliberations. I believe this has been demonstrated on a number of occasions when members did not act or vote along political lines. Of course, I do not believe that they should. There should be equal representation from both the Government and the Opposition on the committee, thus recognising the role of both in the working of the Parliament. We have looked at ways of including another Opposition member on the committee, but I understand that this is not possible unless we delete the name of a member already on the committee and replace it with the name of a member of our choice. For that reason I move the following amendment—

"In paragraph (2) omit the words—

'the Honourable J. W. Greenwood'

and after the word 'Prest' insert the word—

'Wright'."

Amendment (Mr Hansen) negatived.

Motion (Mr Warner) agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

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

"That the House do now adjourn."

COMMONWEALTH GAMES MASCOT

Mr BURNS (Lytton) (10.23 p.m.): I want to deal briefly with the decision of the Commonwealth Games Foundation announced last night on the mascot for the 1982 Commonwealth Games. It is to be a kangaroo and will be produced in Korea. It seems to me that that is a slur on the workers of this country and a slur on each and every one of us who has been involved in asking the people of this nation to spend \$30m in promoting the idea of the Commonwealth Games. As I understand it, we took \$10m from the ratepayers of Brisbane, \$10m from the Queensland Government—which came from the Queensland taxpayers—and \$10m from the Federal Government paid by Australian taxpayers, so many of us paid three times. A decision was made to invite the Commonwealth Games organisers to hold their games here. The idea was to promote our city and our country as well as Australian workmanship and sporting facilities, and our sportsmen and sportswomen.

This is the International Year of Disabled Persons and we are looking for worthwhile work that can be done by disabled people, particularly young disabled people. We ought to look very closely at this decision of the

Commonwealth Games Foundation, because it said that the reason a souvenir could not be produced in Australia was that it could not find anyone to do the work. I do not believe that. Too many decisions made by the Commonwealth Games Foundation are made without consultation, other than with a few people at the foundation's headquarters.

I do not believe that the foundation called public tenders for these mascots. I looked back through the newspapers over the last few months and could find no evidence of public tenders being called by the Commonwealth Games Foundation for the manufacture in this State of mascots. I do not know whether the foundation contacted the Department of Commerce and Industry. Surely the department would be able to tell us whether anybody contacted it. On television tonight a Mr Watts from a sheltered workshop on the Gold Coast said he felt that the sheltered workshops in this nation could make the number of mascots required.

The person who is obviously the spokesman for the Commonwealth Games Foundation seems to be a salesman for the firm concerned. The article in this morning's "Courier-Mail" stated that between 100 000 and 250 000 mascots would be produced and that they would be made in Hong Kong and Korea. Tonight we are told that more than 250 000 will be required. So the figure has increased from 100 000 to 250 000, to more than 250 000. We are told that Australia is not capable of developing the techniques to manufacture 250 000 stuffed kangaroo mascots between now and the Games next year. Quite truthfully, I think that is laughable. The people at the Commonwealth Games Foundation are laughing at each and every one of us.

I believe that the injection of a small amount of money for the manufacture of these mascots would not only help the sheltered workshops of this nation to produce stuffed mascots but also develop an industry in the tourist industry itself. Just about every souvenir that we try to sell to tourists in this city was made in Korea, Japan, Hong Kong, Taiwan or some other country. This might be the needle we need to say, "Let's spend a few bob in the sheltered workshops at Toowoomba, on the Gold Coast and here in Brisbane." Perhaps we could contact the sheltered workshops throughout this nation and get together a group of people who could organise those sheltered workshops so that they could produce the 250 000 kangaroo mascots that are required. Not only would that be an indication from this community that we can do it and that we are proud to have them made in Australia but also it would involve those disabled people in this, the International Year of Disabled Persons, in the production of the mascots. There would be two advantages: it would give those people an opportunity to become involved in the Games—they will not be involved in

them in many other ways. They could produce similar articles in the future for the tourist industry.

Some say that it is a matter of price. Those who will spend \$2,000 or \$3,000 to fly to Australia to have a holiday and to attend the Games would not quibble about paying an extra dollar for a souvenir. It is said that we cannot get quality control in Australia. Anybody who has walked around the back streets of Hong Kong could hardly say that we cannot provide goods of a like or better quality than that of many of the goods produced in backyards over there. We have evidence of shoddy, dangerous stuffed toys from these countries.

(Time expired.)

ATTACK BY MEMBER FOR ARCHERFIELD ON LIONS CLUBS

Mr MUNTZ (Whitsunday) (10.28 p.m.): I rise in the defence of Lions International and all community service clubs, and on their behalf demand a public apology from the Leader of the Opposition following last week's blatant and personal attack on Lions clubs by the honourable member for Archerfield, who is a member of the Opposition shadow ministry. His accusations made under privilege and in the security of this Parliament are refuted by all Queenslanders. Those who agree with his unfortunate outburst could not be considered Queenslanders, as he described all members of Lions clubs as grubby, greedy, small petty businessmen who are very good at spending other people's money, hoodwinked out of their hard-earned money in the name of charity. I shudder at even having to repeat the honourable member's words. I find his statement appalling, disgusting and, if spoken outside this House, libellous. Such comments from Labor benches not only condemn Lions clubs but reflect on all kindred community service clubs, including Apex, Jaycees, Rotary, Interact, Quota, Rotaract, Leos and many others.

Lions and kindred clubs are the life-blood of every community and consist of hard-working volunteers—men, women and youths—with a heavy commitment and yet dedicated to the improvement of their community and its people. Ask any aged or disabled person or a youth. A Lion cares about his community and the world in which he lives. He is interested in its welfare, in its health standards and in its progress.

He does not wait for regressive conditions to be solved by Government or somebody else. He believes that citizens banded together can initiate and carry out programs that will make his community and the world a better place in which to live. A Lion understands that it is his duty to do all he can to help his fellow-man whenever and wherever he is able.

Lions clubs plan and conduct a variety of community and humanitarian projects. These services, often derived from a community

analysis, form broadly-based activities including the establishment of pre-school and glaucoma screening clinics, eye banks, rehabilitation institutes and research centres. Lions clubs support workshops and job replacement programs for the blind, provide leader dogs and other needs. Library, social and other recreational services are sponsored by Lions clubs.

Lions conduct hearing screening programs for children and adults, support a variety of rehabilitation services and provide and repair hearing aids. Lions clubs engage in public education campaigns and vigorously support the concept of full communication rights for the hearing/speech impaired and the deaf. Auditory equipment is furnished to schools having hearing-impaired students and to hearing and speech centres, and scholarships are often issued to children with this handicap.

Lions award hundreds of scholarships every year. Clubs also sponsor career nights at high schools and invite locally prominent people to help graduates plan their futures. Clubs establish literacy programs and vocational training in developing areas of the world, in addition to sponsoring programs which recognise educators and emphasise cultural activities.

Lions work with veterans' organisations and hold special programs of a patriotic and civic nature in their communities. They sponsor numerous youth groups such as Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, Guides and others. Respect for law and work with delinquents are also important programs sponsored by clubs.

Lions provide environmental and public services and contribute to the recreational needs of their fellow-man. How many parks can be seen to be sponsored by Lions clubs? I could go on and on. The important point I make is that many small towns would be deprived of community services had it not been for Lions and kindred service clubs.

I know every Government member supports me in my call for a public apology from the Labor Party to Lions International. Anything less would unfortunately reflect on this House and question the whole concept of parliamentary privilege.

LAND SETTLEMENT

Mr EATON (Mourilyan) (10.33 p.m.): I wish to speak about land settlement as it is a very acute problem in North Queensland, particularly in the Mourilyan electorate.

Since an early age, we have been taught that the land is our heritage. However, not only in my electorate but right throughout North Queensland a lot of people are endeavouring to obtain land on which to raise their families and build a future for their children. That ambition is being hampered by the Government's allowing big companies to take over large areas of cattle land, mining land and land for various other purposes.

The Government has gained much political mileage out of introducing a scheme to help young people get onto the land. While the Labor Party and I are in full agreement with the theme of the scheme, there are a few pitfalls that should be pointed out at this early stage. The first pitfall is that the scheme depends on Federal Government funding. Any person who wishes to take part in the scheme will have to have 30 per cent of a \$200,000 loan. The Federal Government's record of financing projects in Queensland is not very good. If it depends on Federal Government funding, this scheme will not get off the ground.

I believe an alternative is to revert to the old system, with the Agricultural Bank being returned to its old standard of the early days of this Government. At that time land was made available by ballot, which is a system that brings equality to all citizens who wish to have an opportunity to settle on the land and rear their families in that environment.

I wish to refer to a letter and a copy of a map from the Land Administration Commission. They show that a National Party member passed up the opportunity to obtain a lease to enable one of his workers to apply for and get that lease. The employee had four sons whom he wished to establish on the land.

After long years of good and faithful service, the member of the National Party decided to relinquish the lease. The Land Administration Commission wrote to him in the following terms, and I wish to read the letter so that it will be recorded in "Hansard"—

"I refer to your application to acquire part of Occupation License No. 212 Herberton District on which to establish a peanut farm. It has been decided that your application cannot receive favourable consideration.

"It has been decided to determine the whole of Occupation License No. 212 and to seek Executive Authority to offer the areas marked "A" and "B" on the attached plan at auction as Special Lease in terms of Section 203 (a) of the Land Act, 1962-1978.

"You will be supplied with full details of the areas to be sold including time and venue well in advance of the date of sale."

It is signed by the acting secretary. Attached is a map showing that the area of block "A" is 152.6 ha and the area on block "B" is 72.8 ha.

Peanut-growing is a very viable industry at the moment. It is not capital intensive and it still requires a lot of labour. Agricultural pursuits today have a tendency to become capital intensive. These industries require a lot of machinery and financial backing. In this case, however, the land is suitable for peanut-growing and the opportunity is there

—but the Government is ruling out opportunity for a man and his sons to build a future for his family.

However, this applies not only to him; it will also rule out other families and single men in the area who wish to take their place on the land, for the Government intends putting the land up for public auction, which will allow the big-money boys to step in again. Mining companies are interested and have applied for the area for mining purposes. We know what chance the average citizen, whether he be a wage-earner or a small farmer, would have in those circumstances. He just cannot compete with the big companies.

Here is a remarkable opportunity for the Government to come out into the open and show all Queenslanders, but the people of North Queensland in particular, that the land will be made available for ballot and everybody will have an equal chance to obtain land.

Mr Turner: Would that be a living area?

Mr. EATON: It must be; otherwise it would not have been cut into two. At the moment in the peanut-growing industry it would be more than a living area. This is the part that concerns me. Here is a grand opportunity to put people on the land. There are two living areas. If they were put up for ballot, two people would have an equal chance to compete, not on a money basis but on the grounds of suitability, previous effort and experience. It would be a chance to bring back the Agricultural Bank as the institution it once was many years ago when it supported people on the land.

(Time expired.)

SEQEB RETAIL OUTLETS

Mr PRENTICE (Toowoong) (10.38 p.m.): I read tonight's "Telegraph" and, in looking through the pages, I came across advertisements for electrical appliances from Don Stewart & Company, Tandy Electronics, Tracksons and Kennedys—and, lo and behold, I came across a full-page ad from SEQEB. The first question I ask is: What is it doing there? What is SEQEB doing attempting to sell electrical goods in the public market-place? This is a hoary old subject that many people have raised before. Some might ask: Why raise it again? I will raise such matters again and again until the Government and Government instrumentalities get out of the market-place. The simple facts are that where there is a private enterprise alternative, it should be left to private enterprise.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr PRENTICE: If one looks across at this group of old gentlemen, the member for Ipswich West excepted, one sees that they would not be able to run a decent private enterprise.

When one considers the benefits that can accrue to the community from an effective and hard-working small business sector, it is obvious that people and the Government should be prepared to recognise that where private enterprise can do a job, the Government should stay out. All it does by entering the market-place is take the benefits of those sales and that work, and the jobs that go with it, away from private enterprise. All that is left is a giant bureaucracy with a retail arm. The simple facts are that this does not work.

If we leave SEQEB and look at the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation selling travel—

Mr Underwood: What about EDI and the share-buying spree there?

Mr PRENTICE: I do not agree with the Government's entry into the market-place by way of investment corporations. The Government should get out of the market-place. In certain instances, exceptions can be made in order to protect the benefits that some companies do bring to Queensland. However, as a general rule the Government should stay out of the market-place. SEQEB is allowed into the market-place and the Tourist and Travel Corporation is allowed into the market-place. What next? Will the Transport Department be selling petrol and spare parts? Will it sell the Horvath hydrogen car?

Private enterprise can do a better job with a relatively low number of employees. It can do a job that will benefit the whole community because of the flow-on benefits. It can work more efficiently and more effectively. This Government and other Governments should be prepared to recognise that fact and get out of the market-place. If the Government does not do that, Queenslanders will find themselves on the slow road to socialism. And God forbid that that should happen!

SEQEB RETAIL OUTLETS

Mr UNDERWOOD (Ipswich West) (10.41 p.m.): I rise to speak in support of SEQEB retail outlets. SEQEB is a large employer and its retail outlets provide an excellent service. They provide competition in the market-place and enable the Government of the day to keep an overview of retail outlets in the State. Furthermore, they give the Government an insight into the electrical industry and allow it to watch for rip-offs that may occur when there is a monopoly. Unless the Government keeps its finger on the pulse, monopolies may occur. SEQEB's retail outlets can help prevent that occurring.

Some electricity boards have eliminated their retail outlets, to the detriment of the consumers in their areas. Tomorrow I will be attending a meeting with SEQEB in Ipswich, and I shall be looking for its assurance that it will maintain its retail outlets.

They provide excellent opportunities for people employed in the industry; they also provide excellent sales and after-sales service. In fact, SEQEB's service is much better than that given by some of the so-called free-enterprise outlets.

An Opposition Member: It uses proper tradesmen, too.

Mr UNDERWOOD: That is correct. It employs skilled tradesmen rather than fly-by-nighters. It does not subcontract to unqualified persons who are lowering the standards of the electrical trade. In these days of industrial expansion in Queensland, heavy demands are placed upon the electrical and metal trades. Half-baked so-called tradesmen are moving in and lowering the quality of the jobs carried out for the consumers. At the same time, the consumers are paying top prices for poor-quality jobs.

An Opposition Member: Did Mr Prentice mention the Department of Works?

Mr UNDERWOOD: No, he did not, but from his comments I gained the impression that he would like to do away with the Works Department, the Railway Department and other departments, thereby putting thousands of employees out of work.

Mr Vaughan: SEQEB's prices are not always the best, but you can always trust SEQEB.

Mr UNDERWOOD: That is right. SEQEB provides a competitive price. It might be \$5 or \$10 above the price offered by Errol Stewart; but by the time the consumer has a fridge delivered by Errol Stewart, the price is the same as that offered by SEQEB. That is particularly so in Ipswich. Furthermore, the quality of service is lower than that provided by SEQEB. So much for free enterprise!

The honourable member for Toowong has much to learn about his party's policy and that of the Government of which he is a member. Although the National Party claims that it has a free-enterprise outlook, it probably is the most socialistic party to occupy the Government benches since 1957. It has moved into many socialistic enterprises. It has bought out companies and is attempting to set up Government-controlled coal-mining operations.

We must rise in defence of SEQEB and point out the advantages that it offers to the consumers. Often SEQEB competes at a disadvantage in the market-place with large monopolies like Stewarts. Opposition members defend SEQEB and resist any vile attacks on the most welcome service given to consumers in South-east Queensland by SEQEB.

Motion (Mr Wharton) agreed to.

The House adjourned at 10.45 p.m.