

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

WEDNESDAY, 22 AUGUST 1984

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

WEDNESDAY, 22 AUGUST 1984

Mr SPEAKER (Hon. J. H. Warner, Toowoomba South) read prayers and took the chair at 11 a.m.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! For the sake of decorum in the House, I ask Opposition members to contain themselves for a little while.

Mr R. J. Gibbs interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! If the honourable member for Wolston does not contain himself, I will deal with him accordingly.

FILMING OF PARLIAMENTARY PROCEEDINGS

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I wish to inform the House that, tomorrow afternoon during the luncheon period and also at a later date to be arranged, the Production Services Branch of the Education Department will be filming an educational audio-visual presentation on the operation of the Parliament. The completed educational audio-visual presentation will be made available to all schools in the State in due course. I ask for the co-operation of all members during the filming of this project.

ARCHERFIELD BY-ELECTION

Return of Writ

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I have to inform the House that the writ issued by me on 27 April 1984 for the election of a member to serve in the Legislative Assembly for the electoral district of Archerfield has been returned to me with a certificate endorsed thereon by the returning officer of the election, on 19 May 1984, of Heinrich Palaszczuk, Esquire, to serve as such member.

Member Sworn

Mr Palaszczuk was introduced, took the oath of allegiance, and subscribed the roll.

DEATH OF DR D. J. MURPHY, MLA

Return of Writ

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I have to report the receipt from the Registrar-General of a certified copy of the registration of the death, on 21 June 1984, of Dr Denis Joseph Murphy, lately serving in the Legislative Assembly as member for the electoral district of Stafford.

I also inform honourable members that the writ issued by me on 13 July 1984 for the election of a member to serve in the Legislative Assembly for the electoral district of Stafford has been returned to me with a certificate endorsed thereon by the returning officer of the election, on 4 August 1984, of Terence Joseph Gygar, Esquire, to serve as such member.

Mr R. J. Gibbs interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable member for Wolston.

Member Sworn

Mr Gygar was introduced, took the oath of allegiance, and subscribed the roll.

MOTION OF CONDOLENCE**Deaths of Mr E. G. W. Wood, MBE, and Dr D. J. Murphy, MLA**

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

“(1) That this House desires to place on record its appreciation of the services rendered to this State by the late Ernest Gaden Western Wood, Esquire, MBE, a former member of the Parliament of Queensland, and Dr Denis Joseph Murphy, recently serving as member for the electoral district of Stafford.

(2) That Mr Speaker be requested to convey to the widows and families of the deceased gentlemen the above resolution, together with an expression of the sympathy and sorrow of the members of the Parliament of Queensland in the loss they have sustained.”

Ernest Gaden Western Wood was an honoured member of this House as the Country Party member for Logan from 28 May 1966 to 17 May 1969. The news of his death was received with sadness by his friends and constituents, who knew him as their local member, and by the thousands of people in the Redland shire whom he served so diligently and so well on the local council. He was a very close friend of mine and I deeply regret his passing.

Dick Wood, as he liked to be called, was born in Toowoomba in 1906, the son of George Orm Western Wood and Helen Portia Rosalind Davidson. He attended Toowoomba primary and secondary schools. Subsequently he joined the Commercial Banking Company of Sydney, working on the Darling Downs. He left to work with the Australian Pastoral Company and later joined the Lands Department. In 1938, he married Mary Tudor Hill of Thallon.

In 1939, he was seconded to the Commonwealth Government and was sent to the Northern Territory to implement the Payne-Fletcher report for the development of the Territory. He returned to Queensland to become a lands commissioner, serving at Toowoomba, Cloncurry, Roma, Mackay and Brisbane.

Dick Wood came to Wellington Point in August 1952 and was a small crops farmer in the district for 24 years. In 1958, he was elected to the Redland Shire Council and became chairman in 1961. He held this post for seven consecutive terms and saw the area develop from a small rural community to its present status as a satellite city that is growing by the day.

In 1966, he entered this Assembly as the member for Logan, serving the people of the area for three good years. As a member of this House, he quickly won and held the respect of his fellow members, not only for the contributions he made to debate but also for his sincerity, common sense and humility.

He was chairman of the Redland Fruit Growers Council in the 1960s, a member of the parochial council of the Church of England, chairman of the Redlands Strawberry Festival Committee and many other bodies. He was a life member of the Redlands Show Society, the Redlands Tourist Committee, the Redlands Cricketers Club and the Redland Lions Club. Dick Wood gave many years of service to the South Coast Fire Brigades Board and was a member of the board at the time of his death.

In 1976, he was made a member of the Most Excellent Order of the British Empire for outstanding service to local government and community activities.

Dick Wood will long be remembered and praised for his work inside and outside Parliament. I am sure that all members of the House will join me in offering sincere condolences to the widow and family of this true Queenslander.

Denis Joseph Murphy entered this Assembly last year, when he was successful in winning the seat of Stafford at the October election. His death at the age of 47 years was received with great sadness by all members.

He was born in Nambour in 1936, the youngest of eight children. At various times, Denis Murphy worked as a furniture removalist, railway clerk, lift-operator and physical education teacher. He studied as an evening student at university and obtained a Bachelor of Arts degree and a Doctorate of Philosophy. He joined the staff of the History Department of the University of Queensland in 1966, and in 1979 became a reader in history. In 1983 he was a member of the senate. He was to become president of the staff association.

Dr Murphy joined the Australian Labor Party in 1964 and, subsequently, played a significant role within that organisation. He took over the State presidency in Queensland in 1980 and guided the party through a very difficult period.

His illness permitted him to sit in this Chamber only on Tuesday, 22 November, when he was sworn in as a member of the Legislative Assembly, on Tuesday, 27 March, when he was present for the motion of condolence for his parliamentary colleague the late Kevin Joseph Hooper, and on Thursday, 12 April 1984, the last day of the session. All of us who were present on those three days realised how seriously ill he was, and we marvelled at his determination and his fortitude in the face of great adversity.

On behalf of the members of this Assembly, I extend sympathy and condolence to the widow and family of Denis Joseph Murphy.

Mr WRIGHT (Rockhampton—Leader of the Opposition) (11.13 a.m.): I welcome the opportunity to second the motions of condolence that were moved by the Premier to previous members of this Assembly, namely, Dick Wood and Denis Murphy.

As the Premier indicated, Dick Wood was deeply involved with many local organisations in the Redlands area. I met Dick Wood only once. Although I did not know him personally, I was aware from comments made by others that he had a reputation as a strong, tough and determined man, a man of special personality. I understand that he had a special interest in sport, particularly tennis, and that he frequently played on the court at his own home.

Dick Wood was involved in mixed farming. He was well respected for his skills and expertise in that area.

At times he was extremely controversial, particularly at the local government level. He was always prepared to stand up for what he believed was right. He continued to do so after he was defeated at the last local government election and when he lost his seat in this Chamber. Members appreciate that individuals make great contributions. I readily recognise the contribution made by Dick Wood.

Denis Joseph Murphy was a friend. He was a great thinker, a man of great intellect. He had a sense of vision that is absent from many. He was a man of dedication, a man of application and a man of special determination. He served the community well, especially the Australian Labor Party. In 1980, a time of great adversity in the Australian Labor Party, he took his long service leave to work full time for the ALP. He helped to steer a special course that he saw was aggressive and positive for the party's future.

As a pilot, like the Premier, he visited many country areas. He even went into the Premier's own area of Kingaroy.

Denis joined the ALP in 1964. From then until his death he was one of the outstanding contributors to the party, particularly in the development of party policy, determining strategies for elections or simply developing the public perception of the ALP.

He was married, with two children. He was the youngest of eight children, having been born in Nambour. His father owned a horse team in the Palmwoods district. He was forced out of business by mechanisation and the depression and moved from the area and took a job with the railways as a bridge carpenter. He was a member of the Australian Railways Union for almost 30 years.

Denis completed the Senior Public examination in 1954 and went to the Teachers Training College. He studied at night and was awarded a Diploma of Physical Education and the degree of Bachelor of Arts. In 1966 he obtained a position as a tutor at the University of Queensland and completed his doctorate as a part-time student. As the Premier said, he became a Reader (Associate Professor) in History at the Queensland University. Denis's former students include such people as Peter Charlton, Terry Lewis, Mike Evans and Andrew Stewart. On the sporting field, he played A grade cricket with Toombul in Brisbane and reserve grade Rugby Union.

Denis Murphy's main history is one of history itself, for he wrote many books on Queensland and Australian politics and three histories on the trade union movement. In 1976, his biography of Queensland Premier T. J. Ryan was awarded the Australian Literary Foundation Award. His other books include "Queensland Political Portraits", which contains biographies of the 16 most significant political figures in Queensland's political history, and "Labor in Power, the Labor Party and Government in Queensland, 1915-1957" His most recent book was a biography of Bill Hayden, the Foreign Minister in the Federal Labor Government. At the time of his death he was conducting research for a biography of the Labor Prime Minister Andrew Fisher.

Denis Murphy served in many ways. In the Labor Party he served as an elected branch member on the Queensland Central Executive and on the ALP's new State Council from 1968. He attended every Labor-in-Politics Convention and State Conference from 1968 until his untimely death.

Rather than simply put forward my views on what people thought of Denis Murphy, I repeat in the House some of the comments made by people outside the parliamentary sphere and outside the Labor Party. An indication of his academic integrity is reflected first and foremost by Peter Charlton's article in "The Courier-Mail" of 22 June 1984, in which he said—

"I consider myself fortunate to have been one of Denis Murphy's history students. He explained the problems of Australian History in clear and concise detail.

Unlike so many of his contemporaries and colleagues, it was impossible to detect his political preferences from his lectures.

He enjoyed University teaching, and particularly enjoyed lecturing to evening classes with mature students.

Away from the University, he encouraged people to read and understand history and he brought this clear perspective to his political activities. Naturally enough, he specialised in Queensland Political History."

Further recognition of his academic excellence was a response by Dr Brian Coster, Senior Lecturer in Politics at a Victorian institute, who wrote—

"As one who had the privilege to be a student, colleague and friend of the late Dr Denis Murphy, I write to thank publicly Peter Charlton for his sensitive and moving tribute.

With Dr Murphy's passing, Australia has lost an eminent scholar and teacher and an honourable man of public affairs.

As well as being a cause of inestimable grief to his family and close friends, Denis Murphy's premature and cruel death is particularly tragic because, while he had done so much, he had so much yet to do.

Among his many fine books, the one Denis rightly prized the most was his biography of Queensland Premier, T. J. Ryan, of whom he wrote—'Ryan was only 45 when he died. His death was regarded by both the Labor Party and the Labor movement as a grievous blow.' And so should his own.

I know that all of Dr Murphy's friends, former students and colleagues now living interstate would wish to be associated with these sentiments. Many of us owe him much that we can now never repay.

We will, however, honor his memory always."

As a final tribute, I read the words of Don Barrett, secretary of the University of Queensland Academic Staff Association—

"Denis Murphy died on 21 June, 1984. His passing is a grievous loss to the University and to the State.

The last glimpse of Denis for many of us was afforded by the recent interview conducted by Quentin Dempster on Nationwide. That interview revealed a number of qualities for which he was long renowned: High intelligence, lucidity of thought and expression, modesty, selflessness, humanity, a fine sense of humour, and courage in the face of adversity.

There is no reason on earth why he should have wanted any part of that interview deleted (and, in fact he did not): it did enormous credit. He was too shrewd a Party man to admit he had cancer and far too brave to want to give up the struggle. His concluding words were, 'I'm going to make it, mate; I'm going to bloody make it!'

Denis was a fine teacher at all levels from first-year to post-graduate. His magnificent record of scholarly publications speaks for itself. As President of the Staff Association he worked skilfully and unstintingly to advance the interests of members both collectively and individually.

One recalls the alarm felt by some of our members that, under his leadership, the Association might become a mere extension of the Labor Party. They need not have worried. Quite apart from the fact that the Executive reflects every shade of political outlook from left of Lenin through the wholly apolitical to somewhat right of Genghis Khan, Denis, as President, put his Party affiliations to one side. He knew quite well there was no political mileage in the demanding role of President and especially in the long list of individual members' problems to which he devoted so much time and energy.

Our heartfelt sympathy is due to his wife and family. To have had to share this man with so many others for so long and then to lose him in such an untimely manner must be hard to bear.

For our part we can count ourselves fortunate in the generous and many-sided contribution made by Denis to the life of this University. He was a splendid example to us all."

On behalf of the members of the Labor Party, I echo those words. Denis Murphy will never be forgotten. With the Premier and others, we convey our deepest, heartfelt sympathy and personal regret to Gwen, Justin and Clare.

Hon. W. A. M. GUNN (Somerset—Deputy Premier and Minister Assisting the Treasurer) (11.22 a.m.): I wish to support the motion moved by the Premier expressing sympathy to the families of the late Mr Ernest Wood and Dr Denis Murphy.

Ernest—better known as Dick—Wood, served as the Country Party member for Logan for only one term in this House. As the Premier said, Dick Wood's public service stretched, however, over many decades. The Queen recognised his service by awarding him an MBE in 1976. Mr Wood's interest in government began during the 1930s while he was working in the west with the Lands Commission and subsequently in the Northern Territory while implementing the decision of the Payne/Fletcher commission, which split up large land-holdings for closer settlement.

He was a member of the Redland Shire Council and his move into politics came, as has been the case with so many members of this House, as a natural extension of his service to local government. For a number of years it was my pleasure to work with Dick Wood. We were councillors in contiguous shires. He was chairman of the Redland Shire Council from 1961 until his defeat in the March 1982 election. During that period he saw the shire's population grow from 5 000 to almost 50 000.

Mr Wood viewed the Redlands area as an important dormitory suburb of Brisbane. He lobbied successfully for the return of the rail link, which has provided the people of the area with an electrified service to Thorneside. He also pressed strongly for the four-lane highway, which has reduced the travelling time for commuters between the Redlands area and Brisbane. I am sure that residents of the Redlands area will always remember and appreciate the benefits which Dick Wood's term as shire chairman brought to their area.

For a long time Denis Murphy played an important role in Labor politics in this State. His ability to draw together different factions within his party was rewarded in 1981 when he became the first academic to hold the State presidency. Denis Murphy, as has already been stated, was born in Nambour and was the youngest of eight children. His initial preference for a career as a physical education teacher was a natural choice for a student who had excelled as an athlete while at Nudgee College. He was later to study for a Bachelor of Arts degree and gain his Doctorate in History at the University of Queensland. In 1966, Denis Murphy's outstanding academic career led to his appointment as lecturer in Australian History at the university. He became Reader in History in 1979, and was president of the staff association and a member of the Senate in 1983 until his election as the member for Stafford.

Despite his long association with the Labor Party, Denis Murphy was widely acclaimed by his academic colleagues for his ability to view Queensland's political history as a political scientist and historian. It could be said that his academic background did not endear him to all sections of his party, particularly in the early stages of his political career.

Denis Murphy was respected as the author of biographies of T. J. Ryan and Bill Hayden and a series of books concerned with the history and structure of the Labor Party, in Queensland specifically and Australia generally. In 1975, while in the United States on a research fellowship, he was awarded the prestigious Foundation of Australian Literary Studies Award and the James Cook Prize for Australian Literature for his book on T. J. Ryan.

The illness that led to his death prevented Denis Murphy from playing an active role in this House. It was a measure of his courage that he made an appearance in February to speak to a motion of condolence for the late Mr Kevin Hooper.

I join with the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition in extending condolences to the families of Mr Wood and Dr Murphy.

Hon. Sir WILLIAM KNOX (Nundah) (11.26 a.m.): I associate the Liberal Party with the motion proposed by the Premier and Treasurer and express our sympathy to the relatives and friends of both deceased gentlemen.

I served with Dick Wood and got to know him extremely well. He was a very companionable member and a very genial person. He was very well regarded both inside and outside the Parliament. It is strange that in public life one does not really get to know some of one's colleagues as well as one should, and I got to know Dick Wood much better after he left the House, when our paths crossed frequently in public and community affairs. On many occasions we attended functions connected with matters in which we had a mutual interest.

Dick Wood was always very much alert and alive to the needs of his community, and I can well understand why he was held in such high regard by the community of the Redland shire. The shire council, which he headed for some time, had many problems relating to the development of the area, particularly the outlying islands, and many of the other social and dynamic problems that occur in a rapidly burgeoning area. He gave great leadership in his duties with the local authority and the many other public bodies with which he was associated.

It was always a delight to be in his company, and he was a very easy person to deal with. He was very positive about the issues in which he believed. He will certainly be very much missed in the community.

It was not my good fortune to know Dr Denis Murphy very well. I knew him simply through social contact and, because I am a former president of the Toombul Cricket Club, through cricket. From his students and others who have been closely associated with him in his political life, I became aware of his work and interest in many areas.

Dr Murphy was highly regarded as a man who was able, as president, to reconstruct his party and bring it out of the doldrums. It was a tremendous effort. He showed a great strength of character to achieve what he did.

The tragedy of his death is that he had given so much of his life to his party and to the university that there was all the promise in the world that he would make a major contribution to this Parliament. It is very sad indeed that he was never to be given the opportunity of doing that. I think all members would agree that he was a man who had so much to give but was given so little time in which to give it.

Mr WARBURTON (Sandgate) (11.30 a.m.): I support the motion of condolence moved by the Premier and seconded by the Leader of the Opposition. I did not know Mr Wood personally, but I understand, from what I heard over a long time, that he was a man who held his office in this Parliament with honour and dignity.

I had a long acquaintance with Dr Denis Murphy through Australian Labor Party activities. He became President of the Australian Labor Party in Queensland and achieved his ambition to take his place in this Parliament, only to be cut down at an age that, I am sure all of us will agree, was far short of what it should have been.

I served on Australian Labor Party committees with Denis Murphy, and I could only appreciate his knowledge and capabilities as a dedicated member of the party that he obviously loved so much. Whatever Denis did, whatever task he set himself, he tackled it to the best of his ability and with dedication to the party that he obviously respected and loved.

Although I did not know Mr Wood, I certainly heard a great deal about him. I join with other honourable members in expressing my sincere sympathy to the family and friends of the two deceased members.

Hon. J. P. GOLEBY (Redlands—Minister for Water Resources and Maritime Services) (11.32 a.m.): I associate myself with the motion of condolence moved by the Premier and seconded by the Leader of the Opposition in expressing sympathy to the families of both the deceased, who served as members of this House.

I did not know Dr Denis Murphy personally but, as did all other members of the House, I felt for him during his long illness.

I pay tribute to the late Dick Wood, who, I believe, contributed more than any other individual to the advance of the Redland shire. I was fortunate to serve with Dick for 20 years on the Redland Shire Council. But for his foresight and practical thinking, the Redland shire would not have developed into the ideal area that it is today. Although Dick Wood was a man of vision, he also had both feet planted firmly on the ground. He knew the direction the development in the shire should take and, instead of simply dreaming about what the Redlands district could be, he set about making things happen. That, I believe, was the outstanding quality of Dick Wood.

Naturally, his many years in public life meant that he made a lot of friends and also drew detractors. Those of us who knew him well would probably say that he was at his best when his detractors were at their vocal worst. He never stepped away from an issue and would not run away from a fight. Such was his strength of character and dedication of purpose that he would not allow his course to be altered if he believed he was right.

Dick Wood was a firm believer in the concept that decisions had to be made for the public good, even if some of the decisions were unpopular in some sections of the community. He did not try to clothe himself with public popularity. He believed that he was elected to do a job. Even if his course of action cost him his job, he would not take the popular way out. The real Dick Wood was known to very few people. In some ways, he could be described as a shy man. He was prepared to let his actions speak for him. That was a pity, because he hid many very human qualities from the public.

Dick Wood was a dedicated and proud family man. On many occasions his very active public life interfered with his private life, but his strong beliefs and his great love for his family allowed him to excel in both his private life and his public life. Of all his personal qualities, his humility was probably his greatest virtue. Yet he was a proud man, proud of his family, proud of the Redlands, and proud to be a Queenslander. He had great faith in his ability to achieve, but he let his actions speak for themselves.

Dick Wood's passing was a very sad one for his family, for me personally and for the people of Redlands. At the same time, all Redlanders can be thankful and happy that Dick Wood gave so much and enjoyed doing the outstanding work that he did. Through this motion, I convey to Mary, his wife, and family, my deepest sympathy and that of the people of the Redlands.

Mr GYGAR (Stafford) (11.35 a.m.): The death of Dr Denis Murphy is a tragedy not only for his family and the Labor movement but also for all the people of Queensland. Dr Murphy was a man of honour, integrity, balance and humour. He was not only a scholar of note and a historian but also a man with a sense of history and the vision that that implies.

To lose a seat in Parliament is a traumatic experience at any time. To me, that blow was softened by the thought that the man who replaced me was a man of vision who would bring a clear and critical view to this House and be a credit to the institution of Parliament. There can be no doubt that, had he lived, Denis Murphy would have made history in this State.

It is a tragedy for all Queenslanders that his impressive contributions to public life were cut so regrettably short at the time when a place in Parliament would have given him the opportunity to show his full potential. I hope that it may be some consolation to his family to know that Queensland is a better place for his having been here.

Mr COMBEN (Windsor) (11.37 a.m.): It gives me no pleasure to rise to speak for the first time to a condolence motion for Mr Wood and Dr Murphy. Although I did not know Mr Wood at all, I think that we all appreciate the problems that public life creates for one's family life and the sacrifices which Mr Wood, as a member, would have made. I extend my sympathy to Mr Wood's family and friends.

Today, we also remember Dr Denis Murphy, a man whose stature is well known. Like my leader, I wish to show that stature by quoting the words of one of Denis's professional colleagues at the University of Queensland—Professor Thomis of the History Department of the University of Queensland—who is not connected with politics in any way. Recently he wrote of Dr Murphy—

“He acted with composure and complete integrity in his many roles, any one of which would have taxed the physical and intellectual resources of a normal person. He was unbelievably productive as a writer, has an unsurpassed reputation as a lecturer and teacher, and was for all that a public man of immense stature and importance. The qualities which he displayed in academic life were carried over into the political life of Queensland, and the people of Queensland will be much poorer for his passing. We are not so generously endowed with people of high calibre in politics that we can spare such a man. He was a non doctrinaire parliamentary socialist of the reformist tradition, concerned with the mechanics of power only because of the kind of society he wished to create.”

Dr Murphy worked long and hard for the Australian Labor Party and, during his long illness, was president of its Queensland Branch, a member of Parliament and a shadow Minister. The way was tortuous, and a lesser person would have given up and retreated to the security of university life. But it was to the benefit of the ALP that he did not.

In his chapter on T. J. Ryan in the book "Queensland Political Portraits", Denis referred to the problem that the lawyer T. J. Ryan faced. He said—

"The Labor Party was sensitive about lawyers or 'intellectuals' joining its ranks. It saw these people as joining essentially for their own political ambitions rather than for any conscious desire to promote equality, reform, or better use of government power."

Although those words were relevant to a great Labor leader 60 years ago, Denis Murphy knew at first hand the suspicion with which the Labor Party viewed an academic, and its reluctance to accept him. But Denis was in the party to promote equality and reform and the better use of Government power. Regardless of the criticisms, he did in fact have impeccable Labor credentials.

He was the youngest in a large, working-class family. It is ironic that people today who strive to maximise their potential and achieve success in academic or professional fields are often seen by my party to be suspect, even though the ability to achieve has generally resulted from Labor's education policies, which allow a far greater range of people to enter university, irrespective of family income or wealth.

Denis's own view of his elected political career was not one of unbridled ambition; rather, it was the view of one who wanted to be, firstly, a member of a team that would win government in 1986. If, following the winning of government, greater honours and the portfolio or position that he wanted came his way, that would be very acceptable; but first had to come the team's victory.

Had Denis been able to make his maiden speech in this House—during the early part of his illness I spoke to him on that subject on a number of occasions—he would have spoken on the theme of electoral reform, particularly the need for fair and equitable boundaries. That is a theme which we on this side of the House will pursue with a vigour that would have made Denis proud.

Although I knew Denis for about 10 years before his death, it was only in the year before the last State election that I grew to know him as a close, personal friend. As State President of the Labor Party, and as an endorsed candidate, he had commitments across the State and only limited time for the day-to-day work of his campaign for the seat that adjoined mine. On the other hand, I had plenty of time for the local campaign but had difficulty in obtaining the services of Labor leaders to assist me. So it was realised very quickly that there were considerable mutual advantages, and Denis used his good offices to assist me and I assisted him at the local level. The obvious result was that we won the seats; the hidden result was a close, personal friendship.

Denis called regularly at my home on his return from Labor House and, for half an hour or an hour would provide my wife and me with an often hilarious insight into the personalities involved in the State campaign. We looked forward to those relaxed times, and I wish that some of his critics, who saw Denis as aloof or arrogant, had seen him at such times. Denis Murphy, despite his public achievements, was essentially a shy and private man, to whom it was difficult to get close. My wife and I cherish the memory of those times and the knowledge that we were privileged to know the private man.

Many other people would like to be associated with this motion of condolence. I speak particularly of Terry Hampson, the administrative officer of the Labor Party, who was a longtime personal friend of Denis and about whom he spoke very warmly. Terry can talk about the private aspects of Denis's life and gives as an example Denis's work after the 1974 floods.

Denis Murphy's electorate secretary was Faith Hopkins. All members know the great work that our electorate secretaries do in keeping fools at bay and smoothing troubled waters, but no secretary could give more devotion than Faith did during the eight months that Denis was the member for Stafford. I publicly thank her for the help she gave to Denis and to me when I was assisting him.

The day after the death of Denis Murphy, I went to see Gwen, Justin and Claire. The most notable feature of that morning was that the young man of the family, upon whom the burden had suddenly been cast very heavily, had grown up almost overnight.

It was with sorrow that I joined in this motion of condolence. I know that Gwen, Justin and Claire will bear the troubled times ahead with the same strength that enabled them to survive the last eight months. I join my local branches and the Stafford branches of the ALP with this motion of condolence.

Mr WHITE (Redcliffe) (11.44 a.m.): I support the Premier and other members in this motion of condolence to Mr Wood and Dr Denis Murphy. I did not have the pleasure of knowing Mr Wood but, from what other members have told me over the years, it is obvious that he made a great contribution to the community and was a great family man. As the Minister for Water Resources and Maritime Services said, Mr Wood made a substantial contribution to the Redlands area.

I knew Denis Murphy from our earliest days at school. Our association went back to when we first entered Nudgee College in 1951; we were students together for four years. Denis was an outstanding student, and in 1954 he was one of three students from Nudgee College to win open scholarships to Queensland University. Denis made a great impact upon the other students at Nudgee College and on the life of the college itself. He was a great participator in debates, sport and the social and cultural activities of the school. His death will certainly be lamented by his many friends from school.

Denis and I met again in 1960 or 1961, when he was a high school teacher at Redcliffe. He made a great impression with the students at the Redcliffe High School and in the community. Although it was obvious that Denis and I had diametrically opposed political views, for some reason I was able to retain a friendship with him. During the early years of my business and when he was starting out at the university, we had many a healthy debate about politics. We did not agree often, but we elected to remain friends.

Earlier, honourable members said that Denis will be remembered in history as a great historian. There is no question that his contribution to the Australian Labor Party's history in this State is one of great substance. Reference was made to the T. J. Ryan biography. Denis will always be remembered for that. Reference was made also to his role in the Australian Labor Party. He showed extreme courage under great difficulties to reform the party and to bring people together.

I join with other honourable members in extending sympathy to the families of our two late members.

Mr De LACY (Cairns) (11.45 a.m.): I join with other members in paying tribute to two former members of this Assembly. Because I never had the honour of knowing Mr Wood, I cannot speak about him. I knew Denis Murphy for a long time. I was saddened by his premature passing. I should like to concentrate my remarks on his academic career rather than on his political career. By any standards, Denis Murphy was a brilliant academic. A person does not become a Reader in History and Associate Professor in History at one of the largest and most prestigious universities in Australia unless he has the academic runs on the board. He certainly does not reach that position simply by being president of the ALP.

It is probably wrong to say that Denis kept his academic and political life entirely separate. However, I can state that Denis was able to be completely and totally objective in his academic life. That is borne out by many persons who had the honour to study

under him. I am led to believe that as a lecturer he was unsurpassed. In the last few days I have noted, in the media, reference to students at the University of Queensland taking lecturers to task because of their lack of teaching expertise. I know for certain that, were Denis still there, he would not be included in that grouping; he would be an exception because he was a capable and brilliant teacher and lecturer.

Although he was able to be objective at all times, it is true that his academic life and political life to a large extent sustained each other. His study of history undoubtedly helped to shape his political attitudes. There is a message in the statement that a person who has studied history would become a supporter of the Labor Party. I am certain that that is the message that Denis received. Maybe something in his Irish Catholic upbringing contributed also. However, I am sure that his objective study of history was the main factor that led him to support the Australian Labor Party. There is no doubt that that support and his political interests led to the choice of the subjects that he studied. He wrote many books. As a writer and editor he was tremendously productive. The subject that interested him most was the political history of Queensland, in particular the history of the Australian Labor Party and the trade union movement. It was said earlier that, out of the dozen or so books that he wrote or edited, the one that brought the most critical acclaim was the biography of the former Labor Premier, T. J. Ryan. I think that Denis saw that as his greatest work, as did the critics. He received a number of literary awards for it. He achieved a great deal of inspiration from his study of the career of T. J. Ryan. Earlier an honourable member said that the parallel to be drawn is that, like T. J. Ryan, Denis Murphy died at an early age when the political world seemed to be opening up in front of him.

In conclusion, I say this about Denis Murphy. Whatever he did as an academic at the University of Queensland, he did it with dignity and with authority which commanded the greatest respect from the rest of the academic staff. It is fair to say that Denis was not always loved, but he was certainly always respected. The many roles he played, both academic and political, would, as a member commented earlier, have taxed the intellectual and physical resources of many lesser men. To a certain extent, that is what happened to Denis. It is extremely sad to have him taken away in the prime of life. However, it would be fair comment that in his short career he packed in more than people who lived twice as long. The saddest part of all is that Denis Murphy was denied the opportunity to bring to bear in this Chamber the remarkable talents he had. I deeply believe that we are all the poorer because of that.

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

RESUMPTION OF DEBATE ON BILLS BROUGHT OVER FROM PREVIOUS SESSION

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

“That, pursuant to Standing Order No. 276, the following Bills, which were presented in the first session of this Parliament, be resumed in this the second session at the stage reached in the previous session and thereafter be proceeded with as if no prorogation had taken place—

Evidence Act Amendment Bill: Resumption of second-reading debate (3 April 1984, Mr Goss).

National Companies and Securities Commission (State Provisions) Act Amendment Bill: Resumption of second-reading debate (4 April 1984, Mr R. J. Gibbs).

Companies (Administration) Act Amendment Bill: Resumption of second-reading debate (4 April 1984, Mr R. J. Gibbs).

Imperial Acts Application Bill: Resumption of second-reading debate (4 April 1984, Mr R. J. Gibbs).

Anzac Day Act Amendment Bill: Resumption of second-reading debate (5 April 1984, Mr Burns).

Beach Protection Act and Another Act Amendment Bill: Resumption of second-reading debate (5 April 1984, Mr Eaton)."

Motion agreed to.

SITTING DAYS

Sessional Order

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

"That during this session, unless otherwise ordered, the House will meet for the dispatch of business at 11 o'clock a.m. on Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday in each week, and that on Tuesdays and Thursdays, and after 1 o'clock p.m. on Wednesdays, Government business shall take precedence of all other business."

Motion agreed to.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Appropriation Bill (No. 1)

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

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

Motion agreed to.

MATTERS OF PUBLIC INTEREST

Conviction of Mr Kelvin Condren

Mr WRIGHT (Rockhampton—Leader of the Opposition) (12.1 p.m.): After so many months of recess I had hoped to use this opportunity to bring to the attention of this Parliament the numerous areas of mismanagement by this Government over many, many months. I wanted to do so because, since the last session, the people of Queensland have suffered heavily at the hands of this National Party State Government through increased taxes, a cut-back in everyday services and the fact that, indirectly, this State has not been matching the economic recovery in other parts of Australia.

But the very strength of this Assembly is that, whilst it is the place to promote and protect the interests of the many, it is also the only place where the rights of the individual—that single Queenslander—can be proclaimed without fear or prejudice. I bring to the attention of the Assembly a case of gross injustice, an instance of an individual who has been a casualty in what I believe is a travesty of justice. I refer to Mr Kelvin Condren, an Aboriginal man charged with and ultimately convicted of murdering a Mount Isa woman named Patricia Carlton. In the interests of justice, the Minister for Justice and Attorney-General must intervene. A retrial must be held. I cast no aspersions on the 12-person jury and I make no criticism of the judge. But I believe that justice has not been done. I base my call for a retrial on the inconsistencies in this case, the allegations of unfairness and what I contend is a blatant misuse of police power.

Kelvin Condren was originally picked up by police in Mount Isa on 30 September 1983 for drunkenness. He was released, but was rounded up the next day with other Aborigines after Patricia Carlton had been found in a vacant area at the back of a hotel. He was subsequently charged and convicted of murder.

The inconsistencies, the allegations and the contradictions make this case a mockery. It is an indictment of the Queensland system of justice. Noreen Rose Jumbo, a key witness for the police who originally made a statement that she heard Kelvin Condren say that he had "damaged Patricia Carlton last night", said later that the police had made her sign the statement. She said that her statement was not true. She said that it was not her wish to sign the statement but that she had been forced to do so by the police. She was then treated as a hostile witness and was not used by the police other than at the preliminary hearing. Other police witnesses, Steven McNamee and Louise Brown, said that they were forced by police into making their statements. They were questioned at length in the witness-box but held to their claim that the police had made them sign their statements. There were further allegations by Olive Loogatha and Darryl William Cherry that they were led by the police to give the times of certain events with which they did not agree. Olive Loogatha was not even given a copy of her statement.

Kelvin Condren also signed a statement, which was his record of interview. It amazes me how anyone would accept that it was a true and correct record of a confession by this man. I need to point out that Kelvin Condren went only to Grade 7. It was also shown by experts that he had the comprehension level of a person of only seven or eight years of age. Yet the record of interview said in reference to the use of a steel picket and a rock that Kelvin Condren had said, "I shoved it up her vagina." I stress that this is a person who was educated to Grade 7 level and had the comprehension level of a seven or eight-year-old child. I suggest to the Assembly that this is the last way a man of Condren's intellectual capacity would describe that part of a woman's anatomy.

The record of interview had the police saying that a doctor removed a rock from the vagina of the woman. Medical evidence presented later did not support the police contention. The record of interview claimed that the accused had shoved a 15-ft steel picket up the woman's vagina. Medical evidence did not support that claim.

There was a further contradiction. A white justice of the peace, who was also a witness in support of the police, gave evidence that Kelvin Condren had demonstrated in the police station how he had stabbed in a downward fashion at the woman with the 15-ft long picket. Another police officer gave evidence that Condren had demonstrated how he had brought the picket down over his shoulder in a clublike fashion, again contradicting the white justice of the peace. There is a further inconsistency in that the picket was 15 feet long while the height of the ceiling in the police station was only 10 feet. How could a tall person lift a 15-ft picket in that room? I leave it to honourable members' imagination to decide how such a demonstration could take place. The police claimed that the picket was shoved up the woman's vagina; but the only hair on the picket or steel pipe—it was later called a water pipe—came from the woman's head.

The record of interview prepared by the police, based on what they claim Condren said, is to the effect that Condren admitted "damaging Patricia last night". Another part of the record says that he did it at quarter past four.

I suggest that members of the Aboriginal community know the difference between night and day. They know whether something is done at night or in the afternoon. I suggest also that no Aboriginal person in such a state of mind would refer specifically to quarter past four.

It is strange that there was no blood on the accused's clothing when he was arrested, and the police admitted that it was the same clothing as he wore the day before. There is also a reference in the confession, which he said he did not make, to the fact that he had consumed up to seven flagons of wine.

The inconsistencies and contradictions are many, but my reason for calling for a retrial is that subsequent to the murder that Kelvin Condren was supposed to commit in Mount Isa, another person admitted to a murder in Mount Isa. The Mount Isa police were contacted by the Darwin police and advised that a person by the name of Andrew Albury, who had been charged with the murder of a Darwin woman on 27 November

1983, had confessed to killing a woman in Mount Isa on the very day that Patricia Carlton died. Evidence has been presented to show that Albury was in Mount Isa at the time. He stopped there when he was on a bus tour. There is evidence that he stayed at the hotel nearest to where the woman was found.

Despite the confession that was rung through by the Darwin police, despite the fact that a person in Darwin admitted he was in Mount Isa and had murdered a woman there, nothing was done by the Mount Isa police for two months. My advice is that nothing would have been done had the police not found out that the local lawyers knew that that information had been passed on by the Darwin police to the Mount Isa police. Even two months later, the Mount Isa police would not have bothered to find out about the confession by Albury.

It is not my job to act as judge and jury, but I sincerely believe that an injustice has been done. Whether it be in relation to the weapons, the witnesses, the records of interview, the times, the medical evidence, the confessions, the linguistic experts, or even in relation to the language used by the accused, there are inconsistencies and contradictions that I am amazed anyone could accept. One black man may not mean much to some people, especially people in the National Party. He pleaded not guilty and, in spite of all the inconsistencies in the evidence, was convicted and sentenced to life imprisonment. I believe that he had no hope from the outset. In the minds of certain people, he was guilty. He was a scapegoat, and much was done to ensure that he was convicted in spite of the evidence.

A retrial must be held, and I ask also for a complete inquiry into the police force in Mount Isa. From talking to lawyers and the police up there, I know that the vast majority of the members of the police force are honourable; they are honest police officers trying to do their task as they see it, and they do their work within the law. Recently, eight lawyers in the North-West Queensland Law Society spoke out against police assaults, false confessions and standover tactics of some police in that area. They spoke out against reports of police planting drugs on people to induce them to make false confessions. It is not simply the ALP that is making these allegations; one of the lawyers concerned is a very prominent person in the National Party.

The vast majority of members of the Mount Isa police are responsible, honest and hard-working. On the advice I have received from citizens, lawyers and the police themselves, it is obvious that, regrettably, a small but hard-core, bad element has its own version of what the law is and what justice means.

This is not the first occasion; numerous other allegations have been made. It has been alleged that a man who was dragged by his feet out of a police vehicle was left on remand for months. In front of seven witnesses, another man was dragged by police from his front porch. It has been alleged that a 14-year-old girl was strip-searched at the police station because she was in the company of a shoplifter. It has been alleged that another man was sent to a hospital by a visiting barrister because he had been so badly bashed by the police that he could not appear properly in court. It has been alleged that a man who reported that his car was stolen was bashed by police and that his car was kept by them for a couple of weeks.

Some of those allegations have been referred to the Police Complaints Tribunal, but more than that is needed. An independent judicial inquiry should be established. We need to ensure that justice is being done and that the law is being upheld.

This person who is now serving a sentence of life imprisonment must be given a retrial. The Minister for Justice and Attorney-General, as the senior law officer in this State, must act within his powers to ensure that justice is done for this individual.

Main Line Electrification Scheme

Hon. D. F. LANE (Merthyr—Minister for Transport) (12.11 p.m.): Since becoming Minister for Transport, it has been my practice to keep honourable members informed of progress being made on major projects which come under my responsibility.

As honourable members would be aware, in August last year, the Government approved the start of what is recognised as the world's largest current railway project—the \$600m main line electrification scheme.

Stage 1 involves the electrification of 720 km from Gladstone to Rockhampton and out to Blackwater, at a cost of \$326m, with Stage 2 involving the electrification of 773 km south from Dalrymple Bay and Hay Point, west through the Goonyella system and including Blair Athol and Gregory, at a cost of \$362m.

Contracts and commitments valued at \$80m have already been let. These include overhead wiring, transformers, switchgear, earthworks and power supply from the State Electricity Commission of Queensland.

The major contract so far was for the installation of overhead traction wiring, valued at \$34m, which was awarded to Electric Power Transmission Pty Ltd of Brisbane. It is a very experienced firm in this field of work.

Completion of both stages of the main line electrification scheme would require the manufacture of 146 electric locomotives—70 for Stage 1 and 76 for Stage 2.

The Government's decision to invest in the electrification of major coal-carrying railways involved two important considerations: one being that it was a sound business investment, the second being the employment opportunities presented by such a project.

The largest single contract in the project was for the manufacture of 146 electric locomotives. Eight tenders were received for this contract and an exhaustive technical analysis has begun.

After a meeting of the Loan Council at the end of June this year, when the Commonwealth Government's attitude to State Government and statutory authority borrowings was made known, the Government was in a position to decide to advance Stage 2 of the project so that both stages would be run simultaneously.

This decision was taken by the Queensland Government because of the prices which were available and which it was considered would be unlikely to be on offer in coming years. There was also a need in Queensland for a major project which would stimulate the heavy metal engineering industry, which had faced a downturn for the last couple of years. In the last 12 months the heavy metal engineering industry has received absolutely no assistance from the Federal Government.

When making its decisions on acceptance of tenders for the locomotive contracts, the Government was conscious of the fact that no locomotive-builder in Queensland could have supplied the electric locomotives at the rate of 60 per year without a major expansion in building, equipment and manpower in one plant. The 60 locomotives per year were required when it was decided to combine Stages 1 and 2.

Contracts of this size carry with them not only the opportunity for the Government to make the best possible commercial deal for the State, but also the chance to confer social benefits on the community and to strengthen a local economy.

With this in mind, the Queensland Government deliberately decided to award two contracts—one in Brisbane and one in the provincial city of Maryborough. Therefore, the Queensland Government selected the lowest tenderer, which was Commonwealth Engineering (Qld) Pty Ltd. It was backed by the unquestioned advanced technology of the Hitachi group, and Clyde/ASEA-Walkers in Maryborough, which was supported by the ASEA company of Sweden. That company designed the modern commuter trains for Brisbane.

Without doubt this is the best means of achieving the spread of employment in this State. The Government also had in mind, as well as the world renowned technological excellence of Hitachi and ASEA, the engineering excellence already proved by Commonwealth Engineering and Walkers. Both of those firms have been manufacturers of rolling-stock and traction rolling-stock for Queensland Railways in recent years.

The Government was also conscious of the need to have guaranteed delivery dates and compatibility of the locomotives and unrestricted co-operation between the contractors. This was achieved and the guarantees were received. The first of the electric locomotives will be in operation by August 1986. It has been estimated that the expenditure involved in stages 1 and 2 will create not less than 9 000 man-years of employment.

In awarding the contracts to the two firms, the Queensland Government has also guaranteed a stimulus to the economy of many other Queensland centres, as the two manufacturers will be availing themselves of the services of a different range of subcontractors. Because Clyde/ASEA-Walkers were given the opportunity to lower their tender price by \$6.1m to meet the price of the lower tenderer, I find it hard to come to terms with criticism of the Government's action in saving \$6.1m, which provides employment opportunities and social benefits on such a scale to the provincial city of Maryborough.

The Government was also aware that, because of its expertise with transformers and traction motor manufacture, the other short-listed tenderer—GEC—should enjoy the benefits of about \$25m available in the contracts. As a number of contracts have yet to be finalised and tenders let, this figure, as it relates to GEC, could be increased.

The Government has successfully managed the greatest possible spread of work for the benefit of Queensland. I must say also that the Government's decision in this matter has been acclaimed by the community and the trade union movement in this State. I have a number of letters on hand that express that acclaim. There are few critics and they are uniformed. I will continue to report major developments in this most exciting enterprise as they occur.

The Leader of the Opposition has made cheap political capital in criticising this mammoth and wonderful project that has been launched in Queensland. I can understand that he is concerned about the credit that will come to the Government as the project develops. Queenslanders will benefit by the project and he has attempted to discredit it by whatever means that come into his mind. The community will easily grasp the many pluses and advantages in the project, and the Leader of the Opposition will be on a useless endeavour. The community will applaud the project.

Will the Leader of the Opposition suggest that the contracts should have been given to one tenderer, which would mean putting all of the State's eggs in one basket and creating a monopoly? That is a very unwise course to follow. Will he suggest that the Government should have made a decision that is against the interests of the people of Maryborough? If the Leader of the Opposition were to visit that town now, he might be lynched or run out of town by the local population. Many people from within the Labor movement in Maryborough are very happy about the arrangement made by the Government. One must compare the actions of the Government, in awarding these tenders to worthy private companies, with the current policy of the Australian Labor Party, which is to manufacture all railway rolling-stock in railway workshops by day labour. That is a very inefficient and costly alternative to the contract system, which is the policy of this Government.

West Moreton Coal-fields

Mr HAMILL (Ipswich) (12.20 p.m.): I rise to discuss a matter of public interest to the people of Queensland, particularly to the people in my electorate and surrounding areas. I listened with great interest to the comments of the Minister for Transport about employment and the importance of keeping the business community of Queensland supplied with contracts. My remarks this morning apply to the problem in the coal-mining industry at West Moreton. Late last year industrial action erupted. In October, a sit-in of miners took place at the Southern Cross Colliery. That action was taken to protest against the cessation of a contract to supply coal to the Swanbank Power Station. The diminution in the supply of coal to Swanbank is causing great concern on the West Moreton coal-fields, particularly considering the importance of the supply contracts to

Swanbank in terms of the overall production of West Moreton coal. It has great ramifications for the future employment of West Moreton's mining community and for the wider business community in the area.

At the time of the sit-in at the Southern Cross Colliery, negotiations had reached a total impasse. The miners were then treated to a little pumpkin-scone diplomacy. Because of what has happened since, the only conclusion that can be drawn is that those promises were like the scones—hard to swallow. At present, the mining community in West Moreton is finding both hard to swallow.

Before the last State election, the Premier came to West Moreton and promised a feasibility study into the future of the West Moreton coal industry. I was pleased that the Minister for Mines and Energy lived up to that promise.

A feasibility study was commissioned. I understand that in June this year a report was furnished. Unfortunately, what was a very responsible, comprehensive and positive document was rejected out of hand by Cabinet. The committee had been charged with the responsibility of working out some solutions to West Moreton's problems. No-one knows why the specific proposals in that document were rejected. The committee involved deserves to be told exactly why its submissions were not favourably received by the Government. Having read the report, I believe that, if the recommendations were implemented by the Government, West Moreton would not have to face the insecurity that it presently faces.

Great reliance is placed upon Queensland Electricity Generating Board contracts for West Moreton coal. In 1983, 1 551 000 tonnes of coal was supplied to the Swanbank Power Station alone. The QEGB took 204 000 tonnes of West Moreton coal and Queensland Cement & Lime took 77 000 tonnes. Because clinker brought into Queensland from outside was being used by QCL, the earlier supply contracts were diminished. Interstate consumers took 15 000 tonnes of coal. The export market, which is growing, took only 771 000 tonnes of export coal in 1983.

The future that is mapped out for West Moreton in terms of QEGB supply contracts shows that the 1 636 000 tonnes projected to be supplied in 1984 will be cut back to 680 000 tonnes in 1993, a fall of 956 000 tonnes.

The committee that made investigations into the West Moreton coal-field concluded in its report—

“1. The West Moreton coal industry has made and has the resources to continue to make a valuable contribution to the economy of South-East Queensland as a reliable source of domestic and export coal.

2. Any diminution of the Industry must have a social and economic impact on the Ipswich district in particular.”

I suggest that that economic and social impact will be enormous and that, unless the Government acts upon the recommendations of that report, it will be responsible for considerable increases in unemployment and for a number of business failures in the Ipswich/West Moreton area.

The population of the Ipswich/West Moreton district, which incorporates the electorates of my colleagues Bob Gibbs and Dave Underwood as well as the electorate of the Deputy Premier and Minister Assisting the Treasurer (Mr Gunn), is 115 000. There are 43 000 people in the work-force. The coal industry and industries directly affected by it are responsible for about 12 per cent of local employment. If one considers that, in 1982-83, coal sales from West Moreton alone were valued at \$103m and that about \$48m was paid in salaries and wages by West Moreton producers, one does not have to be a mathematician to realise that the loss of such an amount of income in West Moreton would cause untold problems for the business community not only in the Ipswich/West Moreton area but also in Brisbane.

The problems addressed by the committee related in particular to the production of underground coal. When one considers that three-quarters of the employment in that

industry in West Moreton is engaged in the production of underground coal, one can appreciate the enormity of the problem.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Row): Order! There is far too much audible conversation on both sides of the Chamber. The Chamber will come to order.

Mr HAMILL: Eighty per cent of coal for the generation of electricity is supplied from underground sources. For other domestic markets, 42.5 per cent is supplied from underground sources. Only in the export field is supply obtained almost totally from open-cut sources. The employment implications are enormous. For every job in the mining industry lost, four jobs will be lost elsewhere in the community. On the committee's own findings, about 500 jobs will be lost over the next 10 years. I have a table relating to employment. It comes from that committee's report. I seek leave to have it incorporated in "Hansard"

Leave granted.

Report of the Committee Convened to Conduct a Study into the Future of the West Moreton Coalfield 30-6-84

Table 19

Employment related to total market—Committee forecast tonnage

Year	Q.E.G.B.		Other		Export		Total		Total Men
	Underground	Open-cut	Underground	Open-cut	Underground	Open-cut	Underground	Open-cut	
1984	741	68	100	27	114	167	958	265	1,223*
Employment at Southern Cross ceases by the end of 1984 with a reduction of 100 in the district workforce number at end of 1984									
1985	539	50	109	29	114	167	762	246	1,008
1986	485	45	116	32	114	167	715	244	959
1987	435	40	125	34	114	167	674	241	915
1988	394	36	133	36	114	167	641	239	880
1989	354	33	137	37	114	167	605	237	842
1990	354	33	141	39	114	167	609	239	848
1991	354	33	146	40	114	167	614	240	854
1992	340	31	151	41	114	167	605	239	844
1993	308	28	156	43	114	167	578	238	816

* Of this number 100 men are Southern Cross employees already recognised as not being retained in the West Moreton industry after 1984. Therefore, the actual manpower level for 1984-85 is reduced by this number.

Mr HAMILL: The committee put forward a number of important recommendations to assist the West Moreton collieries. Amongst other things, it highlighted the need to expand the export market. Of course, that cannot be done overnight. The committee's findings highlighted two problems. First is the comparatively low productivity of saleable coal from the district's underground mines, a feature that those collieries are addressing now. A number of important submissions are being made for research and developmental work to increase productivity. The second problem is that governmental and other charges, including rail freights, port and handling charges and royalties, are also contributing factors in the inability of those mines in the West Moreton field to effectively compete on export markets.

The committee's report referred to a number of these factors. The producers welcome the rail freight concession, but for most of them it amounts to only 63c per tonne. That has a marginal effect when 25 per cent of the export sale price of West Moreton coal is siphoned off in State Government taxes, charges and freight.

One matter that could be addressed is royalties. The Ipswich and West Moreton field is one of the few areas in the State over which private lease-holders can claim royalties. One way in which the Government could give real relief to the West Moreton

exporters is to reschedule royalties levied on export coal from the West Moreton. That would not result in a great loss to the State's revenues.

The Deputy Premier and Minister Assisting the Treasurer is on the record as saying that the West Moreton field requires special consideration. An indication of that can be found in rail freights. Such special consideration should be applied right across the board. Positive action should be taken on a number of the points addressed by the committee of inquiry in its report.

One of the committee's positive recommendations is that the only action that could be taken to prevent widescale retrenchments on the West Moreton field is for the electricity industry to purchase additional coal. On the basis of the committee's forecast of total demand and the assumption that 90 per cent of future requirements of coal for electricity generation would come from underground sources, approximately 180 000 tonnes ought to be bought at a cost of \$7m over the next three years. Because of the contribution of the West Moreton field towards the State Government revenues and the economy of Queensland as a whole, that is not an unreasonable request to make of the Government.

The former Deputy Premier and Treasurer (Dr Llew Edwards, as he then was) told the Queensland Coal Preparation Society that the State Government receives income from stamp duty, from pay-roll tax, from royalties and from profit on rail freight. He recognised the need to link taxation on the coal industry to the viability of the industry. Any Government sensitive to the needs of industry in Queensland has to recognise that industry cannot be taxed out of existence during a time of recession. If that is to be the policy of the Government, the result will be widespread unemployment in Ipswich and West Moreton, with consequent business failures that will affect the Queensland economy as a whole.

Land Bank Estate Pty Ltd and Gold Coast Trust Corporation Limited

Mr JENNINGS (Southport) (12.30 p.m.): The matter of extreme public importance that I wish to raise today relates to private property ownership and a new land deal scheme designed purposely to mislead and rob many unsuspecting people. It involves two unregistered companies, Land Bank Estate Pty Ltd and Gold Coast Trust Corporation Limited. The promoters have used the old stunt of the half-truth and the golden horizon technique by stating that at some time in the future big profits will be made. They emphasise that everything is quite legal.

What makes the matter even worse is that this swindling scheme is being perpetrated in the great developing region of the Gold Coast. Such a swindle reflects on the whole area and the many other decent people in the real estate industry. As the men who are "up front" in the scheme are former political leaders, the matter is doubly bad, because that reflects on every member of Parliament right across Australia.

In July, I was surprised to read in a local newspaper an advertisement headed: "Sir Rupert Hamer, Chairman—Land Bank Estate", with the following in large print: "Investment Land for Sale . . . Gold Coast Land at Mudgeeraba . . . Limited Supply at this Price. \$2,500"

Mr BURNS: I rise to a point of order. The member for Southport has raised an issue involving Sir Rupert Hamer. I understand that a writ has been issued against the member for Southport (Mr Jennings) over this matter. Under those circumstances, the same ruling should be applied to the honourable member as has previously been applied to members of the Opposition.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Row): Order! I ask the honourable member for Southport to indicate whether a writ has been served on him.

Mr JENNINGS: I have checked this matter with Mr Speaker. No writ has been served on me. A writ has no bearing on the procedures of Parliament.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I must accept the honourable member's assurance that no writ has been served upon him.

Mr JENNINGS: No writ has been served on me.

As it gives the straight-out impression that a purchaser is buying an area of land for \$2,500, the advertisement is completely misleading. Indeed, from Perth to Brisbane, that has been the picture presented by salesmen. That is quite wrong, and the Albert Shire Council has stated quite clearly that it will not happen. The council issued a statement in which it expressed concern at the advertisement and made the definite point that the minimum area of a subdivision is four hectares, or 10 acres, and that it did not expect that area would ever become urban.

Mr BURNS: I rise to a point of order. I want to clear up the matter of whether a writ has been issued. The honourable member for Southport said that a writ has not been served on him. In relation to this matter, has a writ on the honourable member been issued? If that is the case, should he be allowed to continue to use the privilege of the House to attack Sir Rupert Hamer?

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I inform the honourable member for Lytton that, under the provisions of the law, unless a date of hearing has been set the question of privilege does not arise.

Mr JENNINGS: In addition to the misleading advertisements, a shiny, coloured brochure confirms the ruse and the racket by stating in bold type—

“This investment in prime future subdivisional land is usually only available to large corporations because of their financial resources.”

The claim is that it is prime future subdivisional land. What an outrageous lie! The Albert Shire Council has stated that it will not be subdivided in the future; but, to these sharks, that does not mean a thing. The brochure also states—

“Most of the wealthy have obtained their rewards by just this—”

I emphasise the words “just this”—

“holding rural land until it becomes urban and selling at huge profits.”

That is a completely snide and slippery statement designed to try to scrape inside the law and to completely mislead the buyer. There is absolutely no intention or indication that the land will ever be urban. The land is simply too steep and completely unsuitable for subdivision. The promoters know that, but that makes no difference to them.

As recently as last Saturday, the same type of advertisement with the same misleading material appeared on page 4 of the “Daily Sun”—

“Investment
Land Sale
Gold Coast
(limited Supply)

Price
\$2,500”

Any person who responds to the advertisement is given the same sort of misleading drivel that I have mentioned already.

A director of the company, Mr Brian R. Goldsmith, stated in the press that his company bought the land in June for \$660,000 from a Mr Fritz Mader, who is also a director of Land Bank Estate. According to Mr Goldsmith, Mr Mader retained a 51 per cent share in the company after purchasing from a Peter John Tomlinson and Roslyn Heather Tomlinson some time in June for \$600,000.

Mr CASEY: I rise to a point of order. One of the requirements of a parliamentarian is that when he speaks it should be in a clear and intelligible way so that members can

understand what is occurring and also so that you, Mr Deputy Speaker, can determine whether the matters being presented are in accordance with the procedures of the Parliament. Because of the way in which the honourable member is reading his speech, it is absolutely impossible for other members to follow it. He is abusing the privilege of the Parliament by saying things that he cannot say in the press and elsewhere.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I do not accept the point of order.

Mr JENNINGS: I thank the honourable member for wasting my time.

The 20 acres of the Boomerang Farm, which includes a substantial house and a number of other important buildings, including the profitable boomerang factory, was excised from the property, leaving approximately 182 acres, which the promoters then set out to sell on the basis of 720 quarter-acre units at a price of \$2,850 on terms or \$2,500 cash—in other words, for a total of \$1.8 m.

Mr COMBEN: I rise to a point of order. I cannot hear or understand the honourable member.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! There is no point of order. I wish to advise honourable members that a point of order raised in relation to the audibility of a member does not constitute a valid point of order as far as I am concerned. I do not want any more frivolous points of order raised.

Mr JENNINGS: One wonders whom they are trying to protect.

Sir Rupert Hamer is quoted as saying, "It is not the sort of project where you could make a quick dollar." No doubt he was not speaking for the promoters or himself, as they obviously and most certainly will make an enormous amount by misrepresentation; but buyers certainly will not make money. The deal is like going into a bank and paying \$2,500 cash for a note valued at \$400 or less.

The chairman of Gold Coast Trust Corporation Pty Ltd, Sir Wallace Rae, has described my claims as fantasy and utter nonsense and said that he is convinced that investors who buy in at this stage will have a chance to make a lot of money when the land is rezoned and subdivided. He said that this is inevitable and that anyone who looked at the growth of the area would agree. That is a completely false statement and is purposely designed by Sir Wallace Rae to mislead and trick people into buying.

As a former Lands Minister, Sir Wallace Rae knows only too well the importance of a sworn valuation. He also knows extremely well the significance of the fact that in this case there is no valuation because the land is grossly and ridiculously over valued in order to enable the promoters to get a cash rip off from the unfortunates who believe their statements. One of the abhorrent factors of this proposition is that it is targeted towards people who cannot afford to buy an ordinary block of land, and they, of course, are the people who cannot afford to lose their money.

Mr Burns interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Lytton will not address the press gallery. I warn the honourable member under Standing Order 123A.

Mr Burns: I was just interjecting.

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

Mr JENNINGS: Sir Rupert Hamer, who has accused me of mischief-making in an attempt to settle old political scores, has admitted that and stated that the Gold Coast land scheme is straightforward and a perfectly legitimate scheme for small investors to get in on the ground floor. What rubbish! If this scheme is straightforward, I would like to see one of his complex schemes.

If the promoters of this scheme—the Maders, the Goldsmiths and the Hamers—were transferring the property at the purchase price, it would be a different kettle of fish. But what they have done is inflate the value by about 400 per cent on a completely false premise.

Mr DAVIS: I rise to a point of order. Would the member table the document that he is reading from?

Mr Warburton: All documents.

Mr DAVIS: All documents. I move that way.

Mr JENNINGS: I certainly will.

Mr DAVIS: I move—

“That the honourable member table all documents.”

Mr JENNINGS: Think up some more stops, will you?

Motion (Mr Davis) agreed to.

Mr JENNINGS: The contract states that the Land Bank Estate Pty Ltd is a company incorporated in Queensland. That also is untrue. It is not registered, and it will not be registered by that name. Because the company is not registered, I cannot obtain details of its capital, shareholders, memorandum or articles. In other words, people are dealing with an entity with absolutely no substance or professional integrity, but an indicated complete lack of integrity.

Sir Rupert Hamer and Sir Wallace Rae can walk away, wash their hands of the deal, pass the buck on to someone else and still retain an aura of public respectability, which in my view is outrageous, because they are purposely and blatantly setting out to bleed people dry. On their own admission in the press, they bought the property for \$600,000; but they did not state in the press that they have excised the profitable Boomerang Farm section. If the land had reasonable contours and was able to be subdivided into house blocks, the council would have given appropriate assurances; but the reverse is the situation. Under section 66 of the Commonwealth Banking Act, the use of the word “bank” is quite wrong.

The Gold Coast Trust Corporation Pty Ltd, of which Sir Wallace Rae is disclosed as the chairman, is also not registered. It cannot exist because the use of the word “trust” in a company name is forbidden. My authority for that is Commonwealth Government Gazette G33, 1982.

On the basis that the companies are not incorporated, it is clear that there is a prima facie case of a breach of numerous sections of the relevant code by the publication of certain letters and other documents. In regard to the contract of sale, there are numerous references to land, and these go beyond implied suggestions of the purchaser obtaining an interest in the land. There are other clauses in the purported contract which are certainly not normal. For example, there is no notice of default. In other words, if a person fails to pay any instalment on the due date, it is sudden death; he forfeits all moneys previously paid. Therefore, the contract does not comply with the Property Law Act. That shows the brutal and unethical nature of the people involved in this deal. A young couple might be away or might have an accident and thus be unable to pay on the due date, but they just lose the lot. What a rotten bunch of Shylocks!

For many reasons, not the least of which is that the vendor does not have any contractual capacity because it is an unincorporated body, any purported contract would be unenforceable. Further, there appear to be many breaches of the code relating to companies engaged in such practices.

It should be noted that the registered office of Land Bank Estates—Unit 5, Stradbroke Plaza, 66 Marine Parade, Southport—is also the same registered office as Jojoba International Ltd. The brochure even states the intention of holding rural land until it becomes

urban and then selling at huge profits. This week, the same scheme is being promoted in Perth; but instead of blocks being advertised at \$2,500-odd, they are priced at \$3,300 with a "free" trip to the Gold Coast to view this "magnificent" investment.

The details of the involvement of Hamer or Rae are not known. Have they personally put any money into the scheme and, if so, how much? Have they any shares in the scheme and, if so, how many? Have they provided any personal guarantees in regard to the scheme and, if so, what are they? Will they personally guarantee that the buyers will get their money back if the land is not zoned urban? Are they directors of the companies that they purport to promote and represent and, if so, are they prepared to provide certificates signed by an independent legal firm that their representations conform to the code of company directors? If they are not directors of the companies, how much are they being paid? Why is there no sworn valuation?

Finally, to add to the many cunning moves that have been taken in regard to the scheme, a Supreme Court writ was taken out on Monday, and Mr Pat Cowan, a solicitor, advised members of the press——

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Row): Order! The honourable member has exhausted the time allowed him under Standing Orders.

Mr JENNINGS: I move—

“That the balance of the speech be incorporated in ‘Hansard’.”

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is leave granted?

Government Members: Aye.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Leave is granted. I call the honourable member for Ashgrove.

Mr DAVIS: I rise to a point of order. The member for Southport asked for the remainder of his speech to be incorporated in “Hansard” I am led to believe that, under Standing Orders, before that can be done the member must check with Mr Speaker or the occupant of the chair. We do not know what is to be put in “Hansard” We have not heard of it before.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I am obliged to accept the point of order. I have not checked the balance of the document that the honourable member asked to be incorporated in “Hansard” I allow the point of order. I suggest to the honourable member for Southport that he cannot incorporate his speech without first checking with Mr Speaker or the Chairman of Committees.

Mr JENNINGS: On the point of order taken by the member for Brisbane Central—as I understood it, Mr Deputy Speaker, you put my motion to the House that the balance of my speech be incorporated in “Hansard” As I understood it, the House voted affirmatively on that motion.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! My impression was that the honourable member for Southport asked for the inclusion of the portion of his speech that he had read. I was not aware that there was a remaining portion that the honourable member wished to be incorporated in “Hansard” This being a day allotted for the debate on matters of public interest, for which times are allotted, I consider that it is within my jurisdiction to call the next member to speak.

Ministerial Responsibility

Mr VEIVERS (Ashgrove) (12.43 p.m.): In the exercise of their responsibility, Ministers of the Crown are expected to be beyond reproach and to exercise their duties without favour. In recent times, regrettably, the people of this State have seen this

Government and its Ministers lower the standard of ministerial behaviour and decision-making to the level of, "If you can get away with it, good luck to you." I am speaking about matters such as the granting of coal contracts—honourable members may recall Winchester South—the siting of the Tarong Power Station, the Port of Brisbane container terminal dispute and the Jackson oil pipeline fiasco. Decisions on these matters, involving millions of dollars, have had the unsavoury smell of political favouritism about them.

No-one has to be an Einstein to work out that if such things are going on with big contracts, the degree of corruption at other levels must be mind-boggling. Land acquisition, developmental projects, governmental appointments and promotions within the public service are being undertaken increasingly on the basis of political expediency.

Ministers are pushing their personal barrows and those of their kin, their friends and supporters. Looked at legally, it is often hard to find if anything wrong has been done, but how much longer will the people of this State continue to cop the abuse of ministerial power and privilege?

In giving another example of the benefits that can accrue to a Minister in this Government, particularly if he is a Minister whose department is responsible for the decision-making, I refer to Junefair Pty Ltd, which has the licence for the Oxenford Tavern or, as it is commonly known, Russ Hinze's pub, because Junefair Pty Ltd is a family company of the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I remind the honourable member for Ashgrove that, under the Standing Orders of this House, it is considered to be unparliamentary or inappropriate to impugn the veracity of another member or Minister. I ask the honourable member for Ashgrove not to impugn the veracity of a Minister in this Parliament.

Mr VEIVERS: I will abide by that ruling. I am talking about the company.

Mr CASEY: I rise to a point of order. If the member concerned is present, he can take objection himself.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! He can; but he did not, and I did.

Mr VEIVERS: On 3 August 1983—

Mr HINZE: I rise to a point of order. Mr Deputy Speaker, I feel sorry for you, because you must find it very difficult to hear what is being said. I was sitting here trying to pick up the argument that the member was developing. He began to refer to a company, which is a family company in which I have an interest. He began to talk about "Russ's pub" I was beginning to get the gist of his speech before I took the point of order to which you have quite rightly referred. I do not know what is in the mind of the member, but I am quite prepared—

Mr Fouras: What is your point of order? You are taking his time.

Mr HINZE: I am not taking his time. I am only pointing out that, if necessary, I will take a point of order at the proper time. There will be no doubt about that.

Mr VEIVERS: On 3 August 1983, Junefair purchased the Oxenford Hotel for \$680,000. In March of this year, the company applied to the Albert Shire Council for approval to build a shopping complex around the hotel. The proposal includes two fast-food shops, a supermarket, a fruit barn, small shops, a hall, a mall and—believe it or not—a TAB agency.

That is interesting, because in the "Gold Coast Bulletin" on 24 and 26 June, the Minister, after being questioned on the matter, is reported to have said—

"The TAB Board had surveyed the area and found no established need for an agency."

However, he went on to say—

“And there the matter rests for the normal period of twelve months when, in the usual course of events, it will be reviewed by the Board in the light of developments.”

Does anyone in this Chamber doubt what that decision is going to be? Every hotelier in Queensland would be green with envy to see a TAB agency placed within the environs of his own hotel.

The plan for a shopping centre has caused understandable concern to nearby traders. Local shop-owners in the area are worried and say that the shops to be built are unnecessary. One of them is reported as saying—

“... the Oxenford-Coomera area did not have enough people to support two shopping centres.

‘Instead of one group of people struggling to make a living now, there will be two groups—twice as many people doing half as much work.’”

The public is entitled to be informed of two other aspects of this case involving the purchase of Crown property. The plans for the complex were dependent on the company acquiring two pieces of Crown property. So far, the acquisition of one piece of property has been completed, and an application is currently before the Land Administration Commission for the closure of a road to clear the way for acquisition of the other piece.

The first piece comprising 5 574 square metres, or 1 377 acres, was owned by the Railway Department. It was part of the old Gold Coast railway line. In December 1983, a two-year lease was given to Junefair with an option to purchase. That option was taken up immediately, and the transfer took place on 27 January 1984 for a sum of \$38,000. This involves a bill of mortgage with a loan from the European Asian Bank Aktiengesellschaft, a bank incorporated in the Federal Republic of Germany. It is interesting to see the Minister spreading his loans all around the world. What happened to the Moscow Narodny Bank, with which the Minister signed a \$550,000 mortgage on 1 December 1978, for two other family companies, Maralinga Pty Ltd and Belah Pty Ltd, to cover other projects?

To acquire the second piece of Crown property, the company must first secure the closure of a section of the old Pacific Highway adjoining the hotel site. Notice for permanent closure of this road was given on 15 June 1984. Objections closed on 2 August last. The district land commissioner will examine the proposal under the terms of the Land Act and then report to the Land Administration Commission, which will make the decision.

The Albert Shire Council has objected to the closure of the road and, according to a reported statement by Councillor Bill Laver, chairman of the Albert shire, on Friday, 29 June, the Minister's own Main Roads Department has objected to the closure of the road. Yet the Albert Shire Council still approved the shopping centre application.

There is an atmosphere of uneasiness about the developments in the vicinity of the Oxenford Tavern. Major roadworks have been taking place, an overpass over the Pacific Highway is being constructed, and access to and from the highway to the tavern has been made easier. The previous owner of the hotel did not have road access to and from the busy Pacific Highway. The Minister has stated that his company has paid for the construction of the road. It is a wonder that the Minister, with his abuse of privilege, did not have the four lanes of the Pacific Highway running right through his drive-in bottle shop with the appropriate “Stop and buy” signs. With a TAB agency thrown in, it could be the world's first six-pack, 6 pic highway stop.

The construction of the access road is highly questionable, particularly from a road safety viewpoint. A freeway, especially one as busy as the Gold Coast Highway, should only have limited access. It would be unheard of in Europe or anywhere else in Australia for there to be access to a hotel from an autobahn or freeway. I remind honourable members that the three portfolios held by the Minister are Main Roads, Local Government

and Racing. The Minister can exert considerable influence on the decisions to be made, and the people making the decisions are placed in very awkward positions. Given the track record of the Minister and his personal commitment in this matter, can anyone think for a moment that he will sit back and not buy into the decision-making process? The capital gain alone would surely make him a multimillionaire.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Row): Order! I have already warned the honourable member for Ashgrove that the Standing Orders of this Assembly provide that such imputations cannot be made against another member. I ask the honourable member to withdraw his last comment.

Mr VEIVERS: I withdraw the comment, Mr Deputy Speaker. It is obvious that the Minister is taking a personal interest.

As a result of the very considerable roadworks already completed, section 207 of the Land Act becomes easier to apply in favour of the Minister's company. The improvements to the old road will help to justify the acquisition of the land. Would an ordinary citizen have the same opportunity as the Minister? That is really the heart of the matter.

For years the Minister has been in trouble over his personal interests and public responsibilities. Milk quotas, quarrying operations and bank loans have been debated. In 1979, when the Minister's loan from the Moscow Narodny Bank became public, an editorial from "The Courier-Mail" reported—

"In principle, when a Minister has important public business with a financial institution, it is unwise for him or his family to have major private business with the same institution. Ministers need not only to be above reproach in their private business dealings, but to be seen by the public as above reproach."

The Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Racing, despite the convention that a Minister's pecuniary interests should never clash with his public duties, is embarking on a project over which he has discretionary power and influence as Minister. He has purchased a hotel next to a major highway. As Minister for Main Roads, he has overseen the construction of an access road that will be of tremendous commercial advantage to the hotel. Then he has overseen the acquisition of railway

Time expired.

Social Standards

Mr INNES (Sherwood) (12.53 p.m.): Today I wish to address the matter of changing social standards in this country. Parliament has legislative responsibilities as to public order and criminal law. Some of the matters that I will speak about relate to both of those responsibilities, and I intend, at the first possible opportunity, to move a notice of motion about them.

The decision of the Australian Broadcasting Corporation to give the partners of homosexual employees the same entitlements as married couples and their families is the focal point of what is happening in Australia. Significant changes have taken place in the fabric of our community and society under the Hawke Labor Government. Mr Hawke is a great conjuror, creating an illusion and pulling consensus rabbits and a string of sports stars out of a top hat. Meanwhile, within the community, his associates are picking our pockets, not only for money and taxes, but also for other things that we value, such as our institutions and basic social principles.

I claim to speak on behalf of the overwhelming majority of Queenslanders when I say that they are opposed absolutely to the changes that have taken place in the ABC. If, as is rumoured, a similar policy is being implemented by Government departments, they stand opposed completely to that.

The facile, logical argument that one equates homosexual de facto relationships so called and de facto relationships properly so called with marriage is rationalising oneself

off the face of the earth. The term "de facto" cannot be applied and should never be applied to homosexual relationships. The term "de facto" can be applied to relationships between men and women. That is the only definition recognised by the dictionary. It is the only proper definition that is available for what used to be called common-law marriages. To make that facile progress is to disregard the gut reaction and the logical and essential truth of the position as seen by the majority of Australians.

I speak on behalf of the majority of Australians, whether they vote Liberal, Labor or National, who wish to bring up their children on the right course in life, who wish their children to be straight and to marry the right boy or the right girl, and who wish to continue the species and the standards that have applied in Australia to date. I do not speak on behalf of arch-conservatives or the people on the outer-right fringes of politics. I certainly do not speak on behalf of the people on the outer-left fringes.

If institutions and organisations for which the Government is directly responsible condone, approve or financially support such massive changes that are opposed by 99 per cent of Australians, the reality is that things will get worse. People fall into two categories: those who absolutely oppose homosexuality, and those who say, "What happens behind closed doors between adults is their problem, but what happens in public is our problem." Whichever view one takes, when the matter is brought out into public profile, it is a matter of concern for the majority of persons.

It is undoubtedly difficult to bring up children in this day and age. There is an aberrance of an entire world that is propelled by the electronic media into the lounge-room via the television set every hour of every day and night. The aberrant, the wayward and the exotic is all propelled into a situation in which somebody is struggling to do old-fashioned things such as bring up children with a sense of right and wrong. People are deeply offended by what they see. They feel helpless because they do not control the media.

Since the matter was raised, and following my raising of the matter two or three weeks ago, I received telephone calls from a number of persons saying, "Please continue to say it." I have received telephone calls from women whose marriages have been destroyed by homosexual relationships into which their husbands have been inveigled. That behaviour is facilitated in the modern world by the presence of such things as gay bars and apparent approval given to places at which such persons can gather.

I have received telephone calls from persons who were distressed because their homosexual neighbours have acted overtly in their relationship while the persons who telephoned me were trying to bring up their children in the correct manner. Fights between people acting out male and female roles in male homosexual relationships have occurred in the streets. I have received complaints about adult women walking down a street to their home, being met in the street, kissing in public and being intimate in public. People are distressed by such behaviour because, in that environment, they are trying to bring up their children whom they hope will be straight. There is no doubt that they would be compassionate and understanding if something went wrong. However, they want their children to begin life on the straight and narrow. I believe that their views and ambitions for their children are entirely proper and soundly based for a happy and tolerable society.

Mr McElligott: What can you do—put them all behind bars?

Mr INNES: I beg the honourable member's pardon?

Mr McElligott: What can you do—hide them away somewhere?

Mr INNES: No. What one says is that in no way should the Government or society give overt approval—certainly not financial approval—to the spread of those relationships.

Mr McElligott: Keep them off the streets?

Mr INNES: Keep them off the streets and keep the whole matter behind closed doors. That is simple.

As soon as it was suggested that the laws in New South Wales and Victoria should be changed to decriminalise homosexuality, an aggressive phase was adopted. People said, "It is beautiful. It is commendable. We should be allowed to go into the schools and talk about it. We should be able to push it on radio and on television." It is held up as something that is acceptable and normal. I do not know what other honourable members think, but I oppose that view. That view is opposed by 99 per cent of Australians.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: (Mr Row): Order! Under the provisions of Standing Order No. 36A, the time allotted for the debate on matters of public interest has now expired.

Sitting suspended from 1 to 2.15 p.m.

Hon. Sir WILLIAM KNOX proceeding to give notice of a motion—

Mr WRIGHT: I rise to a point of order. I seek your ruling, Mr Speaker, on whether a member can continue to give notice of motions that he wishes to move. I thought the rule was that other members had to be given the chance to give notice of motions. That has been the rule of the House. The honourable member for Nundah could give notice of one motion, other members could be given the opportunity to do so and then, should he wish, the honourable member for Nundah could give a further notice of motion. However, he ought not to do it as a list of notices of motion, as he is now doing. There should be a ruling on that.

Mr SPEAKER: I do not agree, but I could be corrected on that.

Honourable Members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Honourable members, I have been advised that the Leader of the Opposition is correct in his point of order. Therefore, we will proceed accordingly.

LEAVE TO MOVE MOTION WITHOUT NOTICE

Hon. W. D. LICKISS (Mount Coot-tha): I seek leave to move a motion without notice.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Is leave granted?

Honourable Members: No!

Honourable Members: Aye!

Sir William Knox: Divide!

Mr SPEAKER: I think the "Ayes" have it.

Mr Burns: He wants a division before you make up your mind.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! A moment ago I asked the House if leave was granted. I said, "The 'Ayes' have it."

Mr Burns: Mr Knox called "Divide!"

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I asked the House if leave was granted. I heard on both sides "Noes" and "Ayes" and said, "The 'Ayes' have it." Is a division being called for or not?

As I have no call for a division, the "Ayes" have it and the member for Mount Coot-tha may proceed.

FEDERAL BUDGET

Hon. W. D. LICKISS (Mount Coot-tha) (2.18 p.m.): I move—

“That this House records its disappointment that the Federal Budget for 1984-85 failed to adequately assist the family, small business and primary producers, and refused to recompense Queensland adequately in the Medicare arrangements to reimburse Queenslanders for losing a successful free hospital scheme.

And the House further notes that—

- (1) Australians are one of the highest taxed people in the world;
- (2) The increase in proportion of income tax of Government revenue has gone from 50.8 per cent to 53.1 per cent;
- (3) The tax increase will be in excess of \$2.4 billion;
- (4) Federal Government outlays account for more than 30 per cent of gross domestic product; and
- (5) Most Australians will be paying more than 46 per cent of gross income in income tax during 1984-85.”

Hon. Sir WILLIAM KNOX (Nundah) (2.19 p.m.): I second the motion.

Mr LICKISS: I am sure that, today, Australians must be lamenting the actions they took—

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I have no copy of the honourable member's motion. Therefore, the debate cannot proceed.

Mr LICKISS: The attendants have copies for distribution.

Sir JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN: I rise to a point of order. Although the Government agrees with the honourable member, it was never intended that this matter be debated today. I called out “No”; I do not know how many others called out “No”. I do not know whether there is any other method of taking a vote on it. Certainly, a number of us called out “No”

Mr SIMPSON: I rise to a point of order.

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Mr LICKISS: Today, Australians must be lamenting—

Mr MACKENROTH: I rise to a point of order. Mr Speaker, you accepted the honourable member for Nundah (Sir William Knox) as the seconder of the motion. Therefore, the member for Mount Coot-tha had finished his speech.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I ask the member for Mount Coot-tha to proceed.

Mr LICKISS: Today, Australians must be lamenting that they voted for the Hawke Labor Government. The introduction of that Government's second Budget reveals that the people that the Labor Party purported to assist—that is, the family—have not been assisted. The Budget contains very little that will help the family, which is the basis of our society.

Great play has been made of the increasing employment opportunities. However, the great employer of labour in Australia is small business.

Mr SIMPSON: I rise to a point of order. The motion that I have in my hand is not in the name of the member for Mount Coot-tha (Mr Lickiss); it is in the name of the member for Nundah (Sir William Knox). Therefore, I suggest that it is out of order.

Mr LICKISS: The person who moves the motion is responsible for the motion before the House. Sir William Knox did not move it; I did.

Mr SIMPSON: I rise to a further point of order. The mover said that the motion had been tabled in the form in which he read it. That is not so.

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Mr LICKISS: This is becoming more interesting all the time. It is interesting to note who does not want this motion discussed. The important point is which party does want to discuss this matter.

Mr DAVIS: I move—

“That the member for Mount Coot-tha be no longer heard.”

Question put; and the House divided—

In division—

Mr CASEY: I rise to a point of order. Mr Speaker, I draw your attention to Standing Order 155, which states—

“A Member having given his voice with the Ayes or Noes shall not, on a Division being taken, be at liberty to vote with the opposite party . . .”

I draw your attention to the fact that when you called initially for the voices in this debate, the Premier and all members of the Cabinet sitting directly opposite clearly said “Aye” to the motion. They have, therefore, contravened Standing Order 155 and are not entitled to participate in this vote.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! As I was not in a position to know which members, or how many, voted “Aye” or “No”, I ask those members on my left in the House who wish to vote “Aye” to change their seats right now. There is nothing in the Standing Orders that allows me to call another division on this matter, which is normally what I would do. As I said, I was not in a position earlier to record, or to have noted, who said “Aye” and who said “No” in this particular instance. I ask all those honourable members on my left who wish to change their vote to do so now.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! For that matter, I ask honourable members on both sides of the House to do that.

Mr WRIGHT: I rise to a point of order. Is it not correct that the Premier voted in the affirmative? If so, and as he informed the House of his position, should he not now leave the Chamber?

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I have given my decision on the matter. As I said, I was not in a position to record who said “Aye” and who said “No”.

Ayes, 29

Campbell
Casey
Comben
D’Arcy
De Lacy
Eaton
Fouras
Gibbs, R. J.
Goss
Hamill

Kruger
Mackenroth
McElligott
McLean
Miller
Milliner
Palaszczuk
Prest
Price
Scott

Shaw
Veivers
Warburton
Warner, A. M.
Wilson
Wright
Yewdale

Tellers:

Burns
Davis

Noes, 47

Ahern
Alison
Austin
Bailey
Bjelke-Petersen
Booth
Borbidge
Cahill
Chapman
Cooper
Elliott
FitzGerald
Gibbs, I. J.
Glasson
Goleby
Gunn
Gygar

Harper
Harvey
Henderson
Innes
Jennings
Katter
Kaus
Knox
Lane
Lee
Lester
Lickiss
Lingard
Littleproud
McKechnie
McPhie
Menzel

Muntz
Newton
Powell
Row
Simpson
Stephan
Stoneman
Tenni
Turner
Wharton
White

Tellers:

Randell
Neal

Resolved in the negative.

Hon. C. A. WHARTON (Burnett—Leader of the House): I move—
“That the debate be now adjourned.”

Question put; and the House divided—

Ayes, 42

Ahern
Alison
Austin
Bailey
Bjelke-Petersen
Booth
Borbidge
Cahill
Chapman
Cooper
Elliott
FitzGerald
Gibbs, I. J.
Glasson
Goleby

Gunn
Harper
Harvey
Henderson
Jennings
Katter
Kaus
Lane
Lester
Lingard
Littleproud
McKechnie
McPhie
Menzel
Miller

Muntz
Newton
Powell
Row
Simpson
Stephan
Stoneman
Tenni
Turner
Wharton

Tellers:

Randell
Neal

Noes, 35

Campbell
Casey
Comben
D'Arcy
De Lacy
Eaton
Fouras
Gibbs, R. J.
Goss
Gygar
Hamill
Hartwig
Innes

Knox
Kruger
Lee
Lickiss
Mackenroth
McElligott
McLean
Milliner
Palaszczuk
Prest
Price
Scott
Shaw

Veivers
Warburton
Warner, A. M.
White
Wilson
Wright
Yewdale

Tellers:

Burns
Davis

Resolved in the affirmative.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr BURNS (Lytton) (2.48 p.m.), by leave: During the parliamentary recess I made statements expressing my anger at the failure of the legal system in Queensland to treat both poor and rich equally. My anger arose from the Walsh case, in which one of the State's leading barristers and an agent from the Public Defender's Office were reported

to have been in Walsh's home in the early hours of the morning waiting for the police to arrive and to have refused police requests for blood analysis, etc.

I said that if a young Aboriginal lad, a migrant or a meat-worker from my electorate had been charged with the offences with which Walsh had been charged, he would not have had the opportunity to have a top barrister so readily available at public expense. Mr Walsh's father, who is a leading lawyer, said that in my eyes it was a crime to help a friend. I have no argument with a father doing the best for his son or a mate helping him out. However, I questioned, and still question, the right of the well-off Mr Walsh to obtain a leading barrister-friend's assistance at public expense. I repeat that it does not happen for the ordinary man whose father knows no top barristers or agents for the Public Defender.

Mr Sturgess reacted by resorting to personal abuse. He said that my claim was idiotic and that I should have more sense. He stated further that he would even act for me. If Mr Sturgess thinks that it is idiotic to suggest that those who can pay more or who are in the know receive better legal representation than the ordinary Aborigine, migrant or meat-worker, I think that he has been drinking the spiked, stolen drinks that he used so theatrically to defend Walsh.

I hope I never need Mr Sturgess to defend me. I most certainly will not be involved in real estate rip-offs, like the crooks of Russell Island whom Mr Sturgess defended so successfully in a long, drawn-out, costly trial and I most certainly will not be involved in bottom-of-the-harbour schemes. So Mr Sturgess will not be defending me on charges associated with robbing the honest tax-payers of this nation. Like many other young and elderly people in the community, I have had my beer but I have not gone home and tried to murder my neighbour. So I will not need Mr Sturgess to dazzle the court with a well-rehearsed production of what the Grosvenor school of law said was the only way to get Walsh off.

I will be raising the Walsh case and a number of other matters in debates in the Parliament and, unlike Mr Sturgess, I will not set out to denigrate decent publicans or their staff in trying to win at any price. However, I will seek to expose the reasons for Mr Sturgess's violent response to my just claim that there is one law for the rich and another for the poor.

FISHERIES ACT

Motion for Disallowance of Regulations

Mr KRUGER (Murrumba) (2.51 p.m.): I move—

“That the Fisheries Regulations under the Fisheries Act 1976-1982, as made on 26 January 1984 and tabled in this House on 28 February 1984, be disallowed.”

I understand that, since I gave notice of this motion, the Government has made concessions in consultation with the industry. I wonder why the industry was not consulted before the proclamation of the regulations. However, I will deal in more depth with that matter later in my speech. If concessions are envisaged, we ought to know what they are. I assume that the Minister will give some clarification later. The industry and I want to know about the issues. Until we are informed about any concessions, I must proceed with my original objections to the regulations. If the statements about concessions that have been made were honest and genuine, it seems ridiculous that we have not been given any details. As that has not happened, I must act on the basis that the rumours of concessions are not accurate. If the rumoured concessions are to be beneficial, I can only say that they must have arisen as a result of this motion.

As I pointed out when I raised this matter in caucus before I gave notice of the motion, there have been problems with the aquarium fish trade and with the regulations made on 26 January. Until that time, the Government had intended to proceed with ridiculous regulations that it had previously introduced. As the day wears on, we will see how good the Minister and the Government are.

I deal now with the history of events. Early in February I received several phone calls and letters from people concerned about the Eighth Schedule to the Fisheries Regulations which were made on 26 January. That occurred at a time when a committee comprising members on this side of the House was considering similar problems with birds under the proposed Vertebrate Pest Bill. All honourable members know that the Vertebrate Pest Bill was shelved because of matters raised by the Opposition which clearly showed that there was no need for the legislation. On about 10 or 11 February this year, there were outbursts from the Minister for Lands, Forestry and Police, who was to introduce the Bill, that there would be no categorisation of birds and fish. What the Minister did not understand at that time was that the matter was not finished. Subsequent questions by Opposition members led to further outbursts. Prior to that there had been categorisation of fish, which is what these regulations are all about.

The regulations were not introduced in the way they should have been. They were introduced in secrecy, which ought not to happen. I am told that when an adviser to the department, Mr Roley McKay, was questioned he said that if he had his way he would ban the whole lot and that there would be no fish imported into the country.

I will look at it in some detail and go through the non-indigenous fish listed in the schedule. Several fish have been banned in Queensland. Apart from complaints I have received, colleagues have contacted me on behalf of aquarium-owners and fish-fanciers in their electorates. During that period, I became aware of the strength of the association, how many people were involved and what the hobby meant both financially and from the point of view of enjoyment by those who keep aquarium fish.

Mr R. J. Gibbs: There are quite a few piranha over there.

Mr KRUGER: If the right sort of bait was used, quite a few of them would grab it at any time. The sort of bait I am talking about is little green flat things that can be stacked into large piles. Members opposite are renowned for grabbing at them.

One of the complaints I received was from a Mundubbera chap, who is a well recognised operator in the aquarium fish trade. He pointed out quite clearly that he had been disadvantaged and that his business would decline. The member for Bulimba (Mr McLean) handed me a letter from Fisharena Aquarium, which dealt with many of the problems. The letter states—

“I am writing to you as my local MP to ask were you aware of Government legislation which has affected most aquarium shops and overnight made a large percentage of the owners criminals in the eyes of the law.

For many years there has existed a list of fish that you could legally import from abroad. There have also been many species of fish that although you were not permitted to bring into the country you were allowed to buy from local breeders and legally sell.”

The letter also mentioned the quantity of fish bred locally. For many, many years these fish have been bred in Australia.

I received a letter which was also sent to quite a few members of Parliament on both sides of the House, some of whom have been very, very sympathetic to aquarium fish-dealers. Government members have said that what happened was wrong but when I asked them to support me in the House today they refused, simply because they want to back the Government. However, time after time they condemn members of the Labor Party for voting en bloc. The fact that they will not support their own views in this place shows how weak and gutless they are.

Mr Borbidge: When was the last time you crossed the floor?

Mr KRUGER: That has nothing to do with what I am talking about. I am issuing the challenge to Government members. When the honourable member is good enough to come over here and issue the challenge to me, he can do so. He should not issue it from there while making a heap of stupid, ridiculous interjections.

Because the information I have really shoots the Government apart, I wish I could have it all included in "Hansard". The Government has not believed any of the information that has been put to it. The Dedicated Aquarium Hobbyist Group, which was formed to fight these regulations, went to great lengths to point out to the Minister what it felt was wrong with the entire matter. I took the information I received to other members of the Opposition to try to sort out what could be done from that point. As a result, I contacted the Department of Primary Industries and received the following reply—

"I refer to your recent questions regarding amendments to the Eighth Schedule of the Fisheries Act 1976-1982 and the consequences of these amendments to certain fish breeders.

Schedule 8 of the Act lists prescribed non indigenous fish, that is imported tropical fish that may only be held in an aquarium situation."

I return to the point that these fish were introduced into Australia 30 to 40 years ago. Although the importation of fish presents some problems, many of these fish have been in Australia for some time. The letter continues—

"The purpose of the Eighth Schedule is to complement Federal Government legislation which is set out in the Customs (Prohibited Imports) Regulation and the recent amendments to the Schedule have been made to accommodate changes to the Customs Regulation."

The department went on at great length to say that it would not enforce the regulations. To me, that seems ridiculous. That is no guarantee to the people involved in the trade and no guarantee to a little old lady or somebody else that a nice cichlid or other type of fish regarded as a family pet, the same as a dog, cat, bird or whatever, will not be taken away. The letter was signed by Mr Hegarty on behalf of the director-general (Dr Alexander), so it is genuine and fair dinkum. If the department does not intend enforcing the regulations, why were they introduced?

The Dedicated Aquarium Hobbyist Group spoke to various other sections in the fish trade. The four or five major groups in this State discussed what was needed and a joint organisation was formed to contest the regulations now under debate.

A close look at what happened then shows that they received recognition not only from people within Australia but also from people overseas. For a start, Americans connected with the trade sent letters of support stating that they were very concerned about the attitude of the Queensland Government. I might add that although the Queensland Government uses as an excuse for its action the fact that Queensland has to fall into line with Canberra and the other States, as I go on I will produce a couple of letters that indicate clearly that the other States are not acting.

The group collected about 2 500 signatures requesting that the amendments to the Act be repealed. The trade is saying that if some of these fish are dangerous, they should be banned, but there has been no clear or conclusive proof that there is any real danger. The First Schedule to the Act referred to exotic fishes not listed in the Eighth Schedule to the Fisheries Regulations 1977.

In the limited time available to me, I cannot give all the facts or go through the entire history of this matter, but I certainly have all the facts available. There was also a permit system that enabled certain fish to be kept. That system was used by aquarium hobbyists who wished to keep and study the members of the African cichlid group. It was the group most affected by the regulations brought down in January this year.

How, then, can people be disadvantaged by breeding and selling these fish when the Act states that the sale of fish covered by the permit is illegal anyway? Nobody is arguing about the need for some sort of permit system in some cases; but what really needs to be looked at is what has happened to the rest of the species that are available. The letter from the Department of Primary Industries falls down because it fails to mention the many other groups of fishes now affected by the recent legislation. The

Central and South American cichlid fishes, catfish species and members of many other species are now lost to the hobby and trade.

I am not an expert in the field, but after speaking to people about the fish they have in their homes, I realise that many of them are available, and have been for many years. Many varieties have been in existence in the hobby field in Queensland for varying periods, some for more than 40 years. Why, then, have they suddenly become a threat? I suggest that it is because somebody suddenly believed that they should be banned. Many of them were removed from the prescribed list over recent years.

All of the stock available to hobbyists and dealers were locally-bred descendants of the then legal imports. To remove all these fish from circulation will have dire effects on the lives and livelihood of many people. Till 25 January 1984, people were quite justified in keeping and/or selling such fish; but not so the day after. The point is that the day after these regulations came into effect people were suddenly holding fish illegally. I might add at this stage that the champion fish at the Brisbane Show was one such fish. It has been banned under these regulations. That shows just how stupid the situation is.

The Dedicated Aquarium Hobbyists and Dealers Group is very concerned about the way in which, and the speed with which, this legislation was passed. Why would it not be? As I pointed out before, it was legal one day and illegal the next. How ridiculous! I guarantee that many members did not know that the regulations had been implemented. As happens in many instances in this State, the decision would have been taken by a few fellows sitting in the Cabinet room talking about things they know little or nothing about and then implemented.

The reason given for invoking the legislation is even more startling. According to a senior officer from the Fisheries Service, it followed a verbal—not written—request from one person in the trade. Apparently, a misconstrued statement taken out of context has resulted in this fiasco.

Paragraph 3 of the DPI circular states that certain fish numbers shall be contained and that other less desirable species shall be eliminated. Over past decades, hobbyists have seen thousands of species removed from the prescribed list of legal imports. Today, the prescribed list contains no more than 100 names. The restriction to a few species shows how seriously people in the trade treat this issue.

A Fisheries Service spokesman countered that by saying that in some cases all species and subspecies of illegal fish are allowed in this State. If he had bothered to check out that statement he would have found that many of them are either rare in their natural state, too expensive for the average aquarist or, most importantly, not popular in the hobby anyway.

The Dedicated Aquarium Hobbyists and Dealers Group tells me that its members are great supporters of conservation in our environment. There seems to be some concern that these people will be doing the wrong thing. I am assured by the people in the trade that they are interested in the environment generally. If that were not so the fish that have been available in Australia for 40 years would certainly have been in our waterways long before now. If the Minister cares to tell me that the people in the trade are doing the wrong thing and telling me a heap of lies, I would challenge him to do so later. Many of them keep varieties of native fish and have no wish to see their habitats destroyed.

It is no secret that certain people involved with the environment would dearly love to totally ban the importation of fish. The cichlid group is banned today, and it could well be the goldfish group tomorrow. The goldfish that have been loved so dearly by so many people for so long could quite easily vanish from Queensland. I wonder how long it will be before we get some sanity in this place about these matters. It has been said that these fish are to be banned so that they will not be a menace to the environment. After the 1974 floods, not one type of fish kept in the aquarium situation did not escape

into our streams. I challenge the Minister to tell us clearly which of these fish are causing the problem, which are destroying the native fish and where the problems are occurring.

The next matter of contention is paragraph 5 in a letter from the Department of Primary Industries, which refers to ill-informed comments by certain people. It is a pity that I do not have an hour to deal with these matters. If honourable members wish to examine any of the documentation I have from the department and other people, it will be made available to them.

I am concerned about the viewpoint of the person who has been supplying good, interesting fish to so many people for so long. What is to happen to him if the Minister does not devise something sensible to counteract the problems I have outlined? Mr Halliwell, the secretary of the Aquarium Fish Importers and Pet Traders Association of New South Wales, received a letter from Mr Knowles, the New South Wales Director-General, in these terms—

“I refer to your recent letter querying whether licensed breeders would be able to continue breeding those species which are prohibited imports.

Although the Queensland Fisheries Service has recently banned the production and sale of species other than those permitted for import, there is no immediate intention to introduce similar legislation in New South Wales. If, for ecological reasons, it was found necessary to introduce bans on the sale of any species these would only be introduced after full consultation with the aquarium industry.”

I am making the point that consultation should have occurred in Queensland. There was no point in introducing this back-door legislation without consulting the people who know something about the matter.

I have a letter from the Freshwater and Marine Aquarium Magazine of California indicating disgust with what has taken place in Queensland. Debates similar to this have taken place in American legislative bodies for many years. Part of another letter from the Department of Primary Industries to Mr Halliwell was in these terms—

“Your comments about Nile Perch are somewhat astray. I don't know where you got hold of the story of this species attacking man, but it is certainly apocryphal.”

I believe that the Premier has carp in his dam at Barambah. I understand that carp is another suspect species. It is said that the Nile perch, which the Government has allowed into the State and is testing, has not attacked man. A reference from “The Cichlid Fishes of the Great Lakes of Africa”, written by experts in the field, points out that the Nile perch grows to 163 kg. A fish of that size is in the grouper class and could well tackle a man.

My reasons for moving for the disallowance of the regulation are that no real reason has been given for them, little or no research has been made into the need for prohibiting the species listed, there has been undue haste in the introduction of the regulations and it was done through the back door. If the regulation was needed, why was it not phased in over a period? If smuggling is a problem, it should be checked in a completely different way.

Time expired.

Mr CAMPBELL (Bundaberg) (3.10 p.m.): I second the motion on the basis of what has been said by people who know the industry. With an already depressed pet trade, this legislation may be the final straw that breaks the camel's back. The enactment of these regulations will have devastating effects on the wholesale and retail hobby and aquarium trades alike.

The most despicable aspects of these amendments to the regulations were the secrecy and the speed with which they were introduced. One day people had legal varieties of fish in their tanks. Next day, however, they found that they were breaking the law, through no fault of theirs, and were liable to substantial fines for possessing fish that they had owned for years. They are the fish of the dedicated aquarium-owners and hobbyists, and have been available in Queensland since 1926.

It is not just the Opposition that is objecting to these regulations. The pet fish and aquarium industry is not small and insignificant. The keeping of fish is publicly accepted as being the second most popular and valuable hobby in Australia. It rates second only to photography as a hobby. The industry throughout Australia is estimated to have an annual turnover of approximately \$100 m. Queensland accounts for \$15 m of that turnover. Since the new Eighth Schedule came into effect, the turnover of small dealers has been reduced by 30 to 40 per cent. Putting business out of action is not a good way in which a Government that champions small business can help the economy.

These regulations have done immense harm to the industry and, if retained, could do permanent damage to the industry. They could cause small businesses to go bankrupt and jobs to be lost, and Queensland cannot afford any more bankrupt businesses or loss of jobs as a direct consequence of action by the State Government.

I request that these regulations be disallowed on the following grounds: The regulations are inconsistent with subsequent decisions of the Government; they discriminate against the aquarium fish hobbyist; they have caused a great deal of uncertainty in the minds of the members of the Queensland public; they have drastically affected the livelihood of many small business people in the wholesale and retail aquarium trade; and there is no substantiated scientific evidence to confirm that all the species of fish in the Eighth Schedule are a threat to the environment. The Eighth Schedule is inconsistent.

Subsequent to the gazettal of these regulations, the Department of Primary Industries informed the aquarium industry and hobbyists that the cichlid can now be kept under a permit system. So, in effect, the schedule states that it is illegal to keep these fish in Queensland, and the department then says, "We will give you a permit to keep the fish." That is the inconsistency. The situation can easily be corrected by passing this motion to disallow the regulations.

Small businesses and the wholesale and retail traders have been placed in a very serious financial situation. I shall refer to some cases that have come to my attention. Case No. 1 refers to a central Brisbane trader. Since January, his turnover has been reduced by 40 to 50 per cent. Previously he employed one full-time staff member and two casuals. He now employs one full-time staff member and one casual and has to work longer hours himself. Since the issue of the permits, his business has changed. Turnover has increased by 20 per cent.

Case No. 2 concerns a north Brisbane trader. His turnover has been reduced by 50 per cent, and 90 per cent of his business comes from fish and fish supplies. His turnover has been cut in half. He does not employ any staff now and has to work seven days a week himself. The Government does not believe in unions, but I ask: Why do small business people have to work seven days a week and have their turnover cut by half?

Since January, that same business has not sold one six-ft tank for large fish. Since the issue of the permits, the business has had orders for those tanks. Cichlids are an important part of the aquarium trade. They are bigger fish and the hobbyist can progress from smaller fish to them.

The turnover of another business has gone down by 20 to 30 per cent. The man who owns it has worked hard for over five years to build it up, only to have it cut down from under him.

In one business that imports fish—and that involves quarantine—the turnover was reduced by 40 per cent. Since the permit system has been announced, the turnover has increased by 30 per cent and the business can now manufacture larger fish tanks and one extra casual staff member has been employed. Because of these regulations, that is the plight of many people in the industry.

The regulations discriminate against Queensland hobbyists. South of the Tweed River, the fish are legal and present no problem; yet north of the Tweed River, the fish are illegal. I would like to know on what grounds the fish have been made illegal. The

Queensland hobbyist is being discriminated against, because the climatic conditions may be more favourable for the fish-keeping hobbyist in Queensland. That should not be the reason for discriminating against the hobbyists.

Mr Turner: What better reason than if the environment is more suitable for fish to live in our tropical waters when they could die out down in southern waters? What better reason?

Mr CAMPBELL: If the Minister is so concerned, can he tell me why after the 1974 floods, the fish listed in this regulation did not become feral fish and attack the environment? The fish have been here for 40 years and some have probably escaped in the past. Why has this regulation been imposed now? The benefit-cost ratio must be considered. There are risks in anything. Every time we get in a car we are exposing ourselves to risk, but cars are not banned.

An Opposition Member: There are risks with a National Party Government.

Mr CAMPBELL: Yes; free enterprise!

Since 1926, cichlids have not become feral and they are unlikely to do so. There is no substantiated evidence that the species listed in the regulations are an environmental threat. In support of that statement, I refer to a comment by Mr Max Schmidt, an animal quarantine senior inspector with the Department of Primary Industries, that appeared in the "Telegraph" of 23 May 1984. The article states that—

"People who bought ornamental fish from retailers need not worry too much. Retailers can supply healthy, disease-free fish that have undergone the required quarantine procedures."

The argument about the introduction of new diseases is not valid; it cannot be substantiated.

If the Government is concerned about certain fish damaging the environment, it should take steps to amend the Fourth Schedule, which refers to noxious fish. Those fish could be banned altogether. This Eighth Schedule is not needed. The Fourth Schedule should be expanded after consultation with the industry. From my investigations, it seems that no-one in the Department of Primary Industries has a great understanding of aquariums and fish, and the officers are prepared to say that. Every year the Eighth Schedule will become out of date and will have to be updated.

People who have been legally keeping fish banned in this regulation are now criminals and can be fined up to \$2,000. It is not up to the Government to make criminals of the ordinary people. The Eighth Schedule is not needed. If the Government is concerned about the environment and noxious fish, it should ban them through the Fourth Schedule. Many fish that appear in the Eighth Schedule have done no harm and could be kept.

Honourable members should agree to the disallowance of this regulation. The Eighth Schedule is inconsistent, it shows uncertainty, discriminates against hobbyists, and drastically affects small businesses in Queensland.

Mr BOOTH (Warwick) (3.20 p.m.): The member for Murrumba took a fairly tolerant attitude when he moved the motion for the disallowance of the regulations under the Fisheries Act. He said that he was not opposed to the permit system. If he is not opposed to the permit system, surely it is an advantage——

Mr Kruger: What permit system do we have under those regulations?

Mr BOOTH: There is no question that permits are available to persons who want them. If I am wrong about that, the honourable member can tell me where I am wrong. I am not an expert on aquarium fish. I say with sincerity that when the issue first arose——

Mr Kruger interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Row): Order! Earlier I said that if a member interjects and does not receive a response from the member who is speaking, the interjection adds nothing to the debate. I ask the member for Murrumba to cease shouting across the Chamber when he is not receiving a response from the member who is speaking.

Mr BOOTH: When the issue first arose, I spoke to a group of dealers, breeders and traders to find out their problems. As I am not an expert on the matter, I wondered what their problems were.

I had some difficulty understanding what was said by the mover and seconder of the motion. The seconder said that fish-breeders and fish-traders were being destroyed. I cannot understand that. Although cichlids are sought-after fish, the trade in them is only about 2 per cent of the total turnover of fish-dealers. Although the change would have some effect, one would not think that it would have the disastrous effect that some people claim.

Having spoken to the people involved, I thought that the permit system had been accepted. In fact, I was surprised when the issue resurfaced today. I believe that the traders and breeders are reasonably satisfied with the permit system, and that the Minister and his staff also are satisfied. The system allows them to keep a tab on the whereabouts of the fish. If someone has a number of those fish, their whereabouts are known. I do not think that the present system makes criminals out of the dealers.

One must be careful and consider what has happened in the past. I know that history is not infallible, but the lessons of history should not be ignored. The spread of European carp from the south to Queensland is frightening. Although the European carp appeared to be a good fish, it was not. If the only thing that worried us was European carp, that would be enough. However, other things worry us.

Mr Kruger interjected.

Mr BOOTH: I am trying to make some sense.

Mr Kruger interjected.

Mr BOOTH: I will do much better without the honourable member's interjections.

Tilapia are found in the North Pine Dam. I do not suggest that they exist in large numbers. They can be found also in the Leslie Harrison Dam and in the Townsville storm drainage system. That is enough to worry about. We do not want any more of them. It is far better to be careful now than to be wise after the event.

Mr Kruger: You have accepted those into the State, haven't you?

Mr BOOTH: We have not accepted them. The honourable member says that we have accepted European carp and tilapia. We have accepted them only because they appeared here without our knowledge. European carp found their way into the streams and they could not be removed. I do not think that it would be possible to completely remove European carp from the streams of Australia or to get rid of tilapia.

Mr Campbell: Did you say that cichlids account for only 2 per cent of the turnover?

Mr BOOTH: That is what I have been told.

Mr Campbell: I have been told otherwise.

Mr BOOTH: I have been told that it is 2 per cent. Until I am proved wrong, I am prepared to act on that information. The figure that was given to me was 2 per cent.

When people became aware of the fines that could be imposed under these regulations, they were concerned that they would be regarded as criminals. When the permit system was explained to them, I believe that they accepted it. They have nothing to worry about. It would be quite foolish for us to tear up the regulations and say, "You can

have open slather. We will do nothing to control this type of fish. The Federal Government has decided to ban the import of the fish. The Opposition has not mentioned that. Surely the action by Federal authorities should give members opposite cause to wonder whether or not they are on dangerous ground.

Queensland has more to worry about than any other State. Many of the breeds listed are exotic, tropical fish. It is more than likely that they will breed better in our streams and environment than they will in the south, where cold weather will clean them up, if that is the appropriate expression. In Queensland, north-western Australia and the Northern Territory, these fish could survive. I do not say that they would survive or that anybody would be villainous enough to put them in the streams. One member opposite admitted that fish could have been introduced into our streams accidentally in the 1974 flood. I accept that. It is difficult to deny that an accident could have occurred.

Fish in an aquarium are beautiful creatures. People enjoy having them in their homes. Sometimes the people responsible for them are young children who forget to feed them and to look after them. At some stage the guardian takes a hand and says, "We'll get rid of these things." It is then they could enter a stream.

Mr Kruger: Are you saying that that will not occur if there are permits?

Mr BOOTH: No, I am not saying that that will not occur with the permit system. The Government believes that permits will bring home to people the seriousness of the problem and that they will do something about looking after the fish.

It is only right that the Government should exhibit concern about exotic species entering our streams. I have already adverted to the menace of the European carp. I do not think that they are as prevalent in western streams as they were. I use the word "think" advisedly. That is not to say that they will not return in plague proportions.

Mr Kruger: You should look around Kingaroy.

Mr BOOTH: I did not know that the member for Murrumba was a fan of Kingaroy, but I will take his word for it.

Mr Kruger: I like Kingaroy, but I'm not too sure about the representative up there.

Mr BOOTH: The member knows a good town when he sees one. I am surprised at his admission that he is a great fan of Kingaroy, but I will accept it. Some people eventually learn.

It has been said that nearly all exotic fish are harmless and peaceful. That is possibly so while they are contained in an aquarium, but it does not necessarily follow when they are released into a stream. Many people have been surprised at how big tilapia have grown.

The member for Murrumba said that he was not opposed to the permit system. That is the crux of the matter. If there is no objection to the permit system, there is nothing wrong with the Minister's directive. He has issued a regulation specifying that for each species of fish listed there must be a permit. All breeders and traders were very upset when they first sighted the regulations. I do not think they are upset now. They have accepted the regulations and are prepared to go along with them. I see no reason why they should be altered. Substantial headway has been made and it would be foolish to take any action.

It is more important that such regulations be implemented in Queensland than in any other State. It is all very well to say, "They are not worried about them in Victoria."

Mr KRUGER: I rise to a point of order. The member for Warwick continues to talk about permits. Can he give us some indication of how the permit works and what he is talking about?

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

Mr Turner interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: The matter will be explained.

Mr BOOTH: I think he was just trying to use some of my time. However, I have made my point.

I have made the point that the Minister has acted in good faith and his creditability remains intact. I see no reason to revoke the regulations. The Government is sympathetic to the breeders and traders and does not want to hinder their businesses in any way. However, there has to be some control and that is what the Government has done.

Time expired.

Mr EATON (Mourilyan) (3.30 p.m.): I am pleased that Government members have acknowledged that the Opposition is not opposed to a permit. What has to be taken into consideration in this debate is that the motion for disallowance was moved four or five months ago. This is the first sitting of the Parliament in over four months. When the motion was moved, both the Opposition and the people involved in the industry were placing a great deal of pressure on the Government, which claims it is trying to help the industry.

The Opposition would be the first to support the Government in the banning of tropical aquarium fish, or any other fish for that matter, if they are injurious to the State as a whole. As an example, if somebody wished to import the South American piranha, he would have to get past the Federal Labor Government first, and I am sure that both the State Government and the Opposition would support such action taken by the Federal Government.

The argument has to be placed in its proper context. The reason the Opposition moved for the disallowance of the regulations was that it had not been able to have full consultation with the majority of people involved in the industry. When the member for Murrumba moved for the disallowance, uppermost in the minds of members of the Opposition was that there was no opposition to a permit system and to regulations, provided they were made in consultation with, and for the benefit of, the industry and the State as a whole.

Most people in the Government and the department are fully aware of the opportunity for research, particularly into tropical fish, in Queensland. The keeping of tropical fish is a big industry in Australia. Because of the extreme cold in the southern parts of Queensland, many people spend a great deal of money to preserve their aquarium fish in water that has to be kept at a certain temperature.

One of the reasons I joined this debate was to draw to the Government's attention the lack of research into fish diseases. One of the reasons for the regulations is that they will prevent diseases and pests being introduced into Queensland waters. I am sure that, without too much trouble, the Government could find out all about the problem that arose a few years ago with what was known as the Johnstone River disease. It was a form of ulcer found on fish caught in the Johnstone River. Although it was also found in other places, it was most prevalent in fish caught in the Johnstone River.

Constituents of mine who had caught fish in bait nets or on lines came to my office with the diseased fish frozen in plastic bags. As this occurred four years ago, I am not sure to whom I wrote about it, but I think it was the Health Department. I offered all possible help, from the catching of the fish and freezing them, through to putting them into containers for delivery. I was prepared to do anything the Government asked but I received a very negative reply. I was told to try another department so I made a telephone call, only to be told that that department was not interested either. Although a little research into the matter was being conducted, the feeling was that little could be gained by dissecting the fish to try to ascertain the cause of the disease. The people in

my electorate were most unhappily at the attitude displayed by the government departments, especially because at that time many fish with that disease were being caught. Government departments showed no initiative in setting up research into the disease, which had been blamed on fertilisers and spray chemicals. Cane-farmers as well as those in other agricultural pursuits were blamed. The disease is not now as evident, but I wish to draw the Government's attention to that very disappointing response to the offer made by many of my constituents. I realise that research requires a great deal of money and I hope that the forthcoming Budget provides a great deal of money for the various Government departments, particularly the Department of Primary Industries, for research in primary industries. The opportunity is there and the need is there. I hope that the Government can recognise that and make the money available.

Because in this instance different species are dealt with, I would like to draw a comparison with deer. The importation of certain species of deer into Australia is not allowed because it is feared that they could become pests. I believe that in this session the Government intends to bring in legislation dealing with deer. I am speaking only from hearsay because I have not been informed officially, but I believe that deer can at least be controlled. If diseased or carnivorous fish are let loose in the State's river systems, there is no way in which they can be controlled, particularly when the wet season causes flooding. So, although deer might pose a similar problem, I am sure that if an open season was declared on both legal and illegal species, neither would last long.

The Opposition is concerned particularly about the banning of fish that have been bred here for 40 years and have been satisfactorily controlled. The Government has imposed restraints upon business expansion; yet we are told constantly that this is a private enterprise Government. It seems to have forgotten that a lot of money is spent on aquarium and tropical fish. I know of a man in north Queensland who air-freights fish all over Australia. He has to get up early in the morning, take the fish to Cairns airport, then notify his customers of the flight on which they will arrive. It is quite a big business. I understand that the Government played a part in helping that man establish the business by making Crown land available to him. It has been a very good project for north Queensland.

Another project will soon begin in north Queensland, and I am sure that the Department of Primary Industries and the Fisheries Service are aware of it. It is hoped to set up a prawn farm at Flying Fish Point, just outside Innisfail. There is a great need for more research and development to assist with the expansion of the industry. All the information needed as to cost has been obtained from overseas, but perhaps research into local conditions is lacking. But having spoken to the people involved in the industry, particularly those who are prepared to spend large amounts of money, I believe that this and other projects will be goers and will bring more people to north Queensland. That is essential, because the population will soon follow if an industry is established in an area. One of the reasons why there is now an unemployment problem is that there is insufficient industry to cater for the local work-force. That is why I am so concerned about restraint being imposed on a member of the private enterprise that this Government so loudly espouses.

I will not take all the time available to me, because, after all, the Government has many months' notice of the moving of this motion. In the meantime, it has had input from the industry and has had sufficient time to deal with the problem. When the amended regulations were first announced, no one was too sure what the result would be. That is why the Opposition moved the motion for disallowance.

Mr COOPER (Roma) (3.38 p.m.): I do not wish to take up very much of the time of the House on what I believe is an Opposition move that is really much ado about nothing. Nevertheless, I wish to explain in the clearest possible terms the Government's attitude.

The regulation that is the subject of the motion for disallowance replaces the Eighth Schedule to the Fisheries Regulations, which lists those non-indigenous species that

aquarium fish hobbyists may keep without a permit. Aquarium fish fall into three broad categories. Category 1 comprises totally prohibited fish such as piranha, walking catfish and possibly quite a few ALP members. Category 2 comprises permissible non-indigenous fish that can be introduced and held without a permit. Category 3 covers non-prescribed, non-indigenous fish which, although not totally prohibited, may be held by permit only. There are those three broad categories.

The changes to the Eighth Schedule have placed in the third category many popular species that were formerly in category 2, that is, permissible non-indigenous fish. The changes have also taken into category 2 some fish that were previously in category 3.

It has been policy for many years to base the Eighth Schedule on species that are permitted imports under the Commonwealth's Imports of Fish Regulations.

Mr Campbell interjected.

Mr COOPER: I will be clear.

In other words, the Commonwealth and State lists have been almost identical. The amendments to the Eighth Schedule mirror a number of changes that were made to the Commonwealth Prohibited Import List over the past 18 months or so. The changes were made with industry consultation at the Commonwealth level. The groups objecting currently to the changes claim not to be represented by the consulted groups. Nevertheless, the changes now permit the introduction and keeping of a number of species that, previously, were not allowed to be imported or kept.

Of course, it is the exclusions that are causing the present concern. That is especially so with breeders and retailers who have built up a substantial speciality trade in certain African cichlids and other species which, for a period, were banned from importation under Commonwealth legislation but, at the same time, were not banned under the Queensland regulations.

For a number of years the serious hobbyist in Queensland has been able to obtain a permit to keep and breed those species that were not on the Eighth Schedule. They are the fish mentioned in category 3, that is, the non-prescribed and non-indigenous fish. As a result, the people most disadvantaged by the amendments to the schedule have been the smaller dealers or breeders and the individual hobbyist. The Government realises that. However, it is estimated that the cichlid trade amounts to only 2 per cent of the overall aquarium fish market. That is a departmental estimate which is quite acceptable to me. The main lines include swordtails, guppies, neon tetras and gouramies.

Queensland has rightly adopted a much more concerned stand than the southern States on the keeping of exotic tropical fish. Obviously that is so because the southern States have cooler waters where the tropical fish will not live for long. Areas of most serious concern are the north of Queensland, north-west Australia and the Northern Territory, where the warmer tropical waters are to be found.

Southern States took little interest in the risks associated with imported aquarium fish until a type of goldfish—the European carp—was set loose in the waters of the Murray-Darling system. That fish is one of the few non-tropical species of interest to aquarists, and it is considered to be noxious. It is prohibited and cannot be held under any circumstances.

Even in Queensland, which has maintained much tighter control than the other States, feral populations of a number of exotic fish species have become established, mostly as a result of deliberate or accidental release by aquarists.

Tilapia, which is also considered to be a noxious fish, is established in the North Pine Dam, the Leslie Harrison Dam and the Townsville storm-water drainage system. Two species of carp are common in southern streams, and guppies, swordtails and gambusia are competing with native fresh-water fish in most streams of south-east Queensland.

Much of the problem stems from the fact that many people do not realise that any exotic fish, no matter how peaceful or harmless it may appear in an aquarium, poses some level of risk to the environment or to native fish if it escapes or is released. The level of risk might be very slight, but every species poses a degree of threat and, in most instances, the degree of threat is unknown.

The problem in the field-testing of fish is to assess the degree of threat. It is often such a long-term and costly business that, quite often, the testing simply cannot be done. On the other hand, in closed-circuit aquariums, the risk virtually disappears. Only a freak accident or phenomenon, such as the 1974 floods, could lead to an accidental escape. The potential for deliberate release always exists, however, and this factor must be considered.

Since the introduction of the new Eighth Schedule, interested hobbyists and trade organisations have had discussions aimed at minimising the effect of the change to the regulation on people who either hold large stocks of the fish commercially or are dedicated hobbyists. Those bodies have had discussions with the committee of the Minister for Primary Industries, and those discussions have been aimed at attaining a degree of control that will allow dealers and hobbyists to practise their trade or to enjoy their hobby respectively and at the same time achieving a degree of control by a Government that recognises the risks involved.

The discussions held over the last few months culminated on 6 August in a meeting with representatives of the main trade and hobbyist groups, at which an amicable agreement was reached. It was agreed that an extension of the current permit system would go a long way towards satisfying the needs of dealers and hobbyists.

The Minister has agreed that permits will be made freely available and, subject to other conditions and concessions as the law allows, will be issued on the proviso that the fish are held in closed-circuit aquariums. Every attempt will be made to accommodate traders and hobbyists, while recognising that a potential risk does exist. And a Government would be irresponsible if it did not recognise that risk. In fact, such attempts have been made since objections to the changes were first brought to the Minister's attention. Therefore, very little inconvenience has been experienced.

In addition to that concession, the Minister has agreed to review the whole schedule of non-indigenous fish as soon as the State and Commonwealth have examined the matter with a view to obtaining uniform requirements throughout Australia.

In the light of those facts, I support the regulations.

Mr INNES (Sherwood) (3.47 p.m.): I rise to speak briefly to this motion and to seek the Minister's clarification of a number of matters.

My view, which is shared by my colleagues in the Liberal Party, is that as a basic principle one should do nothing to cut across that very legitimate interest that is shared by tens of thousands of Australians—particularly youngsters, but not only youngsters—who keep fish, including imported tropical fish, as a hobby. It is a valid interest and one that has entertained people such as scientists for years. For hundreds of years people have been collecting fish. Collecting them has enabled people to acquire an ability to look after living things. Certainly two of my children keep tropical fish.

An Opposition Member: Do they have a permit?

Mr INNES: They have no permit, and I want to ensure that no permit will be necessary.

After talking with the Minister's advisers, I understand that some amendments are to be introduced to provide for fish that can be kept without a permit. I want clarification on whether that is still broadly the situation. The fish listed in the schedule make up 95 per cent of the fish found in aquariums in every suburb in every town in Australia. I know that for a fact, because one of my children insists on visiting every aquarium

in every suburb in every town that he visits. I have been to aquariums in the Blue Mountains, in the suburbs of Sydney and, I think, even in Dubbo.

Catfish, barbs, goldfish, tetras, redbtail sharks, red fin sharks, discus and gourami are to be found probably in one in every 10 houses throughout Brisbane and throughout the more northern parts of Australia. The aquarium industry is an important one. There is a lot of money in it, and there is an enormous amount of legitimate interest in it.

It is good for youngsters to learn how to keep fish, how to test the water, how to introduce medication or controls of various diseases and fungus, and how to look after the plants. Keeping fish is character-building, it is legitimate, and it is beneficial.

I am sure that everybody understands that, when there is a danger to our watercourses, controls should be imposed. This control system will ensure that certain fish are prohibited. European carp and piranha are two species that are prohibited, and I sure all honourable members agree with that prohibition. The carp has done great damage to Australia's native fish. Other fish that appear on a schedule require permits. The permit system has been discussed with the industry and permits will be obtainable for a significant period, probably one or two years, at nominal cost.

The schedule under debate lists the overwhelming number of fish species currently kept and sold, and offers enough range for people with an interest in tropical fish to be accommodated. I see no objection to a practicable permit system for those with interests that go beyond that list but short of a desire to keep prohibited fish. I accept that there must be some control. However, I ask the Minister to clarify that the fish appearing in the schedule are those that people and youngsters in Queensland with an interest in tropical fish will be able to keep without permits and without fear. I ask the Minister to briefly clarify the structure for the controls other than those applying to fish in the schedule.

Hon. N. J. TURNER (Warrego—Minister for Primary Industries) (3.54 p.m.), in reply: I thank honourable members for their contributions. I am amazed at the attitude of the Australian Labor Party on this issue. The Labor Party is committed, supposedly, to conservation and environmental issues and its members have linked themselves with the trendy conservationists on issues such as Daintree. However, the Labor Party has moved a motion to disallow this regulation, which will protect the environment of Queensland's waterways.

I am pleased to be able to set the record straight on a number of aspects that have arisen in the debate, and clear up the misconceptions held by Labor Party members.

The permits are available under section 58 of the existing Act. My department has held discussions with numerous sections of the industry and assurances have been given that permits will be made available.

For the benefit of the honourable member for Mourilyan, I point out that the Government is complying with Commonwealth regulations and that those changes came into effect approximately 18 months or two years before the Queensland regulations. It cannot be said that the State Government acted in indecent haste.

The regulations in question are the Fisheries Regulations of 1977, and the amendments that are the subject of this debate refer to the Eighth Schedule to those regulations. In fact, the Eighth Schedule is replaced.

Before going into detail on this matter, I shall repeat a statement that I have made previously. We must be ever on the alert to the potential dangers to our State and nation of introducing species of animals or plants capable of damaging our environment. There would be no more lovable creature than a rabbit. However, we are well aware of the destruction caused over many years when rabbits reached plague proportions. Many persons thought that the prickly pear was a nice-looking plant in a pot. Anyone associated with primary industries or country areas would be aware that that pest devastated our farming and grazing lands until the cactoblastis moth was imported to control it.

It is a situation similar to those two examples that the Government is trying to forestall by the proposed amendments. The Eighth Schedule to the regulations sets out the list of prescribed non-indigenous fish that may be kept without a permit. The common name as well as the scientific name appears on the schedule. It would be reasonable to expect that people would make adequate inquiries to find out whether a permit was necessary to keep a particular variety of fish.

The changes to the schedule that are now being called into question reduce the number of types of fish that may be kept. A number of fish which are now permitted to be kept were previously excluded, but the new exclusions are causing some concern. I myself have received a number of representations on the changes. I believe that the matter has been satisfactorily resolved following discussions with industry over a long period. However, the resolution needs some explanation. As I mentioned previously, I appreciate this opportunity to put the matter into perspective. The people affected by the changes to the Eighth Schedule are mainly tropical aquarium fish-breeders, fish-sellers and associated hobbyists. It has been suggested that some suppliers of aquarium accessories could be affected. These regulation amendments, which are the present cause of concern, deal with the keeping of fish which are not native to Australia and are of a tropical origin. I point out that there are only three places in Australia where those fish constitute a serious risk. As some members have already mentioned, they are Queensland, the northern areas of Western Australia, and the Northern Territory. It is not surprising that conditions for the keeping of such fish are less stringent in New South Wales and Victoria than in the tropical areas of Queensland.

Mr Kruger: The carp has done well in Victoria.

Mr TURNER: It has done well here. As the Opposition spokesman on primary industries, the honourable member would be well aware of the problem and the extent to which the Queensland Government is going to introduce Nile perch into this country.

The program that must be instituted at Walkamin will take 10 years. It must be proved that they will do nothing to destroy the environment or other breeds of fish. At any time such a program could be wiped out. That is the approach adopted by the Department of Primary Industries in that area. Some people think that it does not matter whether goldfish or small aquarium fish come into Queensland because they will never pose any problem. That is not correct.

Honourable members will be aware that a species of goldfish, namely carp, which is one of the few non-tropical fish imports, is now a major pest in Victoria and New South Wales. That should be a salutary lesson. As the member for Murrumba pointed out, they exist in Queensland.

I am somewhat surprised at the persistent attitude of a few people in the aquarium trade and in certain of the hobby areas who believe that, apart from a few obvious baddies, such as piranhas and walking catfish, exotic species by and large are quite harmless in the wild. Fortunately, that attitude is not shared by the majority of people in the trade who are prepared to look at the matter realistically. One often hears the comment that a particular banned species is no more dangerous or harmful than a guppy or a swordtail. I point out that guppies and swordtails are currently providing the main environmental impact in most of the local streams round Brisbane. They have virtually eliminated the populations of many local native fish. The truth is, of course, that any exotic fish poses some potential for environmental impact. That is why I stressed what the Government is doing with Nile perch. Honourable members must appreciate that those fish must have some impact on the environment.

The important questions are: What is the degree of seriousness of likely impact and what is the likelihood of the impact being realised? I point out to honourable members that finding the answers could be extremely expensive and that the problems would take many years to resolve. Unscheduled releases of tropical aquarium fish have already made serious inroads into local water facilities. Some members referred to the problems of tilapia.

Mr Kruger: Could we take it that you will stick strictly to the schedule as written?

Mr TURNER: If the member will listen, I point out that a permit system is available under the Act. Assurances have been given to the trade. If the member is patient, I will enlighten him.

Tilapia is considered to be a noxious fish and has been prohibited from being introduced into the country or held under any circumstances. The risk of escape, either accidental or deliberate, is a factor which simply cannot be overlooked.

Since the introduction of noxious fish legislation in the Fisheries Act 1976, there has been a prohibition in Queensland on the possession, without a permit, of any species of exotic aquarium fish not listed in the Eighth Schedule to the Fisheries Regulations. It has been policy to base the Eighth Schedule on those species which are permitted imports under the Commonwealth's Imports of Fish Regulations. Over the past 18 months or so, a number of changes to the Commonwealth list have been accommodated in the present changes to the Eighth Schedule.

Prior to the introduction of our noxious fish legislation, there was very little commercial breeding of tropical aquarium fish in Australia. However, in recent years, an expanding hobby trade has built up in the breeding and sale of species such as African cichlids, which were banned from importation under the Commonwealth legislation but were not at that time banned under Queensland regulations.

Mr Kruger: How many charges have been laid against people for keeping illegal fish?

Mr TURNER: I would not know the exact number.

Mr Kruger: Has there been much action taken under the schedule?

Mr TURNER: No, because when the regulations were made an assurance was given that I would be looking at the matter. Constant discussions have been held.

The breeding and sale of some species has greatly accelerated in the last 18 months, the period in which there have been discrepancies between the Commonwealth and Queensland lists. I can understand some professional breeders and retailers being concerned about the new regulations, as many of them have built up a substantial speciality trade in these African cichlids and other non-prescribed imports, which are not necessarily handled by the big suppliers and importers. I do concede that it could have an effect on people trading in special breeds. The development of the specialist trade has been helped by the discrepancies between the Queensland and Commonwealth laws which, at the same time, have operated to the disadvantage of the importers.

In the interests of putting things into proper perspective, I point out that these locally bred fish undoubtedly constitute a substantial proportion of the turnover of those aquarium shops dealing with them. However, sales of these fish would amount to only a small percentage of the overall sales in the industry as a whole, and the industry has shown in the past a considerable capacity to adapt.

I further point out that for a number of years the serious hobbyist in Queensland has been able to obtain a permit to keep and breed species which are otherwise prohibited. Noxious fish, of course, do not come into this category and never have. The only way the serious hobbyist will be affected by the change is that a few more fish species names may now have to be associated with his permit, or more permits may need to be issued. The hobbyist who has a large and valuable collection of cichlids, therefore, will not be obliged to dispose of them.

What the Government is trying to do is to keep track of fish in order to minimise any risk to native populations and the environment at large. Since the Eighth Schedule was amended, I have received several deputations from trade and hobbyist groups on this matter. I have already assured the industry that I would not implement the new

regulations to their detriment until I had received and considered written submissions from the various groups. Submissions are now to hand and have been taken into account. As recently as 6 August, an officer of my department met a number of interested industry people and I am advised that the meeting was most productive.

In accordance with my previous undertakings, I have directed that the presently existing permit system be used in such a manner as to ensure that no person presently holding excluded Eighth Schedule fish be disadvantaged. In fact, I have directed that the permit system be used to the extent of its capabilities to ensure that disruption to the industry is minimised. Provided the fish are not totally prohibited species, permits will be made available. I understand that the industry is substantially satisfied with this resolution until such time as the Commonwealth and State advisory committee can devise a uniform system.

Finally, I will again point out that Queensland is the State which is most at risk from unscheduled escapes or illegal releases of exotic fish. Many of the State's waterways are already carrying feral populations of exotic aquarium fish, to the considerable detriment of a number of our own native species. Much of this situation has come about because of the lack of co-operation in past years from the aquarium industry and some of the Government agencies in southern States. Fortunately, these attitudes are changing. In this regard, I am pleased to be able to report that the Commonwealth/State Advisory Committee, which I mentioned previously, is currently developing an Australia-wide uniform approach to noxious fish legislation. In the meantime, I am satisfied that Queensland has to have controlling legislation.

The present changes to Schedule Eight of the regulations represent a reasonable and uniform approach to control, and the availability of the permit system will minimise disruption to all genuinely interested parties. I therefore oppose the motion.

Motion (Mr Kruger) negatived.

GOVERNOR'S OPENING SPEECH

Mr SPEAKER: I have to report that His Excellency the Governor, on Tuesday, 21 August, delivered to Parliament an Opening Speech of which, for greater accuracy, I have obtained a copy. I presume honourable members will take the speech as read?

Honourable Members: Hear, hear!

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Mr BORBIDGE (Surfers Paradise) (4.6 p.m.), who was received with Government "Hear, hears!", said: I move—

"That the following address be presented to the Governor in reply to the Speech delivered by His Excellency in opening this the second session of the Forty-fourth Parliament of Queensland—

'May it please Your Excellency—

We, Her Majesty's loyal and dutiful subjects, the members of the legislature of Queensland, in Parliament assembled, desire to assure Your Excellency of our continued loyalty and affection towards the throne and person of our most Gracious Sovereign, and to tender our thanks to Your Excellency for the speech with which you have been pleased to open the present session.

The various measures to which Your Excellency has referred, and all other matters that may be brought before us, will receive our most careful consideration, and it shall be our earnest endeavour so to deal with them that our labours may tend to the advancement and prosperity of the State.' "

I am very proud to have this opportunity today to formally move the Address in Reply to His Excellency's Opening Speech to the second session of the Forty-fourth

Parliament. I take this opportunity to reaffirm my allegiance and that of my constituents to Her Majesty the Queen and her most able representative, His Excellency the Governor.

Mr R. J. Gibbs: Surprise, surprise!

Mr BORBIDGE: I suggest to the honourable member for Wolston that his interjection does him little credit.

Sir James and Lady Ramsay have endeared themselves to the people of this State in their tireless dedication to their vice regal duties. Queensland is a vast and decentralised State, yet they have been familiar figures throughout the cities, towns and remote regions that we in this place have the privilege of representing. They have carried out their duties with dignity and with dedication, and I am sure that all honourable members join with me in wishing them well and recognising their service to the people of Queensland.

At a time when so many of our traditions—and I refer to our system of government, our flag, our Parliament, our rights as a sovereign State of the Commonwealth—are under attack, we should reflect on just how much our system of government has achieved in terms of stability, economic progress and social responsibility. This simply is not possible under many other forms of Government throughout the world today. We, as members of this Parliament, have an overwhelming responsibility to guard jealously that which has served us so well.

Mr Davis interjected.

Mr BORBIDGE: When I make that comment I know that I am speaking on behalf of the members of the Government if not for some of the rabble who sit opposite and who are so determined to bring down the foundation stones of our democratic society in Australia with their moves towards a grand socialist republic and all that entails.

Mr R. J. Gibbs interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable member for Wolston that repeated interjections will not be tolerated.

Mr BORBIDGE: For the benefit of Opposition members, I again point out that we, as members of this Parliament, have a very great responsibility to guard jealously that which has served us so well, and this is especially so when uninformed, ignorant or politically motivated individuals propose that we should trade in the proven for the untested—throw away the foundation stone of our nation for some form of Utopian ideology that is as impractical and unworkable as it is remote.

Our system of Government, with its division of power between the Commonwealth and the States, with the Queen as head of State, has shown an ongoing capacity for change—not change for change's sake, but reform when reform has been required. Indeed, these safeguards were built into the Australian Constitutions by our founding fathers, and it is these safeguards that today are so much under threat.

His Excellency has outlined an ambitious legislative program for the Parliament to consider. The measures announced are in keeping with this National Party Government's commitment to progressive conservatism; to be innovative, reformist and ambitious.

They are measures that will fire entrepreneurial imagination—not stifle it as those measures advocated by the Opposition would do—and effectively limit Government interference in those areas that are not the legitimate province of Government.

The recent announcement of the Government's intention to join with the Brisbane City Council in an attempt to secure the 1992 Olympics Games is indicative of this spirit, as is Expo 88, and the quite incredible progress being made on a number of major projects in my electorate. I refer to the Jupiters Casino and the Conrad International Hotel—Australia's largest privately financed construction project.

I refer also to the stabilisation of the Southport Bar, in the electorate of my colleague Mr Jennings, that will provide safe Pacific Ocean access from The Broadwater, Stage 2 of the Gold Coast Hospital, the feasibility study for a Gold Coast rail link now nearing completion and the education facilities under construction. This Government has served the Gold Coast well, just as it has served Queensland well, despite the prophets of doom, despite the knockers and despite the people in this Parliament who rarely have anything constructive to say for the betterment of this State.

The momentum that is being generated now seems likely to escalate. Queensland, more than any other part of Australia, epitomises private enterprise, initiative, incentive and opportunity. The National Party Government is continuing to demonstrate an ongoing capacity to foster these qualities.

I pay tribute to the Premier and to his Ministers for their insight, vision and determination.

Mr Davis interjected.

Mr BORBIDGE: The honourable member for Brisbane Central seems once again to be doubting the potential of this Government and this State. I will provide the honourable member with a few figures. I hope that he will take them in and learn something. Queensland's population is continuing to grow at a substantially higher rate than that of any other State. Only yesterday His Excellency referred to the increase in birth registrations—from 34 972 in 1980 to 40 012 in 1983.

The State's net migration gain from all sources for the past 12 months was 14 640—six times the rate of increase in New South Wales, 4 times the rate of increase in South Australia and treble that in Victoria. During the same period, New South Wales lost 13 216 residents, Victoria 4 343 and South Australia 1 618. Queensland has in fact consolidated its position as Australia's leading population growth State.

In my own area of the Gold Coast, this trend is continuing.

I am not claiming that in the area of economic performance all is as well as we would like, but I am saying that compared to our fellow Australians interstate we are performing remarkably well.

Statistics for population growth to the year 2006 are worthy of comment. It is estimated that by then Queensland's population will reach 3.75 million, an increase of 1.4 million. The implications of this trend may well prove unprecedented in our nation's history.

Australia is experiencing a political shift of influence from the southern States to the new frontiers of northern Australia. It will be in Queensland that much of this nation's future development will continue to occur. This development requires people, infrastructure and capital—and it creates jobs. It will be from Queensland that a far greater political influence will emerge on the Canberra decision-making process, with implications not yet fully realised or even comprehended in much of Australia. That, ultimately, will place an increased responsibility on this Parliament and its members. In the previous session, the Government demonstrated a capacity to deliver—to be a Government of performance, not promises. The Government has proved its ability to honour every major pre-election commitment that it made 12 months ago. That is in stark contrast to the performance of the Commonwealth Government and the Labor Governments in New South Wales, Victoria, South Australia and Western Australia.

This year we have noted that Queensland's estimated economic growth will be the highest of any State. In the past decade our population has grown much faster than that of any other State and our gross domestic product has been the highest. That trend will continue. In the past three years our increases in State taxation and charges have been the lowest of any mainland State.

Mr Davis: That is untrue.

Mr BORBIDGE: I am glad that the honourable member interjected. I note that he is retreating from the Chamber. He cannot accept the facts given by the Australian Bureau of Statistics. He is running for cover. The taxes in Labor-governed Western Australia increased by 33 per cent, in New South Wales they increased by 29 per cent, in Victoria by 40 per cent and in South Australia by 17 per cent. Those percentages should be compared with a 15 per cent increase in Queensland. Our job growth has been equal to that in any State.

Mr R. J. Gibbs interjected.

Mr BORBIDGE: I understand the sensitivity of Opposition members. They do not have a good track record. Wherever Labor has occupied the Treasury benches in the Parliaments of Australia, it has had a lousy track record. Compared with the performance of the Queensland Government, Labor's efforts in government elsewhere have been pathetic.

Our job growth has been equal to that in any State, with an estimated 45 000 additional job opportunities in the past 12 months. The June unemployment figures show that Queensland experienced the biggest drop in unemployment in any State and that of 10 300 jobs created Australia-wide, 4 300 were in Queensland.

In the financial year recently completed, building approvals increased by 35 per cent, the value of new housing approved increased by 29 per cent, motor vehicle registrations increased by 23 per cent, and the value of primary production improved by 30 per cent, on the levels for the previous year.

Despite a determined campaign to undermine public confidence in the economic performance of the Government and despite the need to increase Government services to the electorate, the Queensland Government finished the financial year with a surplus in the Consolidated Revenue Fund of \$860,000.

An Opposition Member: How much do you owe?

Mr BORBIDGE: Over the last few months the Opposition has sought to subvert the Queensland economy. In desperation it is seeking to salvage some of its tattered political credibility. The Leader of the Opposition made incredible statements about massive imagined Budget deficits and about many other things. As the figures came in, time and again he was proved to be wrong. The Government ended with a Budget surplus of \$860,000. I remind the honourable member that we are the only State Government in Australia that carries an A1 + P1 rating on the international money markets of the world. That says a great deal for the performance and stability of this Government.

The Australian Bureau of Statistics has recently confirmed Queensland's low-tax status. The ABS figures show that Queenslanders pay \$433.97 per head in State taxes and charges, or \$242.13 per head less than in Victoria, \$225.83 less than in New South Wales, \$64.22 less than in Western Australia and 76c less than in South Australia.

In the 1982-83 financial year, taxes, fees and fines levied by the Queensland Government amounted to \$1,062.5m, an increase of only 8.6 per cent on the previous year, and an increase lower than the inflation rate at the time. This compared to a 22.3 per cent increase in Victoria and a 17.2 per cent increase in New South Wales.

A major benefit for Queensland business that is not reflected in the tax comparison relates to workers' compensation premiums. Queensland's performance in this area is becoming a major incentive for business to relocate from the southern States.

I instance the case of a major clothing manufacturer who recently relocated on the Gold Coast and who will save approximately \$500,000 per annum on workers' compensation premiums alone.

A recent study of workers' compensation premiums throughout Australia shows that employers in some States are paying up to \$64.54 per week per employee for every \$100

in wages paid. In some industries, employers are being forced to pay up to \$200 per week in workers' compensation for each of their employees. Queensland employers are paying dramatically lower workers' compensation premiums than their counterparts in every other State.

Recently the Minister for Employment and Industrial Affairs announced the results of the triennial review of workers' compensation premiums in Queensland. They showed that 26 rates remained unchanged, 182 were reduced and 197 were increased. The important fact for this Parliament, and indeed for the employers and the people of Queensland, to realise is that in the vast majority of cases, workers' compensation premiums in Queensland in 1984 are no higher than they were in 1976.

I shall look again at how those great socialist States that Opposition members say we should be following are performing in the workers' compensation field. Premiums in the building and construction industry cost \$5.87 per week in Queensland compared with \$29.54 in New South Wales, \$23.35 in Victoria, \$6.04 in Tasmania, \$12.76 in Western Australia, \$12.22 in South Australia and \$12.76 in the Northern Territory. Those dramatic differences are carried through in almost every other area of business activity—carriers and carters, engineers, meat workers, primary producers and timber workers.

I cite the person employed purely on office duties. The premium is 22c in Queensland, 44c in New South Wales, 79c in Victoria, 72c in South Australia, 32c in Tasmania and 39c in Western Australia. I took across the gamut of small business and refer to bakers. Bakers pay a premium of \$1.72 in Queensland, \$12.09 in New South Wales, \$9.90 in Victoria, \$5.87 in South Australia, \$2.89 in Tasmania and \$6.03 in Western Australia.

Mr R. J. Gibbs: You are ruining small business.

Mr BORBIDGE: What I am suggesting to honourable members opposite is that workers' compensation premiums in this State are making viable many businesses that would not be viable under the administration of their friends in the other mainland States of Australia.

Mr Jennings interjected.

Mr BORBIDGE: As the honourable member for Southport said, Gazals are saving \$450,000 per year in workers' compensation in the electorate of the member for Southport. That is compared to New South Wales. That company has come to Queensland and is employing in excess of 200 people. The honourable member for Wolston should be ashamed of himself for not supporting the Government in crucial areas such as workers' compensation, because its performance has been so good.

Workers' compensation paid by carriers in Queensland is \$4.81, in New South Wales, \$14.65; in Victoria, \$11.20; in South Australia, \$11; in Tasmania, \$6.04; and in Western Australia, \$11.89. What is happening at the corner butcher's shop? Butchers in Queensland are paying \$4.24 for every \$100 in wages paid, in New South Wales, \$10.20; in Victoria, \$15.22; in South Australia, \$7.15; in Tasmania, \$7.25; and in Western Australia, \$13.12.

I turn to the timber industry. The honourable member for Wolston might learn something from this before he retreats from the Chamber because he cannot accept the facts. He does not like to hear his arguments demolished. Sawmillers in Queensland pay \$9.01, in New South Wales, \$30; in Victoria, \$56.50; in South Australia, \$30.10; in Tasmania, \$15.18 and in Western Australia, \$15.29. The Queensland rates are effective from 1 September as the result of a recent triennial review.

The comparison is even more dramatic when it is considered that the figures quoted are before the deduction of any bonuses which could result in a discount of up to 60 per cent on the premiums paid. The workers' compensation system is a major incentive for employers to expand and to employ.

If any part of Australia is representative of the free enterprise spirit, it is the Gold Coast. The great tourism industry, with its close association with small business and property development, will ensure an exciting future for Surfers Paradise and the Gold Coast, provided the political and economic mood is positive.

Political stability can be hard won and it is a fragile and precious commodity. It can be easily lost and the community must not lose sight of the important relationship between the existence of political stability and the fostering of a healthy economic climate.

Mr Jennings interjected.

Mr BORBIDGE: The honourable member for Southport has reminded me that that good relationship is indicated by the incredible speed and progress being made on the construction of the Gold Coast casino at the present time. It is actually ahead of schedule.

His Excellency, in his Opening Speech, referred to developments in mining and mineral exploration. He mentioned that, in the oil and gas sector, Queensland leads Australia in exploration. Coal production in the 1983-84 financial year increased by 23 per cent to 42 000 000 tonnes, and Queensland's international customers increased from 17 to 24.

I do make the point, however, that the role of tourism in broadening the base of the Queensland economy must not be underestimated, especially as resource development eases. Tourism has created 30 per cent of all new jobs in this State over the past four years and the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation estimates that even modest growth will generate 30 000 additional employment opportunities by the end of next year.

Presently, \$1,482m worth of tourism development projects are committed or under way. The industry has an economic impact of \$2.25 billion on the Queensland economy. It is now the No. 2 industry and, by 1990, it will be No. 1.

Many people in our community have to come to grips with the great economic importance of the tourism industry. The ongoing capacity of the tourist industry in job creation can be demonstrated in this way: For every \$1 spent, \$2.60 is generated throughout the community. If people cannot see smoke-stacks, they cannot see jobs. They forget about the number of people who work in a hotel, motel or restaurant and that each of those establishments is a factory and a job-producing mechanism in its own right. The community does not always realise that more people are employed in tourism in Queensland than are employed in the motor vehicle manufacturing industry across Australia.

In the motor vehicle manufacturing industry the tax-payer, through tariff protection, is presently contributing in excess of \$13,000 per job per year.

The Government, through the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation, has been innovative, unconventional and extremely effective in promoting this State. I suggest that the time is now appropriate for a dramatic increase in the level of funding made available to the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation and to Queensland's regional tourist authorities.

The National Party policy of the present flat-rate subsidy to regional authorities being replaced by a formula incorporating, within minimum and maximum limits, a dollar-for-dollar contribution within the industry itself must be pursued. I urge the Government to give that matter serious consideration.

What has been achieved to date is impressive; what can be achieved in the future is unlimited. Increased funding on tourism should not be seen as a public expense but rather as an investment in jobs.

I place on record my support for the work being carried out by the Gold Coast Visitors and Convention Bureau. I do, however, find it a source of constant annoyance

that many people who depend on the industry do not seem to give the industry and the private enterprise sector the support that they should be prepared to give. I am astounded that hundreds and hundreds of tourist-oriented businesses on the Gold Coast simply are not interested in supporting the area's regional tourist authority. It is time that those persons accepted their responsibilities.

In 1982-83 visitors to the Gold Coast spent over \$300m on accommodation and daily expenses. Compared with 1979, the number of nights spent in Queensland in 1982 by interstate visitors increased by 25 per cent. It is important for honourable members to note that Queensland has replaced Victoria as the nation's second most popular holiday destination and that it is moving in on New South Wales.

The number of interstate visitors to Australia who spend most of their time in Queensland has increased by 16.9 per cent, while New South Wales has seen a decline of 1 per cent.

The contribution of the tourism industry to the Queensland Treasury through taxes and charges is \$110m, an amount that increases to \$211m per year when revenue-sharing arrangements with the Commonwealth are taken into account.

Those figures are no accident. Credit belongs where credit is due. Credit belongs to the industry itself. Importantly, it also belongs to the Queensland Government, to the successive Ministers for Tourism, to the chairman of the Queensland Government Tourist and Travel Corporation (Sir Frank Moore) and to the corporation itself.

There are those, including Opposition members, who say that the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation should be abolished and replaced by a bureaucratic public service department remote from the day-to-day workings of this most vibrant industry.

An Honourable Member: Shame!

Mr BORBIDGE: As the honourable member says, "Shame!"

The performance of the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation would quite firmly suggest that those critics speak from ignorance or as a vested interest, or both. However, problems threaten to hinder the industry's enormous potential. The blatant anti-Queensland attitude of successive Federal Governments in relation to additional international air services is of major concern. Tens of thousands of potential international visitors are being denied easy access to this State by Canberra's ongoing desire to perpetuate the Sydney-Melbourne tourism axis. Almost every international service into Queensland has come about by the efforts of the industry and the Queensland Government despite the obstinance and the reluctance of the Commonwealth.

Mr Fouras: That's nonsense.

Mr BORBIDGE: I will take the honourable member's interjection because I am about to supply him with a few facts of which he is obviously unaware. Firstly, I refer to Cairns Airport. It is a new facility of which we can all be proud. It came into being largely as a result of the efforts of the members of the local harbour board, the local government members and industry in that area.

Mr McElligott: Who paid for the airport?

Mr BORBIDGE: The honourable member was not in the House a couple of years ago when legislation was passed to hand authority for the airport to the Cairns Harbour Board. Canberra said, "We don't want it." The Government, the industry, the harbour board and local members of Parliament have worked extremely hard to make the Cairns Airport the major credit it is to tourism in Australia. A similar management principle could well be applied to other airports in Queensland.

It is encouraging that, despite the difficulties, five international airlines have commenced services in the past three years. I am advised that 15 additional carriers, including

Pan Am and Continental, have expressed a strong interest in servicing this State. In reply to the interjection of the honourable member for South Brisbane, I indicate that earlier this year Cathay Pacific applied for additional services into Brisbane. That application was rejected by the Federal Government. Singapore Airlines is forced to fly from Singapore to Sydney and then to Brisbane. It cannot fly direct from Singapore to Brisbane.

Mr Jennings: It is absolutely ridiculous.

Mr BORBIDGE: As the honourable member for Southport said, it is absolutely ridiculous and a prime example of the Federal Government's hindering the enormous potential of the tourist industry.

After Hawaii, Australia is now the second biggest honeymoon destination for Japanese, yet seats on the Brisbane-Tokyo route are at a premium. Clearly, such anti-Queensland policies should not be tolerated. They are unacceptable to me; they should be unacceptable to honourable members on both sides of the House. I hope that some members will make representations to their Federal colleagues to obtain a better deal and a fair go for the tourist industry in Queensland.

I take this opportunity to commend the Government on the major upgrading of Gaven Way and other major arterial roads on the Gold Coast. Such work will go some way towards effectively tackling the considerable difficulties being encountered with traffic congestion. Like many of my constituents, I will be watching closely the outcome of the feasibility study into a Gold Coast rail link. There can, however, be little doubt that a high-speed commuter link will be necessary if future transport demands are to be met. There would be few places in the world where a major growth centre of some 200,000 only 100 km from a capital city is not linked by rail.

I welcome the Government's initiative, confirmed yesterday by the Governor, to secure high-technology industry for the Gold Coast through the establishment of a park especially for that purpose. Such industries complement and diversify the local economy.

The difficulties faced by small business remain essentially those difficulties confronting the Australian economy. The Australian Small Business Association estimates that 90 per cent of all enterprise in Australia, 55 per cent of all private sector profits and taxes, 60 per cent of all private sector employment and 90 per cent of all job creation in this country is generated by small business. Honourable members know that many small businesses fail and that this Government has been the national leader in legislative reform for small business. I refer particularly to the Retail Shop Leases Act as a prime example. Queensland's Small Business Development Corporation has an important role to play and must receive the strong support of members. I recognise the immense role that small business plays in the life of my electorate.

A major problem continues to be the growth of bureaucracy and regulation. I would propose that the Government give serious consideration to establishing a working party to examine the need for, and the cost to business and the tax-payer of, the proliferation of local, State and Federal Government regulation.

The organisation Tax Payers United, for example, estimates that spending by all levels of Government in Australia now totals \$78,581m per year, 20 per cent greater than the total market capitalisation of all companies listed on Australian stock exchanges. The organisation estimates that Governments consume 43 per cent of our national income—that is, that the average Australian works from 1 January until 7 June for government. It also estimates that in 1983 Commonwealth taxes were 163 times the total profit of BHP, that interest payments on the national debt are now almost twice our spending on defence, that one-third of the work-force now works for government and, perhaps most seriously of all, that the number of tax-consumers in Australia now exceeds the number of tax-payers. This trend is continuing to emerge as a major threat to economic recovery and, I submit, to democracy itself, because the lessons of history

clearly show that when the State increasingly dominates the economic affairs of its people there is an inevitable erosion of freedom.

Mr Davis: That's good!

Mr BORBIDGE: The honourable member who is so excited does not seem to care that the average person in his electorate is working for nearly seven months of the year for government. He is not concerned about a national debt that has blown out of all proportion. We know that his colleagues and his political party are firmly committed to that course of action. The honourable member should know very well that we on this side of the House are not committed to that course of action.

I am advised, for example, that the 19 May edition of "The Australian" carried advertisements for 440 Government jobs with a total salary bill of more than \$10m. That was one newspaper on one day. I am also advised that in the past two decades Federal and State Parliaments have passed 16 631 Acts of Parliament and no fewer than 32 600 regulations. Yet our political opponents, and at times various sections of the community, adopt the curious attitude and level the criticism that the Parliament does not sit enough, that it does not pass enough laws and regulations. The commitment of the Labor Party and its allies, wherever they may be, to over government is well known.

With the Tasmanian Government, this Government is the only Government that is well aware of the escalating danger of over legislation, over regulation and over government. To its credit, the Government is not unaware of the difficulties. However, we must foster an awareness of the danger of excessive Government interference in the market-place.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr BORBIDGE: From the interjections of Opposition members, that is not a commitment that they share.

The Government has restricted the growth of its public service. Other Governments have not. Canberra has not. Indeed, many local authorities have not. The Government manages to balance its Budget and live within its means. Others do not. One only has to look at the deficit contained in the Federal Budget announced by the Treasurer last night. I believe it is appropriate to canvass a warning made a generation ago when Sir Winston Churchill said—

"We must beware of creating a society where no-one counts for anything save a politician or a public servant, where enterprise gains no reward and thrift no privileges."

We should remember that government is a means to an end, it is not an end in itself.

Over the coming weeks many measures will come before the Parliament that will present it with the opportunity to consolidate our State's envied position in the national affairs of Australia. The legislative program outlined by His Excellency to the Parliament yesterday will maintain this spirit and will benefit greatly the people of the State of Queensland.

Mr LINGARD (Fassifern) (4.44 p.m.): It is with pleasure that I second the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply moved by the honourable member for Surfers Paradise. When listening to His Excellency's Speech I was reminded of the magnificent advances that this State has made and will be making in the near future. That fact must be heart-breaking to members of the Opposition, who know they will remain on those benches for a long time. It must also be heart-breaking to the people of New South Wales, Victoria and South Australia—but it serves them right for voting Labor. I repeat the adage: "You can't knock a winner and you can't beat success." And the National Party is a winner.

My electorate of Fassifern has made similar advances. It now contains over 36 000 electors, which is an increase of at least 5 000 in the past 10 months.

On behalf of the people of Fassifern, I express our allegiance to Her Majesty, Queen Elizabeth II. I take great pride in doing this, and I know that His Excellency looks with disgust at the attitudes of the ALP Federal Government and the ALP State Opposition in mocking the Bible, God Save the Queen and the flag.

I ask you, Mr Speaker, to inform His Excellency that the people of Queensland have noted the comments in his Opening Speech, particularly the forceful comment that—

“Many Queenslanders are justifiably apprehensive about moves to change our National Flag. . . .”

and that he—

“ . . . views with concern recent trends . . . to downgrade our traditional links with the Monarchy . . . ”

Quite correctly, His Excellency expressed his disappointment at what is going on at a Federal level and is being supported by the State Opposition.

I do not know how members of the Opposition treat their duty of presenting the Queensland flag to schools and associations in their electorates, but I do know how members of the Federal ALP present the Australian flag. They hand it over in a packet. They do not even open up to the packet and talk about the flag. For instance, they do not give students any ideas about the origin of the flag. At a ceremony the other day, I saw a Federal politician hand over a brown paper packet in front of a scout parade. The poor kids standing at the front had to take the durex tape off the packet and then unfold and raise the flag. What a disgrace!

Everything the Federal Labor Government is doing is aimed at disgracing the people of England. As we face the countdown to the next Federal election, there is no doubt that the Labor Government will try to promote all the malicious rumours it can about things such as Maralinga. This is all aimed at discrediting England. The Labor Government's program is aimed at discrediting the Queen and the royal family. It wants to make people receptive to a republic and the forces of communism and socialism. The aim will be to win power in the Senate and to abolish the two-House system based on the English Westminster system. I remind the people of Queensland that it was a Labor Government which abolished the Upper House in Queensland. From 1915 onwards Labor tried hard to abolish the Upper House, until in 1922 it stacked the numbers and got rid of it. That is what Labor plans for the Federal Senate.

Mr Borbidge: They are trying to abolish it in Victoria, too.

Mr LINGARD: Of course it is.

Of course, when the Senate is abolished, States such as Queensland, Tasmania and Western Australia will be at the mercy of the Labor-dominated States of New South Wales and Victoria. Those southern States will dominate the House of Representatives, which is now organised on the one man, one vote system that gives power to the population bases of New South Wales and Victoria. The industries of the south want that to happen. The Victorian milk industry would dearly love to have the Australian milk industry nationalised. It could then flood the Queensland market with its milk. Southern industries want to capitalise on Queensland's growth and development.

Queenslanders do not want to be dominated by the southern States. Queenslanders do not want to lose the Senate, which protects the rights of the smaller States and the less populated areas. Look at what happened when Labor abolished the Queensland Upper House in 1922. In the early 1950s, under the leadership of Hanlon, Labor had to introduce the zonal system which Queensland still has today. It was introduced to ensure that the northern and western areas were not dominated by the voting power of south-east Queensland. This Government has had to continue the system because we have no Upper House and we know that the opinions of the north and the west must be respected. The zonal system has allowed great representation for the central areas of

Queensland, as is seen by the massive developments in industry there. In the north we have seen the development of the tourist industry.

I can also assure His Excellency that members of this Government show their allegiance to the monarchy with pride. One hundred and twenty-five years ago, when there were only 20 000 people in the area that became known as Queensland, there was a desire for separation. I remind the ALP that the word was "separation" and not "rejection". In fact, the motto adopted by those people was "bold, aye, but faithful". And so those 20 000 people formed the State of Queensland. They built this magnificent Parliament House and they designed their own flag. At all times they displayed the desire to be separate, but never did they want to reject the Queen, England or God.

Mr CASEY: I rise to a point of order. I realise that the honourable member was a schoolteacher, but it is necessary to correct his perspective of history. In 1859 Queensland became the colony of Queensland—a British Crown colony.

Mr LINGARD: We now see this in the radical, socialist and academic element that has crept into the Labor Party and changed it totally from the concept envisaged by those who started the Australian Labor Party. So we see members of the radical, academic element taking over the Labor Party. I call them academic twits. They stay at university until they reach the stage at which they have no job to go into. They apply for overseas scholarships, such as Rhodes Scholarships. They accept them with no sense of pride or guilt, or thought of what Labor Party politics stand for. Off they go to England to do their masters degree. Because they have been influenced by the academic twits at Oxford, they hold strong radical and reform attitudes when they return, and they write voluminous reports and deliver lectures which contain no common sense, such as the Boyer Lectures, one of which was delivered by Bob Hawke.

Mr COMBEN: I rise to a point of order. The remarks made by the honourable member are offensive to me. He referred to people who have graduated from universities being in some way second-class citizens.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Randell): Order!

Mr COMBEN: He is using terms that are totally derogatory. I consider them to be totally unparliamentary and ask for their withdrawal.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! When I call for order I want the honourable member to respect my call. There is no point of order.

Mr LINGARD: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I have given the House a fair amount of liberty. I will accept constructive interjections, but I will not let the present interjections continue. I expect the honourable member to be heard in silence. Unless interjections are constructive, honourable members will be called to order.

Mr LINGARD: That particular person is a reflection of the last word I used.

Mr COMBEN: I rise to a point of order. That is a direct aspersion on a member of this House. The honourable member said, "That particular person reflects what I said in the last sentence." His last sentence was derogatory of university graduates. I find it personally offensive and ask for the remark to be withdrawn.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I think it is a matter of how it is taken personally. I do not see how the honourable member can take objection to it. I call the honourable member for Fassifern.

Mr LINGARD: I have been referring to academic twits—not people who have just gone through university.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member for Fassifern to respect what I have said and to continue with his speech.

Mr LINGARD: They are still living in the idealism of people who have not been knocked round by the hardships of work or family. Then, because they have no job to go to and are dissatisfied, they drift into the organisation of trade unions and politics. They are in the Federal Government and they are in this State Opposition. They bear no resemblance to the people who formed the Labor Party in Queensland and Australia.

I have seen these people in the Education Department and in tertiary institutions. They display their discontent at their own ineptness by proposing radical changes. They want the complete overthrow of the system. They live with the thought that change for the sake of change is good. They breed on discontent—and any society can find discontent. We witnessed the radicalism of Gough Whitlam and his great desire to introduce changes, but the Whitlam Government found that the radical element which supported those changes initially and patted that Government on the back did not represent the true feelings of the conservative members of the public who adopt the protestant work effort and are prepared to work hard for their opportunities. We then witnessed people such as Jim Cairns showing their discontent and their desire to lead an ideal life.

Now the Federal Government is breeding on the discontent of the young radicals in society who see the removal of the flag and the monarchy as an expression of their own radicalism. However, their decisions lack depth of thought and concern about what will happen in the future. There is strong support for the legalisation of marijuana, with no discussion on the long-term implications. Young academics in the Opposition in this State mock at any suggestions of control, discipline and authority. In the same way as young, immature teenagers, they scoff at the thought of being told what to do. They are much like the 26-year-old man who admitted that he was amazed at how mature his father had become in the previous 10 years.

Queenslanders know that this Government is very strict in its attitude to marijuana and pornography. Everyone in New South Wales talks about the corruption of the Labor Government in that State. Taxi-drivers admit that they want a strong Government. Decisions by the Premier and the Cabinet are made not with the thought of immediate gain, but with the thought of what will happen in the future.

The Labor Party supports the legalising of marijuana because it would win many votes from the young people. The Government knows what would happen in the future after marijuana was accepted. Next we would have stronger drugs and more casualties as well as a drug trade which would be almost impossible to control. So, fortunately for Queensland, this State is being controlled by a Government which believes in discipline, control and authority.

Similarly, it will not make drastic changes to the flag and the monarchy. Our forbears designed a flag which displayed their allegiance in the top left-hand corner, and the remainder of the flag showed their independence. We should all remember this and be true to our motto, which reflects the thoughts of our forbears—

“Bold, aye, but faithful”—

bold as we step out and accept our separate identity and methods, but faithful to the country that assisted and supported us during our formative years.

However, despite the forces of socialism and communism, I have no doubt that His Excellency is extremely pleased with the economic, social and financial growth of this State over the last 10 months. The growth has reaffirmed the support that the people of this State gave to the Premier and to the National Party at the last State election.

His Excellency must also be pleased that the recent Stafford by-election has allowed the community to effectively reject the socialism and communism of the Labor Party in this State. The Labor Party's attempt to select a woman candidate with a high profile

has failed miserably. As well, it is a smack in the eye to the woman herself, who has been shown that the public will not accept the kind of biased reporting that she has displayed on the Australian Broadcasting Commission.

Similarly, it has been another nail in the coffin of the Leader of the Opposition, whose only positive comment of the campaign has been—

“I’ll resign if I don’t win the next election.”

But he said that at the last election. I have no doubt he will also be saying it after the next election. The reason he cannot resign now is that there is no-one else to take his place. Most of the members of the present front bench have had a go and failed.

One outspoken member has the charisma of a jellyfish and is known in the community as a true knocker. I refer to reports that at the last Labor Party meeting one member said that he would second a motion for a leadership spill but that he would not move it. What a magnificent display of how to be positive! What he was really saying was, “I want a change. I don’t know who I want, but I will take anybody.”

Quite obviously, there is absolutely no-one else who has any charisma or leadership appeal. There is not one person who has ever shown leadership ability within the community before coming into Parliament. I remind the Queensland public that the Labor Party could not even find someone to nominate for the position of Speaker at the start of the last session.

In the 10 months since its election as a majority party, the National Party has been true to its pre-election promises.

Queensland now is the State with record growth, development and significant opportunity. Its mineral and energy reserves are massive, and it has developed vast food resources, together with a healthy manufacturing capability.

These are the facts which will allow our present campaign called “Enterprise Queensland” to become so well accepted. The campaign will develop new trade contacts in Europe and Asia, expand tourism, attract new capital investment and promote Queensland as a progressive and advanced community. For the Queensland public, the end result will be further jobs and increased prosperity.

The Government accepts that the one urgent problem this nation faces is finding enough employment for everyone. Its policies are aimed at new job creation to ensure that Queensland keeps well above the national average. Figures show that the State’s work-force rose by 17.5 per cent, compared with a 9.1 per cent increase for the nation over a five-year period to February this year.

Queensland created 129 000 jobs during this period. This was an increase of almost 15 per cent, compared with the national increase of just 5 per cent. It has absorbed large numbers of interstate unemployed and job-seekers, yet set national records in a whole range of economic indicators. This is indeed a lucky State. Leading economists indicate that Queensland will again surpass the growth of other States in 1984-85.

Look at some of the developments that have occurred recently—

1. The \$500m Blair Athol steaming coal project west of Rockhampton and the \$400m Curragh coal mine.

2. The \$250m Dalrymple Bay coal export terminal. This, combined with the Hay Point terminal, will make the port of Hay Point the largest export coal port in the world.

3. The \$180m Abbot Point terminal. This brings to 16 the number of Queensland export ports now serving the State.

4. The \$37m Cairns international airport about which the member for Surfers Paradise has spoken. This demonstrates the Government’s policy of promoting the tourist potential of Queensland. Tourist trips to and within Queensland are 25.3 per cent higher than they were five years previously. Massive developments can be

seen at Hamilton Island, and improvements are being made at Hayman Island and South Molle Island. These improvements signify the acceptance of the tourist potential of Queensland.

Public expenditure on capital works was \$944.6m, which is an increase of 58 per cent over the previous year. Capital expenditure by private enterprise has been about \$2,442.9m—an increase of 16.8 per cent over previous years.

The Jackson oil-field and the Jackson to Moonie pipeline were recently opened by the Premier. The pipeline has a pumping capacity of 55 000 barrels of oil a day.

The first stages of the \$115m Bayview Harbour residential marine complex are under way. The construction of a \$300m paper pulp mill in the Maryborough/Gympie area is planned. This mill will provide 500 new jobs and utilise thinnings from the forests and sawmill residue.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr LINGARD: Still Opposition members ridicule! I am talking about 500 jobs. What else do they want? It is obvious that they will ridicule anything.

The Dutch company DAF has selected this State to launch a new venture to develop and manufacture long-distance haulage units at Wacol industrial estate. Australia's biggest gold-mining operation at Kidston will be fully operational by the end of the year. The new \$200m Tarong Power Station has opened to complement electricity developments at Moura, Garbutt and Maroochydore.

Queenslanders will soon see the completed Queensland Cultural Centre, which will house the State Art Gallery, the Performing Arts Complex, the Queensland Museum and the State Library. The State Library has just received the final funding arrangements by Cabinet. The Performing Arts Theatre will provide a \$60m complex that will be opened by the end of the year. The complex has a lyric theatre, concert hall, studio theatre and foyer areas. As well, a substantial allocation has been made to preserve the old museum for use by cultural groups.

During the month of June, expenditure of over \$60m for the electrification of central Queensland railway lines has been approved. This follows the electrification of suburban rail lines in Brisbane. Also envisaged is the development of the Roma Street station to include a massive bus terminal to complement the main railway station. The new Central Railway Station has just been opened. The new Children's Court at North Quay has been opened, as has the new Queensland Radium Institute House at Herston.

Queensland has some of the most up-to-date prison facilities in Australia. The women's prison at Boggo Road and the prisons at Wacol, Woodford, Palen Creek and Etna Creek are magnificent complexes. Boggo Road and Stuart will be updated with the recent allocation of \$40m over the next eight years. Victoria still has Pentridge, in which some sections are exact replicas of Port Arthur. South Australia has Yatala and New South Wales has Long Bay.

Expo 88 will ring the final death-knell for the ALP in Queensland. The member for South Brisbane said that he did not want Expo. How could he be so negative as to be against a project that will bring millions of visitors to this wonderful State?

The theme of Expo is leisure in the age of technology, and this will be a magnificent spectacle for our thousands of young people who will live in an environment much different from our own. The ALP is obviously jealous that the Premier had the initiative and determination to accept a project that was turned down by the Labor States in the south. The Opposition is jealous that the Premier had the power and ability to provide a site for Expo on the south bank of the Brisbane River.

Expo will fit in with Australia's bicentennial celebrations, and everybody will witness the State of Queensland becoming the centre of magnificent conventions that year. It is reported that already accommodation for conferences is impossible to find in hotels such

as the Sheraton in that year. It is expected that \$500m will be spent by visitors and that 5 600 on-site jobs will be provided.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr LINGARD: Still Opposition members ridicule! It is amazing that the ALP spokesman could say that he does not want Expo. His main reason is that there will be too much traffic. How can Opposition members back their spokesman? How can they sit with a person who says he does not want Expo?

The Government's positive attitude towards the Olympic Games has been shown by its agreement to participate in an interim feasibility report with the Brisbane City Council in its bid to host the 1992 Olympic Games. The Commonwealth Government has been asked to participate because, for the project to succeed, it needs the participation of all levels of government. The Queensland Government does not want the Commonwealth to pull out of the Olympics as it has done with Expo. The Federal Government has given a disgracefully small allocation to Expo. It has provided only \$3m to \$4 m for Expo but will provide \$20m for the defence of the America's Cup. Mr Hawke will not even support Expo in Japan next year. If the Olympic Games are awarded to Brisbane, it will help this great State on the move and will be a tremendous boost for the people who live here.

In my position as chairman of the party sport policy committee I will do everything I can to gain the 1992 Olympic Games. Such a concept not only offers a magnificent spectacle for the citizens of Queensland but also provides the ultimate in facilities for our young people. The results of the Commonwealth Games are the QE II sports ground, the Chandler complex with its swimming-pool, velodrome and gymnasium, Belmont and, of course, Murarrie. As well, sports such as weight-lifting, archery, gymnastics, and all the ball games are receiving world standard facilities. Such facilities are costly and difficult to provide unless they can be incorporated into a concept such as the Commonwealth Games or Olympic Games.

The Queensland Government already does a magnificent job in the development of sport. In 1972 it started the first Ministry of Sport and created the position of Director of Sport. The administration of sport in Australia is carried out on a three-tier system. There are clearly defined areas for national, State and local levels. The State level has three areas—school curriculum, recreation and the encouragement of sport. There are 79 constituted sporting groups receiving financial assistance for the encouragement of sport. Over \$3.8m will be distributed this year. The Government adopts the philosophy of the greatest good for the greatest number.

Sporting groups can apply for grants under eight headings, including coaching of juniors, for which a \$1 subsidy is received for every \$4 spent and providing facilities, for which a \$1 subsidy is received for every \$5 spent. Sporting groups can apply for grants for sending State teams to national events. It was disappointing to hear the Leader of the Opposition suggest that the Queensland Government should have funded the paraplegic team that competed overseas. That funding is provided at national level. Queensland sends teams to national events. The Queensland Government was proud that it spent so much money and that so many Queenslanders were selected in the national teams. It is then up to the national level to support overseas travel. Sporting groups can apply for grants for staging national and international events in Queensland. They can apply for grants for administrative costs on the basis of \$1 for every \$2 spent; grants for State directors of coaching; grants for conducting seminars on the basis of \$1 for every \$2 spent; and grants for gifted sportsmen and sportswomen.

It is in the last-mentioned area that such developments as the Commonwealth Games and Olympic Games provide such magnificent assistance to young people. The use of skilled administrators, coaches and educators, combined with Queensland's magnificent climate and facilities of world standard will project this State as a leader of sports development in Australia. That is why, as chairman of the sports committee, I

have made submissions to the Minister for the establishment of a sports development centre. That concept is supported by all members of the committee.

If time permitted, I would refer to all of Queensland's great natural resources and to the programs that the Queensland Government has adopted to promote them. Programs such as "Enterprise Queensland", the Liverpool Garden Festival and overseas delegations have been very successful. Let me compare the positive attitudes of the present Government with some of the strategies adopted by the Australian Labor Party and supported by the trade unions.

I relate a true story of the 1880s in Australia. A socialist orator was speaking to a crowd and promised that there would be strawberries and cream for all after the revolution. To an interjector who continually stated that he did not like strawberries and cream, the socialist replied, "Comrade, after the revolution everyone will have to like strawberries and cream." How true that is! How true it is to compare our Federal Government with the statement that a Government claiming to be big enough to give people everything they want is also big enough to take everything they have.

Every Queenslander knows that he now pays more for hospital care. Anyone who has made a claim on Medicare knows that he receives less than he received under the private scheme. Anyone who is waiting for an operation that is not regarded as urgent knows that there is an unbelievable waiting time. Any aged person trying to obtain accommodation in a nursing home knows that even if his doctor says "Yes", a Federal Government nurse will come round to make the final decision. In 10 years' time Queensland will not have enough hospital facilities of a sufficient standard unless, of course, the Medicare levy is raised substantially. There is no doubt that that will have to happen after the next election.

The State Health Department is now flooded with pleas from elderly people who are desperate for a bed. Those elderly people are being left in appalling conditions while they wait for the Government to lift its freeze on nursing homes. The old people know what is happening. They know what the Hawke Government has done with its assets test; and they will show their rejection of those policies at the next Federal election. They know that the ALP promises have not been honoured.

They know that the Labor Government is making promises and failing to honour them. We all know that the Federal Government will do so again if it is successful at the coming election.

The Hawke-led Government has introduced higher excise taxes. It has imposed higher real personal income taxes. It is a tax-by-stealth campaign aimed at the middle-income-earner, who has to pay for all others to ensure a levelling out of the classes in our society. This is real socialism and communism. I quote Lenin, who said—

"The way to crush the middle class is to grind them between the millstones of taxation and inflation."

Many discussions will be held about last night's Federal Budget. However, one does not need to be an academic to know that, since Labor gained power in Canberra, pay packets have been reduced. The 1 per cent Medicare levy has done that. Those who have sold property know that the levy will be applied to money received from those sales. Those who have received tax refunds know that they are much lower than they were previously. The Government is taking increased taxes as well as its six-monthly automatic increase. The average Australian worker finds himself paying more for Medicare, facing an automatic six-monthly tax rise and receiving less in his tax refund.

The Federal Government has to learn that excessive tax grabs will stimulate inflation and lead to a serious threat to economic freedom. Industries and individuals will be restricted in job-generating projects. Similar restrictions during the Whitlam era plunged the vital mineral and oil exploration industries into recession. Already the automatic six-monthly tax rises initiated by the Federal Government are occurring subtly, while

less subtly an assets test has been imposed on pensions and a 30 per cent tax slug has been placed on lump-sum superannuation.

The Queensland Government has promised that there will be no new taxes such as petrol tax, tobacco tax or financial institutions tax in its Budget. Most importantly, the people of Queensland have seen that, when the Premier and the National Party make promises, they are kept. These positive attitudes and policies allow the Premier to completely embarrass the Opposition and the Federal Government by producing a balanced Budget. How pleasing to note the statement by the Governor that Queensland completed the 1983-84 financial year with a surplus in consolidated revenue, and with its other accounts balanced or in surplus. I repeat the words "surplus" and "balanced".

Since the Leader and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition have been trying to score political points by saying that the Premier is being untrue, I wonder whether they will have the courage to call the Governor a liar. I wonder also how they accept the Governor's statement that the Government has maintained the status of being the lowest-taxed mainland State.

Mr Prest interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable member for Port Curtis.

Mr LINGARD: The Federal Budget presented last night will result in a massive deficit of over \$7 billion. There will be massive interest repayments on that debt. Obvious decreases in the area of taxation are aimed at conning people into believing that they are paying less tax. The average Queenslander pays 1 per cent of his gross pay for a hospital system which he received free before Medicare. He is paid smaller refunds on his Medicare bills. He receives lower income tax refunds than previously.

However, because of good budgeting, Queensland has no financial institutions duty, no tobacco tax and no fuel levies. Stamp duties have been significantly reduced on business transactions and gift and death taxes have been abolished.

Finally, it is quite obvious that this Government has been accepted by the Queensland public as the Government which has promoted the family. The Opposition has once again fallen into the trap of opposing everything which the National Party promotes. It has ridiculed the concept of the Year of the Family. The public, however, has taken the Year of the Family very seriously, and many organisations have promoted it forcefully. The Government has shown that it is committed to upholding the family unit and creating policy to maintain and preserve the family.

Not only do we face the negative attitude of the Queensland Labor Party to family life, but we also face the pressures to the family arising at the Commonwealth level. Oppressive taxation, economic instability and social pressures cause difficulties to families throughout the nation. We see the positive acceptance by Federal Labor politicians of de facto relationships. The Sex Discrimination Bill makes it necessary to employ women to create equal numbers to men. No regard is paid to a man, whose wife is not working, being unable to gain employment in preference to a woman who would probably become the second wage-earner in her family.

The Queensland Government has been positive in its promotion of family life through the Year of the Family. As well, it has promoted the Family and Community Development Bill, which will emphasise the family responsibility when children are brought into the control of the Government. It recognises the fact that many children's problems are caused by family breakdown, so the Children's Court will be re-formed into two areas—criminal and civil. Recognition is also given to the need for a co-ordinating committee to record child abuse and neglect.

By the introduction in the last session of legislation for homes for the aged, the National Party has shown that it wishes to stimulate services and facilities to allow the aged to remain in their own homes or to live with relatives. The policy is aimed at avoiding putting aged people into institutions unless it is absolutely necessary. The

Government has maintained an active program in aged rehabilitation, including assessment units and day hospitals in metropolitan and provincial hospitals.

Once again I refer to the Governor's Opening Speech, in which His Excellency demonstrated the confidence in this Government by saying—

“Such trends are a vote of confidence in the future of Queensland, and the State's commitment to major development projects ensures that our generation is building for a better future for our children.”

I am delighted to know that my children will be teenagers through the years 1986 to 1992, when they will see magnificent developments in sport, culture and the economy. I am also delighted to know that during that time the National Party of Queensland will form the Government.

Debate, on motion of Mr Davis, adjourned.

MENTAL HEALTH ACT, CRIMINAL CODE AND HEALTH ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Hon. B. D. AUSTIN (Wavell—Minister for Health), by leave, without notice: I move—

“That leave be given to bring in a Bill to amend the Mental Health Act 1974, the Mental Health Act 1974-1978, the Health Act 1937-1984 and The Criminal Code each in certain particulars and for related purposes.”

Motion agreed to.

First Reading

Bill presented and, on motion of Mr Austin, read a first time.

Second Reading

Hon. B. D. AUSTIN (Wavell—Minister for Health) (5.18 p.m.): I move—

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

A similar Bill was introduced into the previous Parliament on 22 March 1983. At that time it was my declared intention to allow the Bill to lie on the table of the House so that all sections of the community could make comment on that Bill.

I do not intend to reiterate all of my remarks about the previous Bill, as I am sure that honourable members are aware of the matters that I raised at that time. However, there are certain matters that do need to be repeated. The first is that this is a Bill which touches upon principles of profound importance, not only for the patient but also for the patient's natural support network in the community and the community at large.

This Bill further differentiates between the intellectually handicapped and the mentally ill, a matter which is of great importance. Automatic review by a newly constituted Patient Review Tribunal of all patients who are compulsorily detained has been introduced.

A new tribunal, to be constituted by a Supreme Court judge, has been set up to provide a judicial body for matters that presently are the responsibility of the Governor in Council. The safeguard provided by official visitors has been improved and extended. Certain forms of treatment such as psychosurgery can now be prescribed.

Major amendments have been made in the provisions relating to mentally ill persons involved in criminal and like proceedings.

Those amendments provide for the establishment of a concept of fitness to be tried; a judicial procedure for the assessment of fitness to be tried; dispensing with orders for indeterminate detention by providing periodic review of patients detained on account of mental illness and involved in criminal proceedings; adequate judicial appeal provisions; preservation of rights of trial by jury; and ensuring that a person's mental condition will

be monitored so that the question of his eventual release can be determined in accordance with his interests and the interests of the community.

I am pleased to inform honourable members that there has been a significant response to the previous Bill from various sections of the community.

Apart from copies of the Bill distributed to members of this Assembly, 164 copies have been sent to other parties, most of whom made requests in response to advertisements in the public press.

I feel justified, therefore, in concluding that widespread interest has been shown in the Bill, and it is interesting to note that over 30 of the requests came from professionals working in the field.

Twelve requests came from voluntary agencies, and other requests have been received from unions, journalists, patients and patients' relatives.

About 20 per cent of those who received a copy of the Bill together with a copy of my speech and explanatory notes have responded and, without exception, the responses have been thoughtful.

Most extensive and thorough submissions have been received from the medical (including psychiatric), legal, psychological and nursing professions.

The responses from voluntary agencies and from patients' relatives have been most thoughtful and helpful.

As a result of consideration of these responses, about 20 amendments have been made to the previous Bill.

However, I have been impressed with the real lack of knowledge and understanding of the nature of mental illness by many in the community who have responded to my invitation to comment on the legislation.

Not only is there a lack of understanding of the real nature of mental illness, but there is widespread lack of knowledge of the suffering of the individual who suffers from mental illness, and of the suffering of the family and intimate social groups in which the patient moves.

For instance, it has been said that, by virtue of this legislation, persons admitted to hospital for mental illness lose their liberty, lose control of the treatment of their illness, and lose the right to manage property.

I cannot emphasise enough that any such losses are the result not of legislation but of the nature of mental illness itself.

If we take the question of liberty—only those who suffer from a mental illness of a nature that requires them to be detained in a locked ward will be deprived of such liberty.

It is not spurious to compare the loss of such liberty with the loss or curtailment of liberty of a person who, by reason of paraplegia or even severe heart disease, is confined to bed.

The vast majority of regulated patients, although they are liable to detention, are not detained in closed wards and are free to move about the hospital, or even at times outside the hospital.

They all have access to their friends and relatives and their private medical practitioners and lawyers, and they all have means of communication, such as telephones and post.

In passing, I would refer to the fact that the previous restriction on correspondence in the 1974 Act is removed by these amendments.

In regard to loss of control over any treatment, those persons who are capable of giving informed consent are involved in the decision-making in regard to their treatment.

However, I would point out that the compulsory powers of detention under this Act are exercised only in those cases where persons have lost the judgment necessary to seek treatment voluntarily, but such powers are exercised only for the patient's own welfare or for the protection of others.

Finally, on the matter of the right to manage property, this is not automatic and has not been automatic since 1962.

Regulated patients, unless it is certified that they are incapable of managing their affairs, continue to manage their affairs.

It is only when a determination quite independent of detention is made that a person is incapable of managing his affairs that the Public Trustee is notified and subsequently the patient's rights and benefits are protected by law.

It is therefore quite clear that it is the nature of mental illness which robs the person of his abilities to be at liberty, to control his treatment, and manage his property, and the law only provides for the safety of those who are so incapable.

This matter has nothing to do with that much abused notion of due process.

In fact, mental health legislation provides for a due process of law in relation to those persons who are incapable by virtue of their illness.

The next major matter that has been drawn to my attention concerns misconceptions which abound in regard to the relationship between mental health legislation and the criminal law.

After reading very lengthy submissions from many on this matter, one would be excused for thinking that the Criminal Code had all the sanctity and infallibility of Holy Writ.

The Criminal Code deals with crime and criminal responsibility. The code has made provision for unsoundness of mind based on concepts which are substantially out of date. What this amending Bill is doing is really giving effect to what is contained in Chapter 5 of the Criminal Code, which is a general provision relating to criminal responsibility.

The Criminal Code has replaced the old common law concept of mens rea with more specific provisions relating to culpability, and has made a significant extension of common law in section 27 by providing for irresistible impulse.

However, section 26 of the Code, whilst useful in some contexts, is unnecessarily inhibiting in giving a proper appreciation of criminal responsibility based on state of mind, and this concept, though acceptable in the nineteenth century, is not appropriate to the end of the twentieth century.

It is not in any way inconsistent with the principles of the code to have more explicit and more understanding provisions made for the purpose of assessing criminal responsibility and to provide a much more efficient and sympathetic means of ensuring that persons who are involved with the criminal law and who, for various reasons, may not be mentally fit, are properly dealt with in accordance with their criminality or otherwise.

Civil liberties have become something of a catchcry, but what the amending Bill purports to do is put in proper perspective the treatment of mentally ill persons and to determine to what extent they should be dealt with, if at all, by the criminal law.

For practical purposes, the criminal law is untouched. I make no apology for requiring tribunals or juries to have proper information available to them for the purposes of determining criminal responsibility based on unsoundness of mind. There is, therefore, no erosion of the rights of the individual, nor is there any interference with the system of criminal justice.

Comments have agreed in principle with the amendments concerning major offences, but in some cases the notion has been proposed that there are what have been described as open-and-shut cases. There is no such thing as an open-and-shut case, and the matters to be dealt with are very real to the individuals, even though they may not be of great weight in regard to a scale of indictable offences.

Whether the act leading to indictment is one of murder or of stealing, the individual has a real interest in being treated in accordance with the degree of criminal responsibility. If he is not criminally responsible, it is a travesty of justice that he be treated as a criminal.

In this matter, I can recall a case recently of infanticide in which a mother was suffering from such a severe mental illness that she was hospitalised for many months for the treatment of that illness immediately following the killing of her child. In order to avoid the possibility of indefinite detention, that mother pleaded guilty to a charge of manslaughter and was convicted. That conviction will remain forever in relation to that mother.

The woman had recovered from that mental illness, and the provisions of these amendments now mean that she need never have been tried and convicted of an offence of which she was plainly not guilty.

Despite my attempts to differentiate between the question of fitness to plead and fitness to be tried, the comments that I have received lead me to believe that there remains a good deal of confusion.

Those who have prepared this Bill are well aware of the provisions of the code and of the concept of fitness to plead. They are also aware of the great suffering and injustice which may have resulted to persons who, while technically fit to plead, have been forced to undergo or await a trial when only the end result will be an acquittal on the grounds of unsoundness of mind.

Such persons may well be fit to plead in the technical sense, but having undergone such considerable treatment and been restored to a degree of mental health, they can have their future completely undermined by the prospect of a trial where they are charged and treated as criminals.

We have had two recent instances of persons committing suicide whilst technically fit to plead. We have also had the spectacle of women charged with murdering their young children and having to endure the strains of a trial, however modified, and the stigma of being detained pursuant to section 647 of the Criminal Code.

The truth is that these amendments are by no means an erosion of the rights of the citizen, but are devised to ensure that only those who can be held criminally responsible are treated as such.

The amendments give effect to the truth of criminal responsibility, which is a feature of the Criminal Code. By giving effect to this, it ensures that persons who are not criminally responsible will be dealt with in a humane and civilised fashion and relieves them of the trauma and stigma of a criminal trial. It also provides for such decisions to be made at an early stage and not to be deferred endlessly while awaiting the process of criminal trials. These amendments give effect to the real community interest in determining the matters of community concern.

Justice is a two-way street. At the present time, the matter of criminal responsibility is often a matter regarded as simply a defence.

The criticism of the right of the Crown law officer (the Attorney-General or the Solicitor-General) to have the matter of criminal responsibility raised before the tribunal is completely unjustified. It is the Crown, through the Crown law officers, that is concerned with the administration of the criminal law, and in this regard is the representative of the community.

It is completely inaccurate to suggest that the Crown would seek to have matters raised before the tribunal for the purpose of obtaining evidence. As I have already said, it is imperative that evidence be obtained, and, in any event, where unsoundness of mind is likely to be an issue in the trial, the community has a very real interest in knowing what the state of mind of the individual was, and to have the question of criminal responsibility, whether before the tribunal or elsewhere, fully probed.

When I introduced the previous Bill, I spoke at some length in regard to the nature of the Patient Review Tribunal and the question of legal representation. There has been some representation, although not widespread, in regard to that matter.

Subsequent to that time, a conference of New South Wales stipendiary magistrates was held in Sydney, and I would like to quote from one of the papers delivered at that seminar. In speaking on the principles and practice of the New South Wales Mental Health Act, Mr S. E. Schreiner, a man of considerable experience in the field, had this to say—

“I generally find little assistance is provided when a patient is legally represented—the solicitor usually is totally ignorant of basic medical knowledge regarding mental illness and often of the provisions of the Mental Health Act. As well, many solicitors see their role as ‘getting the patient off and out’ regardless of whether he is a mentally ill person and in need of help—I do not consider that attitude appropriate here. Obviously, if the patient is not a mentally ill person within the definition, then he must be discharged. But if he is a mentally ill person and needs help and treatment, then he should receive it and should not be deprived of his right to treatment.”

I believe that statement summarises the position adequately.

I cannot over-emphasise the necessity, on one hand, to ensure the safeguards for the individual person and, on the other, to provide a workable, effective, humane system. Providing legal representation would not add substantially to the functions of that tribunal. Indeed, it may detract from them.

Where matters of law are involved, representation will certainly not only be allowed but be sought; but to unnecessarily involve legal representatives will impede the proper functioning of the tribunal, cause delay, add unnecessary costs and divert the tribunal from its real purpose. The tribunal is there to ensure the welfare of the patient, but also to judge the acceptance of the community, the safety of the community, and the reactions of the patient’s relatives and friends.

Finally, I repeat my plea that honourable members will view this legislation objectively, and that they will give thought to the fundamental question of the nature of mental illness and the need to confront severely mentally ill people objectively and unemotionally with the need for treatment. This Bill provides all necessary and reasonable safeguards for both the person and the community.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate, on motion of Mr Mackenroth, adjourned.

The House adjourned at 5.33 p.m.